

County, Pa., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Mount Chestnut Grange, No. 133, Patrons of Husbandry, in favor of a good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the Philadelphia Newspaper Publishers' Association and the Pittsburg Newspaper Publishers' Association, protesting against abridging the rights of rural mail carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Civic Club of Philadelphia, in favor of fixing the width of the Mall vista at 890 feet—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the City Parks Association of Philadelphia, in favor of fixing the width of the Mall vista at 890 feet—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the T Square Club of Philadelphia, in favor of fixing the width of the Mall vista at 890 feet—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petitions of B. F. Willis and others, of York, Pa.; Adin B. Lacey and others, of Philadelphia, Pa., and Theo. N. Ely, in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Trades League, in favor of bill H. R. 1976—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LAMAR of Missouri: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mary A. Wilder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to William Neuborg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petition of W. J. Echols and others, of Fort Smith, Ark., against the passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LOUD: Resolution of H. S. Burnette Post, No. 278, Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: Petition of H. Kent Day, of Germantown, Pa., and Charles Z. Klander, in favor of bill S. 4845, relative to the erection of buildings on the Mall—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, in favor of bills H. R. 804 and S. 19, relative to the reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions from the City Parks Association, of Philadelphia; the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects; the T Square Club, of Philadelphia; the Civic Club of Philadelphia, and sundry citizens, favoring the preservation of the width of the Mall in the city of Washington at 890 feet—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PUJO: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to William A. Stovall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: Petition of citizens of the county of Fauquier, Va., in favor of the good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Lodge No. 70 of the International Association of Machinists, of Fort Wayne, Ind., in favor of increasing the capacity of the Naval Gun Factory—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the Citizens Committee of San Miguel, Cal., relative to the location of a military training camp in California—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERLEY: Petition of citizens of Louisville, Ky., in favor of bill H. R. 4668, for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of citizens of San Antonio, Tex., against the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, in favor of bill H. R. 6273—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Mrs. Mary Stapp, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Burnett, Tex.; A. A. Dudley and 25 others, of Fife, Tex.; James Finley and 13 others, of Waldrif, Tex.; J. H. Stapp and 26 others, of Burnett, Tex.; G. B. Awalt and 11 others, of McCulloch County, Tex., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Marion Presbyterian Church, of Marion Center, Pa., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Resolution of the Texas Cattle Raisers' Association, in favor of bill H. R. 6273—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNOOK: Paper to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Henry Lichty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Paper to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Milton Selby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Papers to accompany claim of Mary L. Taylor—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WARNOCK: Petitions of J. C. Vergon and 349 others, Fay Zimmerman and 123 others, and Larkin Bowers and 23 others, all of Delaware County, Ohio, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Shawneetown, Ill., against the passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petitions of the Chair Makers' Union of Tell City, Ind., and the Stout & Wilson Furniture Company, of Salem, Ind., in favor of the enactment of bill H. R. 9303—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, March 26, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on the request of Mr. LODGE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

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

FINDINGS BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Saulsbury, Tenn., v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Woodstock, Va., v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Bettie Brooks Metcalfe and the Fidelity Trust Company, administrator of Lucy Brooks Bell, deceased, v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. MCKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 3015) to provide for an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; and

A bill (S. 4142) granting to the Davenport Water Power Company rights to construct and maintain a canal, power station, and appurtenant works in the Mississippi River, in Scott County, Iowa.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13521) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12446) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. LITTAUER, Mr. MARSH, and Mr. TAYLOR managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (S. R. 55) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to print an extra edition of the map of the United States for 1904, and making the appropriation for maps made in the acts of April 17, 1900, and of March 3, 1901, available for that purpose; and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR HANNA.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, a notice has been heretofore given that on Thursday, March 31, immediately after the routine

morning business, the Senate would be asked to consider resolutions commemorative of the life, character, and public services of the late Senator Hanna, of Ohio. On account of the inconvenience to some who desire to speak on the occasion growing out of that date being fixed, I now recall that notice and give notice that those resolutions will be presented to the Senate on Thursday, April 7, immediately after the routine morning business.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Society of Christian Endeavor of Stockbridge, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Jamaica Plain, Melrose, and Westboro, and of the Indian Industrial League of Boston, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying that lands in severalty be granted to landless Indians in northern California; which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dorchester, Mass., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of Local Union No. 9762, American Federation of Labor, of St. Johns, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Centennial Evangelical Church, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ohio County, W. Va., praying that lands be granted in severalty to the landless Indians of northern California; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented a petition of S. W. Stirk Circle, No. 18, Department of Indiana, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Fort Wayne, Ind., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Indianapolis Journal and the Indianapolis News, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of rural free-delivery mail carriers, and also to prohibit them from soliciting subscriptions, selling wares, or making collections for pay for private concerns; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Landess, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Linnæan Society of New York City, remonstrating against the repeal of the law for the protection of game in Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of the Ladies' Missionary Society of Crossroads, Ind., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jefferson County, Ind., and a petition of Honey Creek Grange, No. 1, Patrons of Husbandry, of Vigo County, Ind., praying for the establishment of a bureau of public highways in the Department of Agriculture; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of the Building Trades Council of Trenton, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Literary Club of Arlington, N. J., praying for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the White Mountains of New Hampshire; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. DRYDEN presented a petition of the Woman's Literary Club of Arlington, N. J., praying for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the White Mountains of New Hampshire; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 37, General Ware Pressers, Brotherhood of Operative Potters, of Trenton, N. J., and a petition of the Building Trades Council of Trenton, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Thomas Cressey, of Newark,

N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation regulating the erection of buildings on the Mall in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the Middlesex County Board of Agriculture, of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called "Brownlow good-roads bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HOPKINS presented memorials of Kohl Brothers, of Centralia; of S. M. Ryrie & Co., of Alton; of the Tenk Hardware Company, of Quincy; of Montgomery, Ward & Co., of Chicago; of the Cottrell Hardware Company, of Quincy, and of the Trout Hardware Company, of Chicago, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relative to the shipping of so-called "high explosives;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition of Triumph Grange, No. 518, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hersey, Mich., praying for 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 Triumph Grange, No. 518, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hersey, Mich., praying for the passage of the so-called "Brownlow good-roads bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Bay County Medical Society, of Michigan, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Trades Labor Council of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., praying for the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of H. S. Burnett Post, No. 278, Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the Republic, of Michigan, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Williamston, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the destruction of derelicts at sea; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the act to increase the efficiency of the permanent military establishment of the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to reorganize the consular service of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 141, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron-ship Builders, of Sayre, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to develop the American merchant marine; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of M. M. Patterson and 16 other citizens of Wilkinsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of the Patent Law Association of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to section 493 of the Revised Statutes, in relation to patents; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented petitions of the Municipal Art Society of Cincinnati, Ohio; of J. H. Pierce, of Elmira, N. Y.; of the Fine Arts Federation of New York City; of Frederick Skinner, of Chicago, Ill.; of Brinton B. Davis, of Louisville, Ky.; of D. Knickerbocker Boyd, of Philadelphia, Pa., and of sundry architects of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation regulating the erection of buildings on the Mall in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BAILEY presented petitions of sundry citizens of Vernon, Leander, Panhandle, Canadian, Hillsboro, Hamilton, Ladonia, and Terrell, all in the State of Texas, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLAURIN presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 4645) for the relief of the heirs of J. H. Peeples, deceased; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WARREN presented sundry papers to accompany the following bills; which were referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 617) for the relief of the estate of John M. Hawkins;
A bill (S. 865) for the relief of the German Reformed Church of Middleton, Md.;

A bill (S. 1022) for the relief of James H. Knox;

A bill (S. 1142) for the relief of Caleb Perkins;
 A bill (S. 1147) for the relief of Eliza L. Rivers;
 A bill (S. 1181) for the relief of Mrs. C. V. Wilkins;
 A bill (S. 1185) for the relief of the estate of R. T. Brown;
 A bill (S. 1485) for the relief of Eugene Augustin Bourcy;
 A bill (S. 2139) for the relief of Sarah E. Callahan;
 A bill (S. 3670) for the relief of the estate of Richmond Pace;
 A bill (S. 4521) for the relief of the heirs of Vernon H. Johnston, deceased;
 A bill (S. 4535) for the relief of the estate of David Hurst, deceased;
 A bill (S. 4564) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. D. J. Booth;
 A bill (S. 4584) for the relief of John F. Byars;
 A bill (S. 4701) for the relief of Mrs. Ann E. Sanders;
 A bill (S. 4705) for the relief of the estate of Solomon Smith, deceased;
 A bill (S. 4709) for the relief of the estate of James Jones, deceased;
 A bill (S. 4728) for the relief of Jacob Cook;
 A bill (S. 4729) for the relief of Mary E. Heller and estate of David Heller, deceased;
 A bill (S. 4890) for the relief of Edward P. Thompson;
 A bill (S. 4944) for the relief of W. F. Gaines;
 A bill (S. 4951) for the relief of the estate of Isaac D. Yocum;
 A bill (S. 4971) for the relief of the heirs of Adeliza Pickett Quays;
 A bill (S. 4987) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Wilson;
 A bill (S. 4989) for the relief of the estate of Sidney F. Tate;
 A bill (S. 4991) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Thompson;
 A bill (S. 4997) for the relief of the estate of C. E. Rosser;
 A bill (S. 5003) for the relief of James R. Nance;
 A bill (S. 5012) for the relief of Henrietta Y. Turner;
 A bill (S. 5015) for the relief of Peter Williams;
 A bill (S. 5017) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Cleveland, Tenn.;
 A bill (S. 5019) for the relief of Mrs. Octavia R. Polk;
 A bill (S. 5089) for the relief of the estate of William B. Ott; and
 A bill (S. 5090) for the relief of the estate of James L. Miller.

MAURICE LANGHORNE.

Mr. CULLOM. I present the affidavit of Maurice Langhorne in support of the bill (S. 668) for the relief of Maurice Langhorne. I move that the affidavit be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BEVERIDGE, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3035) to amend an act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5088) to aid the Western Alaska Construction Company, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4603) to modify the mining laws applicable to the district of Alaska, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FAIRBANKS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. PLATT of New York on the 24th instant, proposing to appropriate \$2,000,000 for the acquisition of a site for a post-office building in the city of New York, such site to be subject to the right of the Pennsylvania, New York and Long Island Railroad Company to use for platforms and trackage under a plane 20 feet below the curb line of the adjoining streets, etc., submitted a favorable report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed: which was agreed to.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4144) for the relief of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HOAR, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5093) for the protection of the President of the United States, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 5265) granting an increase of pension to James Stout; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced a bill (S. 5266) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Nicholas Larney; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 5267) granting an increase of pension to Mary Gamedinger; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5268) granting a pension to Henry Barr; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 5269) to authorize Mr. Herbert W. Bowen, minister of the United States to Venezuela, to accept a gift conferred upon him by the Shah of Persia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DRYDEN introduced a bill (S. 5270) granting an increase of pension to Ellen R. Ostrander; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 5271) granting an increase of pension to Paul Diebitsch; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STONE introduced a bill (S. 5272) granting a pension to George W. Walter; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 5273) for the relief of the legal representatives of Eli Ayres, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5274) granting an increase of pension to Wilson E. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MILLARD introduced a bill (S. 5275) granting to the Akron, Sterling and Northern Railroad Company a right of way across the tide flats on the shore of Valdez Bay, Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5276) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of the heirs and legal representatives of John P. Maxwell and Hugh H. Maxwell, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BARD introduced a bill (S. 5277) to promote further discovery and research in meteorology, and providing for the appointment of a board to consist of three members to examine and report upon a system of long-range weather forecasting, to provide prizes for an exposition of the physical basis of meteorology and the best system of forecasting based thereon and presented to said board, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BAILEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 5278) for the relief of Gertrude O'Bannon, of Hunt County, Tex.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McLAURIN introduced a bill (S. 5279) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas J. Babb, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5280) to prohibit judges from charging on the weight of evidence in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 5281) for the relief of the Madison Female Institute, of Richmond, Ky.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5282) granting an increase of pension to William P. Vohn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. FORAKER submitted an amendment providing for the covering into classified civil service of the United States of all laborers or unclassified employees now in the public service of the United States who served in clerical or semiclerical positions in the public service of the United States or the public service of the District of Columbia during the Spanish-American war, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$250,000 to pay the Wales Island Packing Company for injury to the business and property of said company on Wales Island on account of the recent decision of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MONEY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$150,000 for the protection of the harbor at Natchez, Miss., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GIBSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$4,000 for improving the Missouri River above the bridge at Fort Benton, Mont., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9548) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1833, and commonly known as the "Bowman Act."

INGERSOLL LIFEBOATS.

Mr. PROCTOR. Yesterday morning I submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill proposing to appropriate an additional sum of \$50,000 for furnishing and equipping the United States revenue cutters with Ingersoll self righting and bailing lifeboats, to be propelled by oars and sails or by motor power, as the Department may decide, and a paper or two accompanied the amendment. I ask that they be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont asks that there be printed as a Senate document the papers he sent to the desk yesterday.

Mr. PROCTOR. The papers were referred with the amendment to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The papers will be returned from the Committee on Commerce and be printed and be referred, if there be no objection. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont, and the order is made.

RECLAMATION SERVICE.

Mr. BARD submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate, That there be printed 100 copies of the letter of the Secretary of the Interior addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Irrigation and dated March 15, 1904, reporting upon the organization of the reclamation service.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12833) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY] to call up a bill, if the bill is to lead to no debate.

H. GIBBES MORGAN AND OTHERS.

Mr. McENERY. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 4372) for the relief of H. Gibbes Morgan and other coowners of Cat Island, in the Gulf of Mexico, be put upon its passage.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. KEAN. I should like to have the report read in that case. I do not oppose the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the report submitted by Mr. BARD, from the Committee on Public Lands, on the 16th instant.

Mr. KEAN. I do not think it is worth while to read the report further. I am perfectly satisfied with the bill. The remainder of the report can be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be printed in the RECORD.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4372) for the relief of H. Gibbes Morgan and other co-owners of Cat Island, in the Gulf of Mexico, submit the following report thereon:

The bill is identical with bill S. 4041, as amended and reported by this committee in the second session of the Fifty-seventh Congress, and is intended to confirm to the legal representatives of Juan de Cuevas a part of Cat Island, in the State of Mississippi, situate on the southerly side of the westerly part of the Mississippi Sound.

It appears from the report No. 2 (dated January 15, 1829), to the Commissioner of the General Land Office, by the register and the receiver at Jackson Court House, acting as land commissioners under authority of the act of May, 1822 (ch. 128), entitled "An act supplemental to the several acts for adjusting the claims and titles to lands and establishing land offices in the district east of the island of New Orleans," that the claim of Juan de Cuevas was founded on an original Spanish permit to Nicholas Christian, granted on August 1, 1781, by Manuel de Lousas, the commandant at Mobile, for the whole of the lands of Cat Island, the quantity being unknown, and that the inhabitation and cultivation thereof extended from 1768 to 1828. This report of the Commissioner's is found in Gales & Seaton's edition of the American State Papers, Volume V, page 321, dated January 15, 1829.

The report also contains the following statement:

"Claim No. 1, designated as Cat Island, contain(s) 2,078.47 acres, most of which are unfit for cultivation. The permit on which this claim is founded calls for the whole island. From the long and continued inhabitation and cultivation it would seem that the claimant ought to be entitled to the whole island, if the laws, usages, and customs of the Spanish Government would warrant such an opinion."

This claim, with others of the same character, was approved by the Commissioners by the first section of the act of Congress approved May 23, 1830 (vol. 4, Stat. L., 408), as follows:

"That all the claims to lands reported by the register and receiver of the land office for the district of Jackson Court House, in the State of Mississippi, under

the provisions of the act of Congress approved on the 24th day of May, 1828, entitled "An act supplementary to the several acts providing for the adjustment of land claims in the State of Mississippi," as founded on any order of survey, requette, permission to settle, or other written evidence of claim derived from the Spanish authorities, which ought, in the opinion of the said register and receiver, to be confirmed, and which, by the said reports appear to be derived from the Spanish Government prior to the 20th of December, 1803, and the land claimed to have been cultivated and inhabited on or before that day, shall be confirmed in the same manner as if the title had been completed: *Provided*, That in all such claims, where the plat and certificate of survey, made prior to the 15th day of April, 1813, under the authority of the Spanish Government, in pursuance of such claim, has not been filed with the said register and receiver, such claim shall not be confirmed to any one person for more than 1,280 acres; and that for all the other claims comprised in the reports as aforesaid, and which ought, in the opinion of the register and receiver, to be confirmed, the claimant to such land shall be entitled to a grant therefor, as a donation, not to exceed 1,280 acres to any one person, etc."

The act was construed by the Land Department to limit the claim of Cuevas to 1,280 acres only, and was surveyed to embrace that quantity on the western part of the island. Such survey was approved August 11, 1832, by the surveyor-general, and patent was issued according to such survey on February 23, 1832.

Before the survey was confirmed John Quavre, of Hancock County, Miss., and Mary Quavre, his wife, by deed dated November 22, 1830, granted, bargained, and sold to the United States for the consideration of \$75 a parcel of land, particularly described by metes and bounds on the west point of Cat Island, and containing 1 acre, for light-house purposes. A light-house was soon afterwards erected on this site by the Government.

On August 30, 1847, an Executive order was issued, reserving for military purposes, with other lands, "all that part of Cat Island now owned by the Government." (See letter of Secretary of the Treasury, September 1, 1847, No. 19458; also Commissioner's instructions to register and receiver at Augusta, September 8, 1847, and letters to register and receiver, Augusta, Miss., June 11, 1852.)

On October 25, 1895, the President approved the recommendation of the Secretary of War that "all that portion of Cat Island, Mississippi, which was reserved by Executive order of August 30, 1847, except that portion which lies between a north and south line 1,000 feet to the east of the easternmost corner of Cat Island light-house and the westerly part of the island," be placed under the control of the Secretary of the Interior for disposition under the act of July 5, 1884, "these lands having become useless for military purposes, but the excepted portions are required by the Treasury Department for light-house purposes."

And, on November 15, 1895, orders of the War Department, declaring "that said lands were turned over to the Secretary of the Interior for disposition as provided by law, the same being no longer required for military purposes," were published for the information and notice of all concerned.

The excepted tract of land described in the Executive order of October 25, 1895, included the parcel of 1 acre conveyed by Cuevas and his wife to the United States, and other adjoining lands on either side of the 1-acre tract which had been patented to Cuevas. In the letter of January 8, 1896, referred to as letter "E," from the Commissioner of the General Land Office to the Secretary of the Interior, he states:

"From formal inquiry at the office of the Light-House Board I am advised that the land needed for the reservation on Cat Island is situated on the western end of the island along the limits of the private grant of 1,280 acres confirmed to Juan Cuevas under act of Congress approved May 23, 1830 (4 Stats., 408), and that the site for the light-house thereon was purchased from the owner of the private grant in 1830 by the Government. Therefore if any additional land adjacent to this purchase is needed by the Light-House Board it would seem that it could only be acquired by purchase from the owner thereof."

On the report of the engineer and inspector of the eighth light-house district, dated May 12, 1900, it is stated that—

"The island is gradually washing out at the west until at an average tide the reservation is covered by 1½ feet of water. The light-house is built on screw piles now standing in the water, and as the land adjacent to it is owned by private parties it would, if desired, have to be purchased from them, and there is no necessity for any additional reservation, the present site in the water being considered sufficient."

Notwithstanding such statement, your committee believe that there will be no injustice in requiring that the claimants shall convey to the United States the additional land which was deemed necessary for the purposes of a light-house and attempted to be reserved by the Executive order of October 25, 1895. It is evident from the description of the site, which is now covered, at an average tide, by 1½ feet of water, that the adjoining lands can be of little value.

It appears that no action has been taken by the Department of the Interior under the act of July 5, 1884, to dispose of the lands turned over to it by the War Department, and therefore Congress is free to deal with the matter as if the claim had been presented for the first time.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office, in his letter of December 23, 1902, to the Secretary of the Interior, in relation to a bill referred to this committee in the Fifty-seventh Congress, second session (S. 6491), "for the relief of H. Gibbes Morgan and other coowners of Cat Island, in the Gulf of Mexico," reports, after stating the history of the title, as follows:

"It appears from letters on file in this Office that the claimant, Cuevas, sold the entire island under the conscientious belief that he was the owner of the same, and upon examination of the report of the register and receiver on the private claim of Cuevas, together with the act of Congress by which the claim was confirmed, it would seem that the entire island was confirmed to Cuevas."

"I can not find that the matter has ever been fully discussed or considered by this Office or by the Department, though the lands having been reserved for military purposes, as above stated, the island has been the subject of several communications from this Office to the Department, in all of which it seems to have been taken for granted, as a matter of course, that only 1,280 acres of the land were granted by the confirmatory act."

"Reference to the report shows that the claim of Juan de Cuevas embraced Cat Island; that the area was not known; that the date of the claim was 1781; that the inhabitation was from 1768 to 1828; that there was no survey, and that it was founded on written evidence of title (Spanish permit), and was recommended for confirmation by the register and receiver. The confirmatory act first declares that claims such as this be confirmed in same manner as if title had been complete. The act then proceeds to limit the confirmation of certain claims to 1,280 acres, but there is no indication that the limitation was intended for the claim of Cuevas, and were the matter now for the first time presented for the consideration of this Office I would be inclined to hold that the whole of the island was confirmed to him, but this view of the case does not seem to have been heretofore adopted, since patent was issued by the Government to embrace only a part of the island, and the amount of the land conveyed by it was limited in express words to 1,280 acres. Not only this, but the Government has since issuance of the

patent continuously asserted title to the remainder of the island by holding it in reservation until it was turned over to this Department by Executive order of 1895, to be disposed of under act of July 5, 1884 (23 Stat. L., 103).

"Inasmuch as the proposed legislation is intended to confirm the title in Cat Island to Cuevas and his assignees or transferees, I see no objection to so doing, as it appears to have been the intention to confirm said claim by the act of May 28, 1830."

Your committee concur in the statement and opinion of the Commissioner of the General Land Office above quoted. The original title, based upon the Spanish permit, was for the whole of Cat Island. The report of the register and receiver, acting as commissioners, expressly stated that the permit, on which this claim is founded, calls for the whole island and contains 2,078 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres; and that in view of the long and continued inhabitation and cultivation it would seem that the claimant ought to be entitled to the whole island. From the circumstance that the island is mostly unfit for cultivation, and that the lands have never been required for settlement, there is no considerable value involved in the question whether the United States should recognize the right of the claimants to the remainder of the island.

Therefore your committee recommend that the bill be amended as follows: On page 2 strike out the word "is," at the beginning of line 5, and all that follows down to and including the word "lies," in line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following, to wit: "is upon condition that the legal representatives of said Juan Cuevas claiming the same through or under him shall convey to the United States, by good and sufficient deed, all that portion of Cat Island described as an excepted part thereof in Executive order of October 25, 1895, and lying."

And your committee recommend that the bill do pass with amendment as aforesaid.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there object to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the words "Cat Island," to strike out:

is subject to the reservation made under Executive order of October 25, 1895, reserving that portion of said Cat Island which lies.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

is upon condition that the legal representatives of said Juan Cuevas claiming the same through or under him shall convey to the United States, by good and sufficient deed, all that portion of Cat Island described as an excepted part thereof in Executive order of October 25, 1895, and lying.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of Juan Cuevas, otherwise called Juan de Cuevas, John Quaive, or Quaivie, under the permit from the Spanish commandant at Mobile, dated August 1, 1781, to Cat Island, in the Gulf of Mexico, in its entirety, except as to the lands hereinafter described, be, and the same is hereby, confirmed in him and his legal representatives claiming the same through and under him, the said Cuevas, and that a patent issue accordingly in the name of said original claimant: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act contained shall in any manner impair the right or title of the Government in or to that portion of said Cat Island to which the Government obtained title by deed from John and Mary Cuevas November 22, 1830, and on which Cat Island light-house is now situated; and this confirmation of said claim or title of said Cuevas or his legal representatives to said Cat Island is upon condition that the legal representatives of said Juan Cuevas claiming the same through or under him shall convey to the United States, by good and sufficient deed, all that portion of Cat Island described as an excepted part thereof in Executive order of October 25, 1895, and lying between a north and south line 1,000 feet to the east of the easternmost corner of Cat Island light-house and the western part of the island.

SEC. 2. That this act take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 13521) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12446) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. PERKINS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the request of the House of Representatives for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. PERKINS, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. DANIEL were appointed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12833) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill on page 41, line 12.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was,

under the head of "Washington Aqueduct," on page 41, after line 16, to insert:

For preliminary surveys for additional conduit from Great Falls, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Rock Creek Park," on page 42, line 4, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twelve" and insert "fifteen;" and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert:

And the board of control is hereby authorized to accept dedications of land for the purpose of adding to said park, without expense to the United States or the District of Columbia, and such land, when accepted, shall become a part of said park and be under the jurisdiction of the said board of control.

So as to make the clause read:

For care and improvement of Rock Creek Park, to be expended under the direction of the board of control of said park, \$15,000; and the board of control is hereby authorized to accept dedications of land for the purpose of adding to said park, without expense to the United States or the District of Columbia, and such land, when accepted, shall become a part of said park and be under the jurisdiction of the said board of control.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Public schools," on page 43, line 25, after the word "teachers," to insert "director of cooking, director of sewing;" and on page 44, line 2, before the word "in," to strike out "thirty-two" and insert "thirty-four;" so as to make the clause read:

For assistant director of drawing, two teachers of manual training, two normal training teachers, instructor in shop work, assistant instructor in ironwork, instructor in free-hand drawing, fourteen high school teachers, director of cooking, director of sewing, and ten principals of buildings, thirty-four in all, at \$1,200 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for public schools under the subhead "Teachers," on page 44, line 5, after the word "and," to strike out "sixteen" and insert "fourteen;" so as to read:

For one hundred and fourteen, at \$1,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 6, to increase the total appropriation for officers and teachers of the public schools from \$19,850 to \$20,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 15, after the word "pupils," to strike out "not over 21 years of age;" so as to make the clause read:

For night schools for pupils, and teachers of night schools may also be teachers in the day schools, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 19, after the word "schools," to insert "including material for industrial instruction;" and in line 20, before the word "dollars," to strike out "five hundred" and insert "seven hundred and fifty;" so as to make the clause read:

For contingent and other necessary expenses of night schools, including material for industrial instruction, \$750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 21, after the word "instruction," to insert "including supplies;" and in line 22, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-five thousand" and insert "forty-three thousand six hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

For kindergarten instruction, including supplies, \$43,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 6, to change the spelling of the name "Wheatly" to "Wheatley;" and in line 7, to change the spelling of the name "Wormly" to "Wormley."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 15 on page 47.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 47, line 14, I move to strike out "northeast" and insert "southeast;" so as to read: "Seventh and G streets southeast."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 17, to insert: Of the Bunker Hill, Conduit Road, Chain Bridge Road, Military Road, Ivy City, and Burrville buildings, six in all, at \$96 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 8, to insert:

For one cabinetmaker for repairing school furniture, \$900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 12, to increase the appropriation for janitors and care of buildings and grounds from \$87,460 to \$88,936.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 2, to increase the appropriation for repairs and improvements to school buildings and grounds from \$55,000 to \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 4, to increase the

appropriation for necessary repairs to and changes in plumbing in existing school buildings from \$25,000 to \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 11 on page 49.

Mr. ALLISON. In line 9 on page 49, after the word "material," I move to insert "stationery, printing;" so as to read:

For the purchase and repair of tools, machinery, material, stationery, printing, and books, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 19, after the word "furniture," to insert "and repairs of same;" in line 21, before the word "purchase," to insert "expenses of lectures to teachers;" in line 24, before the word "thousand," to strike out "thirty-five" and insert "forty;" and on page 50, line 2, after the word "cadets," to insert "of the District of Columbia;" so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses, including furniture and repairs of same, books, books of reference, and periodicals, stationery, printing, ice, expenses of lectures to teachers, purchase and repair of equipments for high school cadets, and other necessary items not otherwise provided for, including livery of horse for the superintendent, \$40,000. *Provided*, That arms authorized to be issued by the War Department to high school cadets of the District of Columbia shall hereafter be issued without requiring that the same shall be insured from loss by fire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 4, to insert:

For free evening lectures to be given in the public school buildings or such halls as may be designated under rules and regulations of the board of education, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 11, to increase the appropriation for purchase of pianos for school buildings, at an average cost not to exceed \$225 each, from \$2,500 to \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 5, after the word "dollars," to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That the money herein appropriated shall be subject to the same limitations as to telephone rates as hereinbefore provided under the electrical department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, after line 20, to insert:

For site and toward the construction of one eight-room building, first division, to relieve the Johnson and Hubbard schools, \$30,000; and the total cost of said building, including cost of site, under a contract which is hereby authorized therefor, shall not exceed \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 2, to insert:

For the purchase of the two lots adjoining the Magruder School building on the east, to provide a playground for the children of the Magruder and Sumner schools, \$9,713.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 6, to insert:

For purchase of lot adjoining McKinley Manual Training School on the south, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 8, to insert:

For purchase of lot 25, square 553, adjoining Armstrong Manual Training School, as a site for the erection of an addition to said school, \$3,933.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 12, to insert:

That any unexpended balance of the appropriation for the four-room addition to the Takoma school made in the District appropriation act for the fiscal year 1904 shall be available for the purchase of additional land for a site for said school.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "For Metropolitan police," on page 54, line 6, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seven hundred and twenty" and insert "eight hundred and forty;" so as to read:

Two clerks, at \$80 each; four surgeons of the police and fire departments, at \$540 each, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 13, to increase the number of sergeants at \$1.140 each from thirty-five to forty.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 4, to increase the total appropriation for Metropolitan police from \$763,540 to \$769,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 21, to increase the appropriation for miscellaneous and contingent expenses, including the purchase of new wagons, etc., for the police department, from \$30,000 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 12, to insert:

For converting old morgue attached to sixth precinct station into a stable for horses, \$715.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 16, to increase the

total appropriation for miscellaneous and contingent expenses of the police department from \$42,505 to \$48,210.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 1, after the word "otherwise," to insert "including \$120 additional yearly compensation to the person acting as superintendent of the house of detention;" and in line 4, before the word "dollars," to strike out "nine thousand" and insert "eleven thousand five hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

House of detention: To enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide transportation and a suitable place for the reception, transportation, and detention of the children under 17 years of age, and, in the discretion of the Commissioners, of girls and women over 17 years of age, arrested by the police on charge of offense against any law in force in the District of Columbia, or held as witnesses, or held pending final investigation or examination, or otherwise, including \$120 additional yearly compensation to the person acting as superintendent of the house of detention, \$11,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That all such persons held or detained under public authority prior to the adjudication of cases in which they may be involved shall be held at the place so provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "For the fire department," on page 57, line 17, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the fire marshal of the District from \$1,200 to \$1,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 2, to increase the total appropriation for the fire department from \$298,720 to \$299,120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 8, to increase the appropriation for repairs to apparatus and for new apparatus and new appliances from \$7,500 to \$9,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 18, to increase the appropriation for contingent expenses, horse-hoeing, furniture, fixtures, washing, oil, medical and stable supplies, etc., of the fire department from \$14,000 to \$16,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 19, to increase the total appropriation for miscellaneous expenses of the fire department from \$77,860 to \$81,360.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 59, to insert:

For house and furniture for a chemical engine company, to be located on land to be donated to the District, near Benning, D. C., including cost of connecting said house with fire-alarm headquarters, \$23,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 5, to insert:

For construction, under the direction of the Commissioners of the District, of a fire boat, \$63,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 10, to insert:

For one-third size steam fire engine, \$5,200.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether we have anywhere in the bill made provision for any greater water pressure for putting out fires? There was some effort made to provide for a greater pressure.

Mr. ALLISON. I will state to the Senator that the committee considered that question very fully, and decided that at this session it would not be wise to enter upon what is known as the "high-pressure system," it requiring for its completion \$750,000. In this bill the committee added, as the Senator will see from the amendments, a considerable addition to fire protection, especially the provision just disposed of for constructing a fire boat.

Mr. MCCOMAS. That is a very necessary provision.

Mr. President, I know the bill is large and the revenue is insufficient to meet all the estimates, but the recent calamity in my own State, in Baltimore, seems to be very persuasive that before long there should be an effort in this city to obtain high water pressure for fire. Because of the wide streets and avenues, the terrible calamity which came upon Baltimore is less likely to occur here; but the same thing may occur at any time, and the long delay of the introduction of a system of high water pressure is a dangerous delay while it lasts.

I appreciate the trouble so far as the revenues are concerned; but there are few things more urgent, after the recent experience only 40 miles away, than that we should have in this city a proper pressure to resist fire by the application of water. The fire department of this city is surely not large in proportion to the area of the city, and not quite large enough in proportion to the population.

I hope that the revenues will permit next year the very wise and fully informed Senator from Iowa and his committee to take up the important subject of high water pressure, and that there will not then be any objection to it.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not like to meddle with a matter about which I know but little; but I came to the Senate one morning within the past six weeks and was informed by a very

high official of the Government that if a fire were to break out that day in this part of the city, or in this Capitol, the condition of things was such that there would be no adequate water supply to put it out. I have no doubt that the person who made that statement to me was well informed. Whether the high pressure should be on the aqueduct or on the committee I do not undertake to say, but I will add, in justice to the committee, that I presume no pressure on them would be needed.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the desire for high water pressure service was not urged on the committee largely until after the recent fire in Baltimore. In looking that matter up, we found that there had been no specific estimate made for this high-pressure system, and it did not seem to be in position for the committee to act on the question at this moment. If, however, it had been in such position, with the other necessary things provided for in this bill, we decided that it was inopportune to begin that work at this time.

I do not know at what particular date the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] had the interview to which he refers. It may have been some very cold morning when there was some difficulty in connection with the water department. I am satisfied that we have a very good supply of water at this time. The difficulty, perhaps, is with the size of the pipes with which the water is distributed. An improvement in that respect must undoubtedly be very soon undertaken; but I think it is not so pressing as to be required in this bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 59, after line 20, to insert:

For one 65-foot aerial hook-and-ladder truck, \$3,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 24, to increase the total appropriation for increase in the fire department from \$38,300 to \$133,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Health department," on page 60, line 4, to increase the number of sanitary and food inspectors at \$1,200 each from "six" to "thirteen."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

Mr. STEWART. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 60, line 4, in reference to the health department of this District, was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Nevada desires to call attention to the amendment on page 60, in line 4, to which he refers. The Senator was engaged for a moment and did not observe that the amendment was being acted upon. I hope he may have the opportunity to make what remarks he wishes to make on the subject, and that the amendment may be considered as still open.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not understand to which amendment the Senator from Nevada referred.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment is on page 60, line 4, changing the sanitary food inspectors from six to thirteen. I understand the Senator from Nevada desires to have the vote by which the amendment was adopted reconsidered.

Mr. ALLISON. That may be done by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be regarded as open.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; that it be regarded as still open.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the health department is more important to the health and happiness of the people of this District than any other department under the District government. I am sorry to say it, but I feel bound to give my opinion thereon, that the health department is the worst managed of any department that I have ever heard of.

With regard to milk, meats, etc., it is—

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to ask him to what particular part of this provision he is addressing his remarks?

Mr. STEWART. I am addressing myself, in the first instance, to this whole provision for the health department, and to the subject generally. I do not think it is well provided for. I do not know that I can offer an amendment that will provide for it, but the department ought to be entirely reorganized.

The Appropriations Committee has reported to increase the number of inspectors by seven over the number provided for in the bill as it came from the House and under the present organization I think there were too many provided for in the House bill.

The health officer is paid \$3,500 a year. Such an amount of money ought to be sufficient to get a competent person to attend to the duties of the office, but I am sorry to say we have no such person there. He does not attend to his legitimate duties, but devotes his time to drafting bills for Congress to reject.

Mr. SPOONER. Who is the health officer?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Woodward.

So far as the inspection of milk and meat is concerned, I have

been led to investigate that matter personally. In regard to the inspection of meat, I offered a resolution of inquiry some time ago. As the resolution is short, as are the responses to it, I should like to have the document read, so that the Senate may see what sort of a man the health officer is.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

OFFICE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, March 11, 1904.

SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to transmit herewith the accompanying communication from the health officer of the District of Columbia and its inclosures as their response to the following resolution in the Senate:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
March 3, 1904.

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia report to the Senate what inspection is made of meat, poultry, game, fish, and oysters imported into the District of Columbia in cold-storage or refrigerator cars, giving details of when, where, and the manner of such inspection.

Attest:

CHARLES G. BENNETT, Secretary.

Very respectfully,

HENRY B. F. MACFARLAND,
President of the Board of Commissioners
of the District of Columbia.

HON. WILLIAM P. FRYE,
President pro tempore United States Senate.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, March 10, 1904.

GENTLEMEN: In response to the accompanying resolution of the United States Senate, passed on March 3, 1904, I have the honor to submit the inclosed copies of reports made by the food inspectors and by the inspector of marine products relative to the inspection of meat, poultry, game, fish, and oysters brought into the District of Columbia in cold-storage or refrigerator cars.

Respectfully,

WM. C. WOODWARD, M. D.,
Health Officer.

THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, March 5, 1904.

DEAR SIR: Referring to the resolution passed by the Senate on the 3d instant, calling for information concerning "what inspection is made of meat, poultry, game, fish, and oysters imported into the District of Columbia in cold-storage or refrigerator cars," we have the honor to report as follows concerning the inspection of such articles:

Meats shipped to this city in refrigerator or cold-storage cars are unloaded at a very early hour in the morning and are taken directly to the wholesale houses to which they are consigned. At an early hour in the morning we visit these establishments and inspect, by smelling and handling each and every carcass, the meat just arrived, and oftentimes while it is being unloaded from the wagons, in order that it may be thoroughly examined before it is distributed to the retail dealers. It is deemed more practicable to inspect the meats in the manner stated above in view of the way in which the meats are packed in the cars, and also in view of the fact that no meats are sold until they have been received and recorded at the wholesale houses.

With reference to the inspection of poultry, game, fish, and oysters we would state that such articles are brought to this city in refrigerator cars, packed in boxes or barrels, rendering it quite impracticable to give them a thorough inspection in the cars. These goods are consigned to wholesale and commission houses, where they are unpacked and placed in their cold-storage rooms. We visit these wholesale and commission houses early every day and examine these goods, by handling and closely scrutinizing the same, before they are offered for sale. No inspections are made in the cars themselves.

Besides the above we might add that we visit all the cold-storage and refrigerator rooms of the Center Market every day in order to keep in touch with any of the above-mentioned goods that may have been stored there.

The articles of food mentioned above, together with all other articles of food, are daily examined in the various markets and market stores of the city.

Respectfully,

J. R. MOTHERSHEAD,
THOMAS CAVANAUGH,
W. H. H. HOOVER,
Food Inspectors.

Dr. WILLIAM C. WOODWARD,
Health Officer.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, March 7, 1904.

SIR: In reply to the Senate resolution of March 3, 1904, inquiring what inspection is made of meat, poultry, game, fish, and oysters in the District of Columbia in cold-storage or refrigerator cars, I have the honor to present the following special report relative to the inspection of fish, oysters, etc., which arrive at the different wharves in this city:

The condition of these products is determined by their general appearance and odor, and they are passed or condemned, as the case requires. None of said products are inspected by me while in cold-storage or in refrigerator cars. At times, however, some frozen fish, shipped from the North, reach the wharves, where they are duly inspected as described before. Some of these fish are sold in a frozen state. I make no inspections of meat, poultry, and game.

Respectfully submitted.

GWYNN HARRIS,
Inspector of Marine Products.

WILLIAM C. WOODWARD, M. D.,
Health Officer.

Mr. STEWART. The very reading of that communication shows that there is no investigation about these things which amounts to anything. We do not know whether these examiners are competent or not. They are appointed by the Commissioners on the recommendation of the health officer.

There is very much danger of ptomaine poisoning in the use of these products—

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question, or to ask the chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. As to the sanitary and food inspectors provided for in this paragraph now under consideration—

Mr. STEWART. I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was going to ask whether there is any law which regulates their duties?

Mr. STEWART. The health officer insists upon being a law unto himself.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is there no provision of law regulating the matter?

Mr. STEWART. I am coming to that point. I want to deal with the other matter first.

Most of the beef consumed in this country is killed in Chicago—thousands of head a day. The price of beef on the hoof never was as low as now, and the price of meat never so high. This cold-storage meat is very dangerous. Last July I bought a very fine-looking quarter of beef from the Armour Company, from cold storage. I took it up to my place at Ashburn, had it cooked and made into sandwiches to give some people lunch who were there attending a sale. After they ate it they complained of feeling ill, and about thirty-five or forty of them got very sick. We got all the doctors there were in that section of the country, who sat up with those sick people all night. Some were sick for but a day and some of them did not get over it for a week.

There was great excitement, the people believing there had been poison put in the meat. It was suggested that some colored people had committed the deed. There was one colored boy who had been left with it while the others were at lunch. I knew that, but I told my man in charge not to let that be known, because the people would have hanged him immediately. They were so much excited that they would take it for granted that the colored boy must be guilty. I took specimens of the meat over to the Agricultural Department and to other places and had it analyzed, and they told me that it contained ptomaine poison.

I will read from the dictionary what ptomaine poisoning is. The Standard Dictionary gives the following definition:

Ptomaine: An alkaloid, usually poisonous, derived from decomposing or putrefying animal matter; also, in the usage of some writers, one of the similar alkaloids produced by disease germs in the living body.

The decaying of animal matter produces this poison. When we reflect that practically all the beef is killed in one place, kept for months, and then sent over the country, we must know that it is very liable to be affected in that way, and that it probably is. I do not believe that there is a first-class hotel in this city buying this beef that does not injure the health of its patrons.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. What sort of an inspection of meat would the Senator deem adequate? Would an eyes-and-nose inspection be sufficient?

Mr. STEWART. An eyes-and-nose inspection will amount to nothing if another thing is done to the meat—I do not know that it is done; I do not charge it, but it is urged, and it is very natural that it should be done—namely, the putting of formaldehyde into it. It is said they put it in when the animals are killed—when they pile the carcasses up—and they may lay for a year or two in cold storage. In a case of that kind, the appearance will be all right and the smell would not be bad, but the meat would be poisonous.

I do not know about this myself, but I have been told by butchers and experts that the use of formaldehyde is general, so that the meat is preserved from decay. They say, and probably it is correct, that all the meat is kept for a long time frozen, and when it is thawed out and the air comes to it, it decays very rapidly. To prevent that rapid decay the preservative is put in.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to ask a question, if the Senator will permit me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. I only ask for information; I have never examined this question; but I inquire of the Senator how these food inspectors are appointed?

Mr. STEWART. They are appointed by the Commissioners on the recommendation of the health officer.

Mr. SPOONER. Under a civil-service examination?

Mr. STEWART. No.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator know the sort of examination to which they are subjected?

Mr. STEWART. I do not think they are given much of an examination.

I am coming to another part of the subject now. I happen to have a good deal of knowledge in regard to the milk inspection. In regard to that service I have for the last five or six years tried to help the health officer to get more inspectors. As the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] reminded me the other day, I have appeared before the Appropriations Committee and asked for more inspectors in order that the milk might be properly inspected.

The provision of this law was drawn by the health officer, and all the laws in regard to this matter are drawn by him. At present the milk is not inspected. The health officer at first said there were four or five hundred places where no inspection is had and the other day before the House Committee on the District of Columbia he said there are two thousand places in the District of Columbia where milk is sold where it can not be inspected under the law. There is no law to inspect such milk. The law that was passed by Congress only provided that dairies should be inspected. The police court holds that a place is not a dairy unless the selling of milk is its principal business. So the great mass of places where milk is sold are not inspected at all.

Then there are places about the town and near by in the suburbs where there are from 250 to 500 cows kept. The milk drivers gather the milk from those cows and bring it into the city, and that milk is not inspected at all. Milk can not be inspected in stores, groceries, and saloons. It can be brought to those places and sold, and there is no inspection provided for the milk so sold. Tuberculous cows may be kept right in the city here and their milk sold without inspection.

Then there is another matter which needs particular care. Milk is sent here from the country outside with material in it to preserve it. Formaldehyde, which is a rank poison, is put in it. This milk is seldom inspected. There is not sufficient force to do it. Not one in a thousand cases is examined, because there are no inspectors to do it. They can put in a composition of lime and sugar to thicken the milk and cream without any detrimental effect, if they do not put in too much. Professor Babcock, of the University of Wisconsin, a great institution, has recommended it in certain cases.

But it is dangerous to let the milkmen do it, because they may add something else. They may put in something such as formaldehyde, which is a poison. Formaldehyde is an embalming fluid, and it preserves the milk for a long time. There is no doubt that milk comes here from a distance in which these foreign substances are used. There is a regulation against such practice, but there is no organized machinery for enforcing it.

Then there is another very objectionable practice here, and that is filling the bottles in the wagons in the morning before daylight. I suppose that one-half or perhaps three-fourths of the milk is filled in the wagons. The driver will take a few bottles and fill them from the cans in the wagons. Then he will go on and gather up bottles wherever he can find them—his own or anybody's else. These bottles are not washed, and they are given to the next customer.

Of the inspectors in the health office, only two are engaged in this business; and one great complaint is that these two inspectors go around in the middle of the day. I do not know myself of any specific instance; it is only hearsay; but it is very common talk everywhere, and I have been told by many milk dealers that the inspectors will come around and find milk that has been left over and has soured, which the dealer says he intends to send back. The inspectors take samples of that milk against the protest of the milkman, who did not intend to sell it, but to return it to the shipper, and they bring him into court and he is fined. There is nobody to whom he can go and explain the matter; there is no head of this department; and so he can explain it to nobody.

The milkmen were very much opposed to inspection. When I introduced a bill for that purpose they were all up in arms about it; but I had them appear before the Senate District Committee, and we talked it all over, and they said "If you give us a bill like that; if you provide a proper head of the department, somebody to whom we can go and explain matters; if you provide for an inspection of all the dairies, so that there will be clean work, we want the bill. If you have a man at the head who is a business man and a milkman to whom we can go, it is all right. As at present organized there is nobody in the health office to whom we can make complaints."

This milk bill was sent to the health officer, and he drew up two bills, exceedingly long, irrelevant, and twisted in every possible way, as a substitute for it. Of course, they could not be enacted into law. They were too complicated and they were indefinite, so that it would be all confusion, just as it is now. He insisted that it be left to him and to his discretion. There are twenty-odd inspectors—

Mr. ALDRICH. Twenty-four inspectors in the bill under consideration.

Mr. STEWART. Twenty-four of these officers. Their duties are not defined; there is no head. If a milkman has been wrongfully accused—which is generally the case—there is nobody for him to go to.

In his examination this year before the District Committee the health officer said he had visited the dairies. I examined him about a year ago, and he said that he had not visited any dairies, that he had never seen the milk separated, and that he did not know anything about it. He does not know anything about the subject, but he pretends to, and thus mixes it all up.

The analytical chemist of the Department does his duty. He is a good man, but he has no administrative functions, and he can do nothing. I think, instead of increasing the number of these inconsequential officials, which tends to disorganization, it ought to be diminished.

In the milk bill which passed the Senate recently I left out the health officer, as I thought the provisions of the bill could be executed without him; but the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] thought we ought to have him in the bill, and so we put him in as a member of the board of milk inspection, but not giving him power to destroy everything. We fixed it so that we got a good bill.

I will read what it is and tell what it means:

That a board of milk inspection is hereby created, to be composed of the health officer of the District of Columbia, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry in the Department of Agriculture, and the superintendent of dairies, to be appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and who shall be familiar with the dairy business and who shall possess a knowledge of analytical chemistry, and said board of milk inspection shall be charged with the enforcement of all laws relating to the production and sale of milk and cream in the District of Columbia. There shall also be appointed by the said Commissioners, on the recommendation of the board of milk inspection, one analytical chemist and one bacteriologist—

We put in a bacteriologist on the motion of the Senator from Missouri, but it is as useless a provision as any that can be conceived of. A bacteriologist is not useful for anything in this connection. A number of physicians were present at a hearing before the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia in the House the other day. They were asked what a bacteriologist could do, and they said that all he could do would be to tell how many bacteria there were in a cubic centimeter of the milk. Take a specimen of milk and carry it across the town, and there will be twice as many bacteria in it when you get across. The bacteriologist can only determine the number of bacteria, which determination requires several days, and is therefore entirely worthless, especially as you can not then tell whether they are harmless or injurious bacteria.

All of the scientists upon the subject say that it can not be made of any practical use. It is a mere fancy, a theory that is not applied in any practical way. What does he do? A man brings a sample of milk to the office. He may be a half hour or an hour in doing that. He will find ten times the number of bacteria in it that it had when he started. They accumulate. The way to keep bacteria out of milk is to keep it clean as it comes from the cow, reduced down to a proper temperature. If you let milk get up to a high temperature, nobody can keep them out.

Mr. HOPKINS. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada what provision is made with reference to the shipment of milk from Western States—say Iowa or Illinois—into the District?

Mr. STEWART. We have a provision against the shipment of impure milk into the District. I will read it. It is not in the present law.

There shall also be appointed by the said Commissioners, on the recommendation of the board of milk inspection, one analytical chemist and one bacteriologist, who shall assist the superintendent of dairies and shall under direction of said board, perform such other duties relating to their profession as may be required by the health officer of the District of Columbia, one clerk, and one skilled laborer. And there shall also be appointed by the said Commissioners, on the recommendation of the said board, six inspectors, who shall be qualified veterinary surgeons, who have been graduated after a proper period of study by a school of veterinary medicine authorized by law to confer the degree of doctor of veterinary medicine or some similar degree, whose duty it shall be to inspect all places and dairy farms where milk is produced for sale in the District of Columbia.

Now, these persons must examine the farms. They must examine the cow. They ought to be veterinary surgeons. There are only a few shippers of milk from a long distance into the District of Columbia. The officers can send a man to inspect the property, no matter where it is, just as well as if it is near by, or they can stop the introduction of the milk and inspect every cargo that is brought in.

Mr. HOPKINS. What I desire to learn from the Senator from Nevada is whether the bill to which he has referred is broad enough to permit the inspection of dairies in Western States—say Illinois or Iowa—from which milk is sent to the District of Columbia?

Mr. STEWART. Yes. The bill says:

No person, firm, or corporation refusing to such inspectors free access to the premises to be inspected shall bring any milk or cream into the District of Columbia. And there shall also be appointed by the said Commissioners, on the recommendation of the said board, eight inspectors, who shall be experienced in the dairy business and whose duty it shall be to inspect all milk and

cream brought into the District of Columbia for sale, and also to inspect all places within the District from which milk or cream is sold.

Mr. HOPKINS. There is no provision in the bill, as I gather from the reading, that the milk that comes in shall be examined.

Mr. STEWART. Yes, there is.

Mr. HOPKINS. But you do not make provision there for the examination of dairies outside of the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEWART. Oh, yes; the whole of it is here. The veterinary surgeons are all to work on the outside.

Mr. HOPKINS. I think the subsequent language limits the power that is given in the first part of the paragraph.

Mr. STEWART. No; that refers to another set of inspectors. The first is a board of six.

And there shall also be appointed by the said Commissioners, on the recommendation of the said board, six inspectors, who shall be qualified veterinary surgeons, who have been graduated after a proper period of study by a school of veterinary medicine authorized by law to confer the degree of doctor of veterinary medicine or some similar degree, whose duty it shall be to inspect all places and dairy farms where milk is produced for sale in the District of Columbia.

That covers it all. They are outside. If a man will not allow his dairy to be inspected, he can not send his milk into the District.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the bill which the Senator has in his hand provide for the comprehensive management of this whole department, or only in reference to milk?

Mr. STEWART. Only in reference to milk.

Mr. ALDRICH. It does not provide any machinery for the enforcement of other provisions?

Mr. STEWART. No, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. There does not seem at present to be any provision of law which defines the duties of these various sanitary and food inspectors, and there seems to be a large variety of them at different salaries. I do not know whether the Senator intends to cover that.

Mr. STEWART. No; I am just covering the milk part of it.

Mr. LODGE. I understand this is only the milk inspection.

Mr. STEWART. Only the milk inspection. The other can be provided for.

Mr. LODGE. The report of the three food inspectors which the Senator had read here is the most extraordinary thing I have ever seen. It has never been called to my attention before. If that is the only kind of inspection we have here, the inspection of food products in Washington is worthless.

Mr. STEWART. That is all it is.

Mr. LODGE. It so appears on the face of the report. It is the most incompetent statement I ever saw.

Mr. STEWART. That is all we have.

Mr. LODGE. That is all we have?

Mr. STEWART. That is all we have. We have no inspection in any department now, milk or anything else; and this shows the caliber of the man who is called health officer.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly something ought to be done to give us competent and efficient men and a proper inspection of meat in this city. It appears from their own report that there is no inspection worthy the name.

Mr. STEWART. I offered the resolution because I believed there was no inspection. I could not hear of any. I inquired, and then I offered the resolution.

The bill continues:

The superintendent of dairies shall have, under said board, charge of the inspection of milk and cream herein provided for, and he may, in his discretion, suspend any inspector and report the same to said board. The superintendent of dairies shall receive—

It is all provided for, and an appropriation made for it. This then defines a dairy as a place where milk is sold, so that they can be inspected.

Then there is a provision in the third section that no milk or cream shall be brought in that has any preservative in it—anything put in to preserve it. This measure provides for the detailed work, and I will say with regard to it, to the credit of the milkmen, although they will be put to additional expense, they are unanimously for it. Some of them are not doing this now because, they say, "If we have an inspection that will apply to all, we are perfectly willing to be inspected, but have all inspected." But when you talk to them they say, "What is the use of inspecting us? Here are a thousand or two places that are not inspected at all. They are filling milk in bottles in wagons. They bring milk from tuberculous cows right into the District of Columbia. There is no restraint. They bring milk from abroad with formaldehyde in it in competition with us, and we can not stand that competition and give clean milk. We must have the privilege of doing all these things, too, if others can do that." They say, "If you will inspect all, and have clean milk, we will all be satisfied with it."

Every man dealing in milk has come forward. I did not think they would all come in. They say "We will have to change our operations; we will have to have clean places to wash our bottles; we will have to have more room; but we are all willing to do it if you have an inspection of the milk in general."

I do not suppose there is any chance for this bill, because the health officer will do what he can to beat it. I have here the two bills that he drew. He insisted upon drawing them. They are longer than the moral law. They do not provide any system. Now, I protest against this young man running this thing any longer, because he has been tried and found wanting. He gets along very smoothly when he comes up here. He has had this inspection business about eight or ten years, and I have been talking to him and trying to get him to improve it until I am tired and disgusted.

A Senator can draw up a bill and send it down to the health officer. He remodels it, and when he sends it back you do not know it. No matter how much study you may give it with the aim of remedying this condition, this young man gets up something else. He devotes the best part of his time in preparing substitutes. He has his pets in there. I do not know what for. There is not a man in there who knows his duty at all except Mr. Hird, the chemist. He is a modest man and attends to his own business. Perhaps I ought not to name him, because they may persecute him. All the balance is in confusion. There is nobody at the head. The chief inspector does not know anything about dairies. I believe of all these twenty-four he assigns only two men to attend to the milk business.

I hope that the amendment for the other seven will be nonconcurrent in at all events. I hope the House will do something on this business. It is not a pleasant matter, and I hate to complain of anybody, but the condition of milk and meats in this District is too bad.

Mr. SPOONER. Has the vote been reconsidered?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. It is all open.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that that has already been done.

Mr. SPOONER. Is the Senator from Iowa willing to pass over this portion of the bill and take it up later, in order that some amendments may be drawn and offered to it? I am quite impressed myself—

Mr. ALLISON. I am willing that it shall be passed over, but I should like to say a word or two before it is passed over. However, I would rather hear the Senator from Wisconsin before making any observations myself.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Nevada is not through, as I understand.

Mr. STEWART. I am substantially through. I believe that if this matter goes over until Monday the committee can frame a whole paragraph that will include milk and every other inspection. It is very important that the existing condition shall not continue for another year, and people be poisoned here by the wholesale.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to ask a question, if I knew who had the floor.

Mr. STEWART. Of whom do you want to ask it—of me?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor and yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin. Does the Senator from Wisconsin now yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. COCKRELL. At the instance of the Senator from Nevada we passed this bill to which he has reference, and it has gone to the House. It has been referred to the appropriate committee. They have referred it to the District Commissioners. The District Commissioners are now considering it. They have heard the Senator; they have heard all parties; and they will make a report to the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House.

Now, I do not think this matter ought to be precipitated on this bill. I think the Senator ought to be content to fight out the question before the committee in the House, where all parties can be heard and are being heard.

Mr. STEWART. That scuttle game has been going on six or seven years, and every time there comes a bill that will not hold water.

Mr. SPOONER. It will not hold milk.

Mr. STEWART. No. The law we have now on the statute books, under which you can not inspect 2,000 places now, although it has been amended, was drawn by this same authority. The health officer draws them all. The Commissioners do not pay any attention to it.

This thing has been going: They bring in from all over milk that is not inspected at all; milk from the shanties near by here. That has been going on all the time. He is not authorized under the law to inspect them. Take the filling of the bottles in the wagons. There is an ordinance against filling bottles in wagons, but that goes on all the time. There is no force to inspect it. Congress has given him all the inspectors he has asked for. He has a long list of twenty-four in addition to these, and here are seven more. He has all these inspectors, and under the decisions of the court and under the amendment they can do nothing.

Must we wait on him? If Congress is under him, if we have

to wait for him, it will all amount to nothing. We have waited ten years for him, and plenty of people have been murdered. I do not propose to submit to it any longer, if it is possible to get away from it. If the Senator from Missouri knew what is going on as well as I do, he would not want to wait either.

Mr. COCKRELL. I know this much, that you had a very full hearing before men who are as much interested in it as you or I—men whose wives and children are here—men whose families are affected by it just as much as ours. Now, why precipitate it here? Why precipitate it on every bill that comes up? There is the legitimate place for it. They are investigating this matter.

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. COCKRELL. They will do justice in the matter.

Mr. STEWART. This man do justice! Why has he not done justice during the last ten years?

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not want to go into the matter of any personal animosities between the Senator from Nevada and the health officer.

Mr. STEWART. I deny it. I have no feeling in the world against him except a feeling of disgust.

Mr. COCKRELL. You show it all the time as plain as A B C.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we have passed a bill providing for milk inspection. I think legislation is very necessary. I understand that bill, with the Senator's amendments, was made satisfactory to the Commissioners and to the health department. It went over to the House, and has gone to the committee, and the health officers are up here trying to kill it or delay it.

Mr. STEWART. They have had it referred back.

Mr. LODGE. It is an old trick. We have all seen it done. I think we need some good legislation, and I think we need it now. My attention has never been called to the matter of meat inspection until this morning. I think that report is as bad as anything can be. I did not take any interest in it until I heard it read, and if that is the only inspection of meat we have here in this city there is no inspection of it worth anything. Under those circumstances, I hope something will be done to get competent and efficient men there. Give them all the men they need, but let us have some efficient men.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I heartily agree with what the Senator from Massachusetts says. But who is to judge as to the competency of the officers? Are we going to make the decision?

Mr. LODGE. It is obvious from the report that the men who signed it are not competent. I need nothing but their own testimony. That is a report which on its face shows their incompetency.

Mr. COCKRELL. You have to trust to somebody to make the selection. We all want good government. We all want a clean administration of the matter by competent men.

Mr. LODGE. Then let us get some other method.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then turn out the District Commissioners and put in men who have the ability to make proper selections. That is the only way to do it.

Mr. STEWART. It is not the selection of the men, but it is the legislation.

Mr. LODGE. The Commissioners do not make the selection.

Mr. STEWART. This man Woodward has been running the legislation for ten years. I have his testimony, which was taken by the District Committee. He estimates that there are 2,000 places where milk is sold that he can not inspect. He admits that all of this dirt is going on, but none of the bills that he has ever drawn—and he draws them all—provides against it, and they do not prescribe the duties of the inspectors. They are all subject to his personal control. He just wants a large number of inspectors, and then he does what he pleases with them. They do nothing to benefit this community. I think this man has been dictator long enough.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, if it does not interfere with the Senator from Wisconsin—

Mr. SPOONER. Nothing interferes with me.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada one question.

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I think he is the only member of the Committee on the District of Columbia whom I see present. The chairman is not here, although other members of the committee may be. Who is really responsible for the legislation that we enact here from time to time about the District of Columbia?

Mr. STEWART. About milk inspection?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Does the Committee on the District of Columbia take what the Commissioners send up here? Are they really the lawmaking power for the District of Columbia?

Mr. STEWART. In regard to the health office?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Do the committee look into the matter for themselves, or do they accept the recommendations of the Commissioners and make the laws to suit them? That is what I should like to ask.

Mr. STEWART. The District Committee was unanimous on

the Senate milk bill. They have been unanimous on other bills, but they go to the other House and they go back to the District Commissioners, and we never hear anything more of them. They have been able to overrule us. The committee has been honestly endeavoring ever since I have been on it to get a milk bill, but we can not get it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. With reference to other legislation, are we legislating just as the Commissioners tell us to legislate, or when their recommendations come here are they ever overruled in committee?

Mr. STEWART. So far as I am concerned, I overrule them every time I do not agree with them, and generally I do not agree with them. But on this business the committee are all together.

There is another subject—the question of nuisances. The health officer claims exclusive jurisdiction over every matter pertaining to nuisances. He sends all sorts of unconstitutional and ill-digested bills to the District Committee. The committee reform them and report them back unanimously to the Senate, and then he insists on their being recommitted and thus causes their ultimate failure. That same man has drawn plenty of substitute bills; and it has finally been referred back to the committee at his suggestion. He runs all those things. He is boss everywhere.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada if there is not a law in the District which defines nuisances, or do the Commissioners themselves decide, or does the health officer?

Mr. STEWART. The health officer decides everything.

Mr. ALDRICH. With respect to nuisances?

Mr. STEWART. He decides everything.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no law, then?

Mr. STEWART. He is a law unto himself. That is all the law we have on that subject.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. SPOONER. I wish to give, in just a word, my reasons for asking the Senator from Iowa to let this provision go over in order that some amendments may be drawn and offered to it, if on further consideration they seem necessary. I have the utmost confidence in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. During the fifteen years I have been here, I have never known the District to be better officered in that respect or by more conscientious men.

Mr. STEWART. It is not the Commissioners.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator object to my paying a just compliment to the Commissioners?

Mr. STEWART. I thought the Senator was applying what I had said to the Commissioners.

Mr. SPOONER. I was not attributing anything to the Senator from Nevada except an earnest desire that the milk which is used in this District—

Mr. STEWART. And the meat.

Mr. SPOONER. Particularly the milk, should be carefully guarded in the interest of the public health.

I look upon the Commissioners as men not only of fine ability, but of great earnestness and efficiency in the discharge of their duties, and in what I say I do not wish to be considered as reflecting at all upon them. I suppose, as the health office is a department which is of course apart from the ordinary administrative duties of the Commissioners, the Commissioners follow very much, and must, the head of that department.

Now, it is better to have no department of that kind and no system of inspection at all than to have a poor an inefficient one. If the people are lulled to a sense of security in that respect, if there is an expensive and considerable health department, by the presumption that everything which they purchase in the way of food is carefully inspected they will be less careful than if there were no such department.

I agree entirely with the Senator from Massachusetts that, so far as concerns the inspection of meat, fish, oysters, poultry, game, and the like, this report is utterly inconsequential, and I think it is discreditable. If there were in force here a carefully devised and efficiently enforced system of inspection, no such report as this would have been or could have been sent to the Senate. I do not know anything about these inspectors. The report is simply transmitted by the health officer, who may be an excellent man in his way. I know nothing about him. But this report is signed by the food inspectors, and they report to the Senate how they do it:

At an early hour in the morning we visit these establishments—

They do not inspect on the cars, and I do not know that they could—

we visit these establishments and inspect by smelling and handling each and every carcass.

Whether or not they are there when they are unloaded nobody knows. They find what is in the storage room, but it would be a

very easy matter and a very usual matter, if dealers were disregardful of the public health, for them to neglect to place in the cold-storage room a piece of fish or a part of a carcass that was in some way or some portion of it tainted. Their inspection is confined to smelling and handling the carcass sometimes, they say, while it is being unloaded from the wagons. But after that their inspection is confined to the cold-storage room.

I have done a little bit of inspection myself in this city during the years I have been in here, and with some results. I suppose every Senator has. I used only the nose, but I have been obliged several times to reject upon that inspection some food which has been purchased by members of my family or sent to my house. Even under the best system of inspection I suppose there might and would be instances of that kind.

I think the inspectors should be subjected to competitive examination of the most rigid and careful kind.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. SPOONER. And one object I have in asking that this matter go over is that an amendment may be drawn which shall provide for a careful examination, under the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission, of this small army of inspectors who are now on the rolls, and provision that hereafter appointments shall be made only on competitive examinations, conducted under civil-service rules and regulations. I do not know of any one subject upon which there should be a more rigorous and careful examination to ascertain the fitness of employees than in the matter of food inspection. That is all I have to say.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I agree with Senators who have spoken that the matter of food and sanitary inspection is one of the most important functions of the government in this District. Especially is that so with reference to food. The District is so isolated and so situated that nearly everything that is consumed here must be brought from a distance, and therefore it is important that the most rigid inspection should be had as respects the food we eat and the surroundings of our homes and our public places.

But, Mr. President, in the ordinary method of doing business in the Senate and in the other House it is not the function of the Committee on Appropriations to make laws or to amend laws respecting any of the administrative subjects here.

Now the Senator from Nevada criticises this appropriation. The present law provides for thirteen inspectors. The House of Representatives, on a motion made in the House, cut down the current appropriation from thirteen to six, striking out seven inspectors. I understand from the observations of the Senator from Nevada that he proposes to adhere to the House provision, reducing the number of inspectors we now have from thirteen to six.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. STEWART. If that is not done he will certainly do it, because he has the power now. He is certainly working over there, and certainly will run it if that is not done. If that is done he may let the milk bill pass. He will not let it pass if it is not done. It relieves him.

Mr. ALLISON. I fear that is not a wise method of dealing with this question. The Senator's remarks were largely confined to a criticism of the milk inspector.

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. There is a provision in the bill for six milk inspectors, and I understand from the Senator from Nevada that the bill which he had in charge here a few days ago, and which passed the Senate, provides for six.

Mr. STEWART. It provides for six. If the Senator will allow me, that has been raised to thirteen. He has to use the milk inspectors for that purpose. So he has that already. He can use them for that purpose and can get, of course, any number, and these men can be used for milk inspectors or for anything hereafter.

Mr. ALLISON. The remedy, it seems to me, from the situation is to provide a sufficient force to deal with this question. The laws we now have on the statute books are supposed to give to the necessary administrative authorities all the power they need for the purposes of full and complete inspection.

I quite agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that our Commissioners are intelligent, alert, and active in administering the affairs of the government of the District of Columbia. They are the administrative officers. Every department of the District government is under their jurisdiction and control. I understand that the health officer is a subordinate of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The health office constitutes one of the departments under their jurisdiction, and I feel sure they are trying to secure proper inspection of food in this District. I think they might do more, and I think these inspectors might do a great deal more, but I do not believe it is wise to reduce the number to six, and that is the real question before the Senate.

The Committee on Appropriations requested the Commissioners to furnish a detailed statement of the duties performed by all the inspectors in this District. Thirteen of them are provided for under the Senate committee amendment and six are provided in the bill as it came from the House. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, were requested by us to state the duties of each one of the thirteen inspectors. Beginning on page 99, there is a full statement of what these inspectors do from day to day. I confess that I think they might do more.

Mr. STEWART. Now, let me ask the Senator a question. Are there not about 2,000 places where they sell milk not inspected?

Mr. ALLISON. I will come to the milk question. I am now speaking of the general question. These thirteen inspectors are not milk inspectors; they are general sanitary inspectors. The District is divided into eight subordinate districts, in each of which there is located one of these eight inspectors, as I understand from the statement of the Commissioners. The inspectors in the subordinate districts have control of all the matters in their respective districts that come up and are necessary for proper sanitation, including everything within those districts.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLISON. So eight of these inspectors are evidently needed for this purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was about to say that it is evident we can not close this matter to-day, and the Senator from Connecticut is desirous of having a short executive session. I will therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not yield for the purpose of being taken from the floor.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will wait until the Senator is through with his remarks. I did not mean to take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well. So there are eight inspectors here who are provided for and who seem to be necessary. Whether they are doing their duty or not is another question. But it is a question which we can not regulate in this Chamber. We can not say that an inspector in subordinate district No. 1 or in district No. 7 is not doing what he ought to do. That is a matter of administration and not of legislation. So I fear that after we have passed all the laws we can pass in order to make effective those laws there is still something for the three Commissioners to do, who are the administrative and executive power in this District.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLISON. I wanted to explain that this matter—

Mr. ALDRICH. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not mean to take him off the floor.

Mr. ALLISON. I will be through in a few minutes.

Mr. STEWART. The trouble is that this is a separate department, and the Commissioners do not exercise any jurisdiction over it. We send bills to the Commissioners, and we send to them for reports, and they turn the matter over to him without comment on their part. He makes the reports that come here in regard to every matter connected with sanitation. Are we, then, not responsible in providing for a competent head for the inspection of milk and providing somebody to take charge of it and report on it? There is nobody there in the office now. Are we not to define his duties and qualifications?

Mr. ALLISON. There is a most carefully prepared statute on the statute book respecting inspection. The Senator from Nevada is not satisfied with that law, and he has brought in a bill through the Committee on the District of Columbia, which is one of the ablest committees we have in this body and which is always ready to do anything to promote the interests of this District. That committee has dealt with this question, and the Senate on its request has also dealt with it. It is impossible for us now to do otherwise than to appropriate in this bill for the present organization and system of inspection in the District already provided for. Now, we have six milk inspectors in addition to the inspectors I have named and who are provided for in the first paragraph. These inspectors report what they do, and they do very much. They perhaps do not do all they ought, but they are endeavoring, I think, to comply with the law. No person can bring milk into the District except on first having a license from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. ALLISON. A permit.

Mr. STEWART. No; they do not have any permit. There are probably 400 tuberculous cows right in the District or gathered all around here whose milk is brought in without a license. It is that that I want to remedy.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not speaking of the cows in this District.

I am speaking of the milk that is imported into the District from outside.

Mr. STEWART. We want to protect the people of the District from poisonous milk wherever it is produced.

Mr. ALLISON. I do, and I know the Senator does. I know he has much feeling on this subject, and I sympathize with him. When I drink milk I want to drink pure milk. But these laws provide not only for the inspection of all the herds in this District, but they provide for the inspection of all the herds of cattle the product of which is brought into the District; and no milk can be imported here from outside the District of Columbia without a permit. The inspectors are fully authorized not only to investigate as respects the milk imported, but they are authorized and directed to go to the sources of supply in Maryland, Virginia, and elsewhere from whence the milk comes.

So I want to call the attention of Senators to the fact that, whilst there may be great reason for criticism here, whatever that reason is it is chiefly a criticism of the administration in this District, for which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are responsible; and if there are imperfect statutes, then the responsibility rests with the Commissioners and with the Committee on the District of Columbia, whose duty it is to first provide laws for these inspections in order that we may make the necessary appropriations.

Mr. STEWART. I ask permission to have the milk bill printed in full. I read part of it in my remarks.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no objection. I hope it will be put in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection. The bill is as follows:

A bill (S. 2402) to secure sanitary milk and cream for the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That a board of milk inspection is hereby created, to be composed of the health officer of the District of Columbia, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry in the Department of Agriculture, and the superintendent of dairies, to be appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and who shall be familiar with the dairy business and who shall possess a knowledge of analytical chemistry, and said board of milk inspection shall be charged with the enforcement of all laws relating to the production and sale of milk and cream in the District of Columbia. There shall also be appointed by the said Commissioners, on the recommendation of the board of milk inspection, one analytical chemist and one bacteriologist, who shall assist the superintendent of dairies and shall, under direction of said board, perform such other duties relating to their profession as may be required by the health officer of the District of Columbia, one clerk, and one skilled laborer. And there shall also be appointed by the said Commissioners, on the recommendation of the said board, six inspectors, who shall be qualified veterinary surgeons, who have been graduated after a proper period of study by a school of veterinary medicine authorized by law to confer the degree of doctor of veterinary medicine or some similar degree, whose duty it shall be to inspect all places and dairy farms where milk is produced for sale in the District of Columbia.

No person, firm, or corporation refusing to such inspectors free access to the premises to be inspected shall bring any milk or cream into the District of Columbia. And there shall also be appointed by the said Commissioners, on the recommendation of the said board, eight inspectors, who shall be experienced in the dairy business and whose duty it shall be to inspect all milk and cream brought into the District of Columbia for sale, and also to inspect all places within the District from which milk or cream is sold. The superintendent of dairies shall have, under said board, charge of the inspection of milk and cream herein provided for, and he may, in his discretion, suspend any inspector and report the same to said board. The superintendent of dairies shall receive a salary of \$3,000 per annum; the analytical chemist, \$2,400 per annum; the bacteriologist, \$1,800 per annum; the veterinary inspectors of farms and places where milk is produced, \$1,300 per annum each; the inspectors and the clerk, \$1,000 per annum each; and the skilled laborer, \$800 per annum; in all, \$24,800, which sum is hereby appropriated, one-half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and one-half out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; and from and after the appointment by the said Commissioners of the inspectors herein authorized the offices of such inspectors as are now provided for by law for the enforcement of the laws relating to the production and sale of milk in the District of Columbia shall cease and determine.

It shall be the duty of the officers herein provided for to execute the provisions of this act and all laws and regulations relating to the production and sale of milk and cream in the District of Columbia, and for that purpose shall at all times have access to farms and other places where milk or cream is produced, to dairies from which milk or cream is sold, and to wagons or other vehicles used in the business of distributing milk or cream. And the superintendent of dairies may suspend the permit of any person who obstructs free access to the officers herein named at any hour of the day or night to his premises or property used in the business of producing milk or cream to be sold in the District of Columbia or of selling milk or cream in said District.

SEC. 2. That every place in the District of Columbia where milk or cream is sold is a dairy. All doors, windows, or other openings to any dairy shall be at least 15 feet from an opening of a stable, soap factory, or other building wherein any business injurious to milk or cream is conducted, and no opening to such stable or building shall hereafter be made within 25 feet of an opening in a dairy. Each dairy shall have house room sufficient for cooling, preserving, and bottling milk, and also conveniences for the cleansing of bottles, cans, and all utensils of every kind used in the business.

SEC. 3. That no milk or cream shall be brought into or sold in the District of Columbia which contains any foreign substance used as a preservative, as coloring matter, or for any other purpose whatever. Any person offering for sale any milk or cream containing any such foreign substance or substances shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$100 or imprisonment for not more than sixty days. Any person sending any milk or cream into the District of Columbia for sale which contains such foreign substance or substances shall be fined not more than \$100 or imprisoned for not more than sixty days, or both such fine and imprisonment, and shall be subject to indictment by the grand jury and trial in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. That all milk and cream retailed in the District of Columbia shall

come from a regularly established dairy or dairy farm licensed to sell milk in the District of Columbia. All bottles used in handling milk or cream must be cleansed in such dairy or dairy farm before being used a second time. No bottles used in handling milk or cream shall be filled outside of a regularly established dairy or licensed dairy farm. Any person filling a bottle with milk or cream outside of a dairy or licensed dairy farm for delivery in the District of Columbia shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined not more than \$50 or imprisoned for not more than thirty days. Any person who shall procure bottles to be filled with milk or cream outside of an established dairy or licensed dairy farm for sale or delivery in the District of Columbia shall be fined not more than \$100 or imprisoned for not more than three months.

SEC. 5. That no dealer in milk or cream shall use bottles or other vessels for handling milk or cream belonging to any other person, firm, or company without the written consent of the owner thereof first had and obtained. If any such dealer shall use, appropriate, or have in his possession for use or appropriation, bottles or other vessels belonging to any other person, firm, or company without the written consent of the owner thereof, he shall be fined in a sum not more than \$50, or be imprisoned for not more than thirty days, or both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 6. That no permit to bring milk or cream into said District, or to sell milk or cream in said District, shall be granted to any person who is not prepared to conform to the provisions of this act and all other laws now in force regulating the production and sale of milk and cream in the District of Columbia before making application for such permit, and no person now holding a permit to bring milk or cream into the said District, or to sell milk or cream in said District, shall continue in the business more than sixty days after the passage of this act without complying with the provisions of this act and obtaining a renewal of his permit for that purpose.

SEC. 7. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, on the recommendation of the superintendent of dairies, shall have power to make all rules and regulations necessary to carry this act and all other laws and regulations respecting dairies or dairy farms into full force and effect, and such rules and regulations shall have the force and effect of law.

SEC. 8. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

Passed the Senate March 9, 1904.

Mr. ALLISON. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I want only a couple of minutes.

I wish to say to the Senator from Nevada, with whose purpose to improve milk inspection I have sympathy, I voted for the bill he urged, but because I approve a good bill that the Senator from Nevada introduces it is not necessary to assent to his unjust judgment upon a faithful, intelligent, and exceedingly valuable officer.

Mr. STEWART. No officer of that kind has been reflected upon.

Mr. MCCOMAS. The one who has been reflected upon is the health officer of the District. My reason for saying this is because I have observed him for years. I know that Doctor Woodward is a man of high character, wonderful industry, great learning, which he is always adding to; a student of these very questions, who gives his nights and days to them, and that he himself stimulates and controls to a great degree the important investigations. His highest ambition is to give pure food and milk and the like to the people of this District. He is doing his best. He is a man of great ability. He is a man of rare executive ability. These excellent Commissioners would not have kept him here if he had not been. He came to this place by merit; he has remained in it by merit, and I protest that he is not deserving of the strictures of my friend from Nevada.

Mr. STEWART. I have made no strictures on him but what I know. I know that he makes no inspection of milk or anything else. He fixes it all up.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I say this officer is faithful in the performance of all his duties under the inspection laws, which laws I will not take time now to refer to. It is not pertinent or necessary to do it here. The inspection laws of this District, gradually built up as they are, have been really good, and the administration is far better than is now said here. There may be bad things, for which I believe there is—

Mr. STEWART. Do you think it is his duty to lobby around Congress here to prevent the passage of bills that the committee has brought up?

Mr. MCCOMAS. I say that, in the absence of a tittle of evidence of his doing that, I deny that he is doing it. I have known him for ten years; I have not seen him to talk to for a year past. If he has been around the Capitol and the Senate lobbying I have not seen him. I do not believe he has.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator from Maryland permit just one word? The Senator from Nevada speaks of his lobbying. I do not recollect ever having seen Doctor Woodward more than once, and that was in the Appropriations Committee room eight or ten years ago, about the second or third year of his service here. If he has been lobbying, it must have been with the Senator from Nevada, for he seems to be the only one who knows about it.

Mr. STEWART. I know about it.

Mr. MCCOMAS. He may have talked with the Senator from Nevada; he has not talked to me, and, as I said, I have not seen him here for a year. I want to conclude by saying now, connectively, that this is one of the best officers; he is performing some of the best service; he is doing his duty, and his whole duty. Upon the milk question I want no debate and therefore I do not debate

that. I hope when he gets the inspectors, or when somebody gets them, as the Senator from Nevada desires, that will be well done; but the Committee on Appropriations here are doing their duty, and they are doing it properly. They would do less than their duty if they did not put back those thirteen inspectors.

I have had considerable observation and experience in this District here for years, and in some respects a little closer to some parts of this administration here than other gentlemen may have had on the question before the Senate. I hope the Senate will stand by the thirteen inspectors, and I will vote to stand by one of the best officers, and I hope the Senator from Nevada, who wants to be just, will by and by change his opinion, which is erroneous.

Mr. STEWART. I can not change it on the facts before me. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 1508) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building to be used for a Department of State, a Department of Justice, and a Department of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, that the consideration of the appropriation bill may be proceeded with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and it will be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I am about to conclude what I intended to say, which is that under the provisions of existing law the Committee on Appropriations have presented these provisions in order that those responsible for the administration of that law may have the necessary means. I see there is much discussion upon this subject. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that these provisions for the health department may be passed over for the time being, and I express the hope that the Senator from Rhode Island will allow us to go on for a while as respects matters which are not in controversy. Then I will yield to him for an executive session.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think it will be impossible to do anything more with the appropriation bill to-day.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it is not impossible, and I wish to go on to-day with matters that will not lead to debate. I think there are a good many that will not be debated.

Mr. ALDRICH. I can not very well be persistent against the appeal of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but I fear that no progress will be made or can be made to-day.

Mr. ALLISON. I have some fear myself, from the situation, but I want to try.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the provisions touching the health department be passed over for the present. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suppose there will be no expectation to take them up to-day.

Mr. ALLISON. They will go over until after the other items have been disposed of.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] and other Senators interested in the matter have left the Chamber, and I certainly shall move an executive session now, unless it is understood that these provisions shall go over until Monday.

Mr. SPOONER entered the Chamber.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Wisconsin is here.

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall insist upon my motion unless it is understood that the provisions shall go over until Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa still has the floor.

Mr. ALLISON. I will not insist that these provisions shall be again taken up to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They will be laid over, then, until Monday.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that they may go over until Monday. That is my understanding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Passing Sunday, they will go over until Monday.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to inquire, because of the observation which was made upon my arrival, if it was some matter I am interested in in the debate?

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Rhode Island suggested that a good many Senators had left the Chamber.

Mr. SPOONER. And the Senator from Iowa suggested I had just returned, and that led me to make the inquiry.

Mr. ALLISON. Among other Senators, the Senator from Rhode Island mentioned the Senator from Wisconsin, and I said he had just returned.

Mr. SPOONER. Oh!

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I desire to make some progress with the bill. I see it is manifest that this question can not be disposed of to-day, but I hope Senators will allow us to go on for

a time with the ordinary reading of the bill for action upon other amendments.

Mr. SPOONER. Are we still on the health department items? Mr. ALLISON. Those were passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The health department provisions have been laid aside until Monday.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at page 62, line 23.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Courts," on page 63, line 7, to increase the appropriation for the salary of judges of the police court from \$3,000 each to \$3,500 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 15, to increase the appropriation for the police court from \$21,000 to 22,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, after line 6, to insert:

For acquiring, by purchase or condemnation, additional ground in square No. 489, in the city of Washington, for a site for a new police court building, \$35,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary; for preparation of plans for said building, \$2,500; in all, \$38,000.

Mr. ALLISON. In line 8, in the word "square," the letter "v" is printed for "q."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That has been changed already.

Mr. ALLISON. It is a typographical error.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I should like to inquire what the necessity is for a site for a new police court building, and what amount it is expected will be necessary to expend in the erection of the building. There is provided now \$38,000 for the site and for plans. How much is the building to cost, because if we buy the land it is equivalent to saying that the building is to be built? I should like to inquire as to the necessity for a new police court building. I suppose the police courts are now held in the building which is on Judiciary Square.

Mr. ALLISON. No, Mr. President—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I may be mistaken about that. I should like information on the subject.

Mr. ALLISON. This land to be purchased is a lot adjoining the present police court building. The police court is on the corner of Sixth and Louisiana avenue, and there is an adjacent building which is now rented for the purposes of the police court. It is proposed to buy this land and to construct upon it and upon the premises we already own a new police court building, which it is estimated will cost \$75,000.

The House inserted a provision in the bill that the police court shall be provided for in the new municipal building. All agree that it is necessary that at an early day new quarters shall be provided for the police court. The committee are unanimously of the opinion that it is wiser and better to retain the police court where it now is, and that it is also necessary that at an early day a new building shall be erected upon the quarters now owned and to be purchased under this amendment. It is proposed to construct a plain, suitable building, and the cost of the building will be about \$75,000.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yesterday we eliminated the House provision that the police court should go into the new municipal building.

Mr. ALLISON. Yesterday we eliminated the House provision respecting the transfer of the police court to the new municipal building.

Mr. McCOMAS. Mr. President, I do not want to delay the Senator from Iowa in his desire to get through with the bill, but I do want to say a word about this provision and the one which precedes it.

There is not a wiser provision than this one which is now put upon the bill by the Senate. The old police court, lying on the corner of Sixth and Louisiana avenue, is not sufficient for present purposes. They hold now two courts, running all the while—two police judges with juries—and the accommodations are not commensurate with this day and this civilization. They need the additional building.

Now, the Senate committee added it to the old building space to have the space increased that they may have a proper building. Nothing is more needed than that building.

But, Mr. President, even better than that building was the action of the Senate committee in striking out, on page 16, the provision of the House, the like of which I never saw attempted anywhere else, and if I had not seen it in this bill I could not have supposed it would have been attempted in this bill. The House provision was to put the police court, with all its surroundings, its people, its witnesses, and the drunken and disorderly portion of mankind, in close contact with the offices of the register of wills and the recorder of deeds. Those are the offices which experience shows should always be near the court-house. All over the country where they can have those offices so located they are

in the court-house, and they are now in this court-house at Judiciary Square.

I myself remember cases of ejectment when as many as 50 or 100 immense folios of records would be brought into the court in the trial of a case, and they were brought from downstairs all into the court room of trial. Ejectment cases for about six or eight years were very numerous in this District, because after the early settlement of Washington people did not attend to the purchase of lots that had grown valueless, squatters came upon them, and then men organized here to get titles to large parts of the city; and when the war came squatters who were black squatters who followed the Army, occupied these lands, and the ejectment suits in this jurisdiction were out of all proportion to the age of the settlement of the city of Washington.

Now, it would have been required under this bill that deeds should be brought into the courts from another part of town if the House provision prevailed, and the courts could be delayed in the trial of the cases of ejectment and trespass that frequently require the records of deeds, and it was impracticable in every way.

Then, besides, the judges of probate, with other matters of contest with respect to wills, require all of the papers to be brought from the office of the register of wills into the courts almost daily, and to separate the two was against the public interest, was a great inconvenience, and, had it been done by the House provision, could not have continued for five years. It would have been changed perhaps next year by public clamor. It would have been insufferable.

Then widows and orphan daughters and mothers are required to go to a probate office very frequently at a time when the distress of mind is the greatest and when they, being veiled and desiring to be hidden from general observation, and of course with a crowd of people, would have been compelled to go through the crowded corridors of the police courts to go to probate the will of a husband or a father or son, or to go there as legatees in settlement of those estates.

There could be no greater incongruity than placing in juxtaposition the police court and the probate court and taking the records of deeds and of testamentary papers for a century and a quarter away from offices close to the courts where they belong. To cap the climax, after mixing the police court with these two it was proposed to put in a further provision that in the basement there should be a heating and lighting plant and a repair shop for the District of Columbia—in the same building where the probate court must have hearings in respect of the probate of testamentary papers, which should be filed in offices where they can be accessible for the information of the court. There would be the clatter of wheels and axes and hammers in repair shops all the while going on downstairs in the District repair shop, while upstairs in the probate court wills were being probated or a widow was trying to be heard, with her children gathered around her. I think no special credit is due the Senate committee for striking out that provision, for they could do no less, but it is to its credit to put this provision for a separate police court in now.

I know what the facts are, for I speak from a personal observation of several years. I hope the Senator from Iowa will insist on the provision reported by the Senate committee being retained and upon keeping out the incongruous and very bad arrangement stated in the House bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 64, line 19, to increase the appropriation to defray the expenses attending the execution of writs de lunatico inquirendo and commitments thereunder, etc., from \$600 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Charities and corrections," on page 66, line 16, to increase the appropriation for the salary of stenographer to the board of charities from \$840 to \$900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 20, to increase the appropriation for the board of charities from \$11,120 to \$11,180.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reformatories and correctional institutions," on page 67, line 3, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the principal overseer at the Washington Asylum from \$1,200 to \$1,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 4, to increase the appropriation for the Washington Asylum from \$30,336 to \$30,436.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 9, to increase the appropriation for contingent expenses, including provisions, fuel, forage, harness and vehicles and repairs to same at the Washington Asylum from \$60,000 to \$65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 9, to insert:

For purchase of uniforms, stationery, and text-books for the use of pupil nurses, and for expenses connected with the annual commencement exercises of the training school for nurses, \$150.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will ask the Senator from Iowa to allow me to call up at this time the unobjected pension bills on the Calendar, which we were unable to complete yesterday.

Mr. ALLISON. Of course it will be impossible to finish the District appropriation bill to-day; and I will yield to the Senator from North Dakota at this time for the purpose indicated by him.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. MCKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions:

A bill (S. 270) authorizing the Winnipeg, Yankton and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak.;

A bill (S. 3430) to authorize the Buckhannon and Northern Railroad Company, a corporation under the laws of the State of West Virginia, to build a bridge across the Monongahela River near the town of Rivesville, in the State of West Virginia;

A joint resolution (S. R. 28) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Agricultural Bulletin No. 124, being a report on irrigation in Utah; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 34) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the Military Academy at West Point Alfonso Zelaya, of Nicaragua.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12684) 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, 1905, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. STEPHENS of Texas managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 8889) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania, by the Eastern Railroad Company;" and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12684) 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, 1905, and for other purposes, and asking for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. STEWART. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments disagreed to by the House of Representatives and agree to the conference asked for by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. STEWART, Mr. PLATT of Connecticut, and Mr. DUBOIS were appointed.

CONSIDERATION OF PENSION AND MILITARY RECORD BILLS.

Mr. McCUMBER. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unobjected pension bills on the Calendar, and also to consider bills correcting military records.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of unobjected pension bills on the Calendar and bills correcting military records reported from the Committee on Military Affairs. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Chair would suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that the clerks at the desk would very much prefer to have the pension cases first considered and the military cases follow them, so as to avoid confusion.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is perfectly satisfactory, Mr. President. We shall have time enough to consider all of the cases.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wish to inquire, as there was considerable legislation in regard to pensions yesterday, whether a bill to pension some Indian scouts was then passed?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; that would not come under this order.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wanted to look at that bill. I do not know that I have any objection to it. I merely wanted to inquire whether it had been passed over for future action or whether it had been passed.

Mr. McCUMBER. Those cases do not come under the rule under which we are now acting.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Very well.

GEORGE M. GIBBONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. One pension bill was passed over yesterday. What action does the Senator desire in reference to that?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] is now present. The bill was passed over on account of his absence yesterday.

Mr. SCOTT. What is the bill?

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 4252) granting an increase of pension to George M. Gibbons.

Mr. SCOTT. I have no objection to that bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George M. Gibbons, late of Company K, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ALEXANDER S. HILL.

The bill (H. R. 11610) granting an increase of pension to Alexander S. Hill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alexander S. Hill, late first lieutenant Company G, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MATHIAS C. MILLS.

The bill (H. R. 4877) granting an increase of pension to Mathias C. Mills was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mathias C. Mills, late first lieutenant and adjutant Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JASON H. MASTERSON.

The bill (H. R. 4928) granting an increase of pension to Jason H. Masterson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jason H. Masterson, late of Company C, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant Company E, One hundredth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES W. ADAMS.

The bill (H. R. 2041) granting an increase of pension to James W. Adams was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James W. Adams, late of Company L, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SILOAM WILLIAMS.

The bill (S. 4842) granting an increase of pension to Siloam Williams was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Siloam Williams, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES BLISS.

The bill (H. R. 6706) granting an increase of pension to James Bliss was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James Bliss, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

FRANCIS KNAPP.

The bill (H. R. 7487) granting an increase of pension to Francis Knapp was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Francis Knapp, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MARY J. NEELEY.

The bill (H. R. 11692) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Neeley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mary J. Neeley, widow of M. McGinley Neeley, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

ELLA F. WHITEHEAD.

The bill (H. R. 4599) granting a pension to Ella F. Whitehead was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ella F. Whitehead, helpless and dependent daughter of Benjamin F. Whitehead, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

WILLIAM A. PORTER.

The bill (H. R. 11498) granting an increase of pension to William A. Porter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William A. Porter, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM VARNES.

The bill (S. 4618) granting an increase of pension to William Varnes was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William Varnes, late of Capt. Stewart's Company, First Regiment Florida Mounted Volunteers, Seminole Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JANE E. TATUM.

The bill (H. R. 4539) granting a pension to Jane E. Tatum was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jane E. Tatum, widow of Hamling Tatum, late of Captain Carne's company, Georgia Mounted Volunteers, Creek Indian war, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

MARY SHIVER.

The bill (H. R. 4141) granting a pension to Mary Shiver was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mary Shiver, widow of Abner B. Shiver, late of Captain Lightner's company of Alabama Volunteers, Creek Indian war, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

JAMES H. MARTIN.

The bill (H. R. 3642) granting an increase of pension to James H. Martin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James H. Martin, late of Captain Barker's company, Georgia Volunteers, Florida Indian war, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM H. MANN.

The bill (H. R. 11838) granting an increase of pension to William H. Mann was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It

proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William H. Mann, late captain Company I, Ninety-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

AMANTHUS P. JOYNER.

The bill (H. R. 11597) granting an increase of pension to Amantus P. Joyner was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Amantus P. Joyner, widow of Reddick A. Joyner, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Louisiana Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

GEORGE H. ABNEY.

The bill (H. R. 11612) granting an increase of pension to George H. Abney was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George H. Abney, late of Company L, Palmetto Regiment South Carolina Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

EARL B. FRENCH.

The bill (S. 4742) granting an increase of pension to Earl B. French was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Earl B. French, late of company L, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLA C. TUPPER.

A bill (S. 1310) granting a pension to Ella C. Tupper was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Ella C. Tupper, widow of Francis W. Tupper, late first lieutenant and adjutant, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALVIN RINE.

The bill (S. 94) granting a pension to Alvin Rine was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "and," to strike out "Regiment;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Alvin Rine, late of Company H, Osage County, Mo., Home Guards, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS HERRAN.

The bill (S. 1618) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Herran was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, before the word "Heavy," to insert "Volunteer;" and in the same line, before the word "and," to strike out "Volunteers;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Thomas Herran, late of Company L, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISAAC N. HUGHEY.

The bill (S. 1572) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Hughey was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "of," to strike out "the" and insert "Company M;" in the same line, after the word "Fifth," to insert "Regiment;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Isaac N. Hughey, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN M'CAHLE.

The bill (S. 1989) granting an increase of pension to John McCahle was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John McCahle, late of Company G, Sixty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MARGARET JONES.

The bill (H. R. 11906) granting a pension to Margaret Jones was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Margaret Jones, widow of Wiley Jones, late of Captain Conner's company, Texas Mounted Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

WARREN R. HERRELL.

The bill (H. R. 9562) granting an increase of pension to Warren R. Herrell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Warren R. Herrell, late of Company L, Fifteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SAMUEL PARMLEY.

The bill (H. R. 3434) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Parmley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel Parmley, late of Captain Peak's company, Tennessee Volunteers, Cherokee Indian disturbances, and to pay him a pension of \$15 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ROBERT D. GARDNER.

The bill (H. R. 5330) granting an increase of pension to Robert D. Gardner was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Robert D. Gardner, late of Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ELAM ALLEN.

The bill (H. R. 8713) granting an increase of pension to Elam Allen was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elam Allen, late of Company E, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JENNIE PETTIT MORRISON.

The bill (H. R. 7482) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Pettit Morrison was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jennie Pettit Morrison, widow of Jasper Newton Morrison, late lieutenant-colonel and judge-advocate, United States Army, and to pay her a pension of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

JAMES WALTS.

The bill (H. R. 8462) granting an increase of pension to James Walts was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James Walts, late of Captain Sanderson's company, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

DAVID KINSEY.

The bill (H. R. 11846) granting an increase of pension to David Kinsey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of David Kinsey, late of Company K, Ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

THOMAS BALLARD.

The bill (H. R. 4718) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Ballard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas Ballard, late of the U. S. S. *Indicator*, United States Navy, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

AUGUST BOCKERMAN.

The bill (H. R. 11616) granting a pension to August Bockerman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of August Bockerman, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month.

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

SOCRATES MOORE.

The bill (H. R. 11615) granting an increase of pension to Socrates Moore was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Socrates Moore, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LAURA M. GILLMORE.

The bill (S. 4899) granting an increase of pension to Laura M. Gillmore was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "of," to strike out the letter "Q," and insert the name "Quincy;" in line 7, after the word "Army," to insert "and;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name Laura M. Gillmore, widow of Quincy A. Gillmore, late colonel, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and brigadier-general and major-general, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES W. CHARGO.

The bill (S. 5028) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Chargo was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles W. Chargo, late of Company L, First Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Chargo."

IDA E. NERBER.

The bill (H. R. 12436) granting a pension to Ida E. Nerber was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ida E. Nerber, helpless and dependent daughter of Daniel Nerber, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

ELIZABETH M'L. HAUGHEY.

The bill (H. R. 9834) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth McL. Haughey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elizabeth McL. Haughey, widow of James Alexander Haughey, late captain Company H, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

REBECCA M'KINNEY.

The bill (H. R. 12434) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca McKinney was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Rebecca McKinney, widow of Franklin O. McKinney, late of Company K, Twenty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Wilhelmina McKinney, helpless and dependent child of said Franklin O. McKinney, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Rebecca McKinney the name of said Wilhelmina McKinney shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of the death of said Rebecca McKinney, such pension to be paid to the legally constituted guardian of said Wilhelmina McKinney.

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

JOHN C. WEBB.

The bill (H. R. 10845) granting an increase of pension to John C. Webb was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John C. Webb, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

FANNIE S. MOORE.

The bill (S. 2711) granting an increase of pension to Fannie S. Moore was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "and," to strike out "second;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Fannie S. Moore, widow of John C. W. Moore, late of Company B, Second Regiment, and assistant surgeon Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADRIAN TERRY.

The bill (S. 4765) granting an increase of pension to Adrian Terry was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Adrian Terry, late lieutenant-colonel and assistant adjutant-general, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES O. FARGO.

The bill (S. 3030) granting a pension to Charles O. Fargo was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "Company," to insert "Company H, Tenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and;" and in line 8, before the word "Heavy," to insert "Volunteer;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles O. Fargo, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Charles O. Fargo."

GEORGE G. WRIGHT.

The bill (S. 4056) granting an increase of pension to George G. Wright, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George G. Wright, alias George Gravett, late of Company B, First Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to George G. Wright, alias George Gravett."

ALEXANDER M. BALLOU.

The bill (H. R. 725) granting an increase of pension to Alexander M. Ballou was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alexander M. Ballou, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

BENJAMIN F. EVANS.

The bill (H. R. 728) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Evans was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Benjamin F. Evans, late of Company K, First Regiment United States Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES V. TABOR.

The bill (H. R. 1568) granting an increase of pension to James V. Tabor, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James V. Tabor, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

BENJAMIN F. GATES.

The bill (H. R. 2929) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Gates, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Benjamin F. Gates, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MATTHEW CURRAN.

The bill (H. R. 12326) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Curran was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Matthew Curran, late of Company B, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN L. B. THOMPSON.

The bill (H. R. 732) granting an increase of pension to John L. B. Thompson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John L. B. Thompson, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE W. CARR.

The bill (H. R. 744) granting an increase of pension to George W. Carr was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George W. Carr, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LUCRETIA DAVIS.

The bill (H. R. 11562) granting a pension to Lucretia Davis, formerly Hamilton, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lucretia Davis, formerly Hamilton, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

JEROME J. HINDS.

The bill (H. R. 11711) granting an increase of pension to Jerome J. Hinds was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 10, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-six" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jerome J. Hinds, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant and captain Company A, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ELIAS VEATCH.

The bill (H. R. 4892) granting an increase of pension to Elias Veatch was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elias Veatch, late of Company K, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CATHERINE TULLY.

The bill (H. R. 4930) granting a pension to Catherine Tully was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Catherine Tully, widow of Redmond Tully, late first lieutenant, Twenty-fifth Regiment, United States Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$17 per month.

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

HENRY R. GUSS.

The bill (H. R. 4120) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Guss was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry R. Guss, late colonel Ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

D. MILLER GORDON.

The bill (H. R. 1267) granting an increase of pension to D. Miller Gordon was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of D. Miller Gordon, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN W. HAY.

The bill (H. R. 6365) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hay was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John W. Hay, late of Company G, First Battalion Twelfth Regiment United States

Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CARRIE KEEFER.

The bill (H. R. 4565) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Keefer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Carrie Keefer, widow of Benjamin F. Keefer, late captain Company H, One hundred and thirty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

LYDIA GAVETT.

The bill (H. R. 12439) granting a pension to Lydia Gavett was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lydia Gavett, helpless and dependent daughter of William E. Gavett, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

GEORGE MANYPENNY.

The bill (H. R. 11177) granting an increase of pension to George Manypenny was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George Manypenny, late of Company H, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ALBERT HALDEMAN.

The bill (H. R. 12134) granting an increase of pension to Albert Haldeman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Albert Haldeman, late commissary-sergeant One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MARY YAW.

The bill (H. R. 9862) granting a pension to Mary Yaw was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mary Yaw, widow of Samuel D. Yaw, late of Company K, Fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

WILLIAM H. DAILEY.

The bill (H. R. 12965) granting a pension to William H. Dailey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William H. Dailey, late of Company G, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ANNA C. RAY.

The bill (H. R. 11313) granting a pension to Anna C. Ray was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Anna C. Ray, widow of Robert C. Ray, late ensign, United States Navy, and to pay her a pension of \$15 per month.

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

ELIZABETH G. ILLSLEY.

The bill (S. 4891) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth G. Illsley was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Elizabeth G. Illsley, widow of Charles E. Illsley, late first lieutenant Company G, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CORNELIA A. THOMPSON.

The bill (S. 4817) granting a pension to Cornelia A. Thompson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Cornelia A. Thompson, dependent mother of George R. Thompson, late of United States steamships Lancaster, Kearsarge, and Vermont, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HIRAM W. WHITE.

The bill (S. 320) granting an increase of pension to Hiram W. White was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-six" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Hiram W. White, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BUSHNELL B. LOOMIS.

The bill (S. 329) granting an increase of pension to Bushnell B. Loomis was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Bushnell B. Loomis, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BENSON C. BELLAMY.

The bill (S. 2423) granting an increase of pension to Benson C. Bellamy was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "Eighteenth," to insert "Regiment;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Benson C. Bellamy, late of Company G, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT H. M'ILROY.

The bill (H. R. 3533) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. McIlroy was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Robert H. McIlroy, late captain Company E, First Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES M. HURLEY.

The bill (H. R. 3033) granting a pension to James M. Hurley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James M. Hurley, late assistant surgeon Seventy-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry and Tenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

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

WILLIAM T. HAYTER.

The bill (H. R. 10478) granting an increase of pension to William T. Hayter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It

proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William T. Hayter, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

EMMA THURSTON.

The bill (S. 4405) granting an increase of pension to Emma Thurston was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Emma Thurston, widow of George A. Thurston, late captain, Third Regiment United States Artillery, and to pay her a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

JOHN TAYLOR.

The bill (S. 4846) granting an increase of pension to John Taylor was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Taylor, late of Company D, First Battalion Nevada Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ALFRED KENT.

The bill (S. 208) granting a pension to Alfred Kent was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Alfred Kent, late second lieutenant Company H, and first lieutenant and regimental commissary, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Alfred Kent."

OSMER S. DEMING.

The bill (S. 3867) granting an increase of pension to Osmer S. Deming was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Osmer S. Deming, late gunner's mate, U. S. steamships Grampus and Victory, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEROY R. HAWTHORN.

The bill (S. 1478) granting an increase of pension to Leroy R. Hawthorn was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Leroy R. Hawthorn, late captain and commissary of subsistence, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUTHER ST. JOHN.

The bill (H. R. 544) granting an increase of pension to Luther St. John was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It

proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Luther St. John, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE N. CRAWFORD.

The bill (H. R. 3171) granting an increase of pension to George N. Crawford was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George N. Crawford, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer

Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MINERVA A. POOL.

The bill (H. R. 2144) granting an increase of pension to Minerva A. Pool was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Minerva A. Pool, widow of Ira L. Pool, late of Company A, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Myrtle B. Pool, helpless and dependent child of said Ira L. Pool, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Minerva A. Pool the name of said Myrtle B. Pool shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Minerva A. Pool.

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

ELI T. HOYT.

The bill (H. R. 3832) granting an increase of pension to Eli T. Hoyt was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Eli T. Hoyt, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

THOMAS E. CONNOR.

The bill (H. R. 4980) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Connor, alias Darius B. Smith, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas E. Connor, alias Darius B. Smith, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

AUGUSTUS JOHNS.

The bill (H. R. 9504) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Johns was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Augustus Johns, late of Company H, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN S. MAVITY.

The bill (H. R. 3149) granting an increase of pension to John S. Mavity was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John S. Mavity, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment, and Company G, Fifty-third Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE L. BIXLER.

The bill (H. R. 4949) granting an increase of pension to George L. Bixler was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George L. Bixler, late of Company K, One hundredth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ELECTA L. WILLARD.

The bill (H. R. 4623) granting a pension to Electa L. Willard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Electa L. Willard, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

GEORGE W. FORD.

The bill (H. R. 2922) granting an increase of pension to George W. Ford was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George W. Ford, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM C. GRIFFIN.

A bill (S. 4919) granting an increase of pension to W. C. Griffin was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William C. Griffin, late of Captain Finley's company, Second Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteers, Seminole Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to William C. Griffin."

JOHN T. RADER.

The bill (S. 4648) granting an increase of pension to John T. Rader was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "of," where it occurs the second time, to strike out "Company A" and insert "Companies A and F;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John T. Rader, late of Companies A and F, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES C. FISHER.

The bill (H. R. 11939) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Fisher, alias John C. Pickerell, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles C. Fisher, alias John C. Pickerell, late of U. S. S. *Grampus*, *Great Western*, and *Champion*, United States Navy, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN D. VERNAY.

Mr. CULLOM. I believe the Calendar of unobjected pension bills is now concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. But the Calendar of bills to correct military records comes up next.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask consent to call up at this time the bill (S. 402) for the relief of James D. Vernay. It is to correct the records and reinstate First Lieut. and Bvt. Capt. James D. Vernay in the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement those bills are to be taken up in their order.

Mr. CULLOM. I know that; but I am obliged to leave the Senate Chamber for a few moments, and I should like to have this bill taken up now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection?

Mr. KEAN. I do not think this bill should be taken up under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. CULLOM. I am now asking unanimous consent.

Mr. KEAN. It was not contemplated under the agreement that we were to consider bills of this character.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know exactly what the agreement was.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey object?

Mr. KEAN. I think the bill had better go over.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] knows all about this case. It comes from the Military Committee. The beneficiary is very poor, and I think the bill ought to be considered.

Mr. KEAN. I do not make any objection on the merits of the bill—

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read as it is proposed to be amended.

Mr. CULLOM. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been read. Is there objection to its consideration?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments. The amendments were, in line 7, before the word "in," to strike out "captain mounted" and insert "first lieutenant;" in the same line, after the words "United States," to strike out "(to whom a Congressional medal of honor was awarded for most distinguished gallantry in action);" in line 10, before the word "retired," to strike out "list of;" in the same line, before the word "of," to strike out the word "officers" and insert "list;" in line 12, before the word "that," to strike out the word "at" and insert "of;" in the same line, after the word "grade," to strike out "on account of severe wounds received in battle, creating a total disability which he is under," and insert "the retired list being thereby increased in number to that extent;" and on page 2, line 3, after the word "however," to strike out "That he shall receive no pay for the period he was out of the service" and insert:

That no pay or allowances shall become due or payable to this officer since his dismissal from the Army by sentence of court-martial up to the passage of this act.

Mr. COCKRELL. Now let the bill be read as it will read if the amendments are agreed to.

The Secretary read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint James D. Vernay, late first lieutenant and brevet captain, United States Army, a first lieutenant in the Army of the United States; and when so appointed he shall be placed upon the retired list of the Army, unlimited, with the pay and emoluments of a retired officer of that grade, the retired list being thereby increased in number to that extent: *Provided, however,* That no pay or allowances shall become due or payable to this officer since his dismissal from the Army by sentence of court-martial up to the passage of this act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THEODORE F. NORTHROP.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the first military desertion bill.

The bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Theodore F. Northrop was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides that Theodore F. Northrop, late first lieutenant, Second Regiment New York Cavalry Volunteers, shall be held and considered to have been a captain of cavalry, in command of scouts in the army of General Sherman, from September 10, 1864, to May 22, 1865.

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

CARL W. ALBRECHT.

The bill (S. 4405) to correct the military record of Carl W. Albrecht was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of War to correct the military record of Carl W. Albrecht, who was enrolled into the service of the United States in Company H, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, April 29, 1898, as Charles Albrecht, and whose name stands on the roll as Charles Albrecht.

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

WILLIAM A. HAMMOND.

The Secretary read the title of the bill (S. 1665) to amend the act approved March 15, 1878, entitled "An act for the relief of William A. Hammond, late Surgeon-General of the Army."

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Does the bill come under the agreement?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does not come under the agreement.

Mr. KEAN. It does not.

GEORGE H. WHITE.

The bill (S. 3938) for the relief of George H. White was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of War to revoke and set aside so much of General Orders as approved the finding and sentence of the general court-martial dismissing Capt. George H. White, Nineteenth Regiment Michigan Infantry Volunteers, and to issue to him a certificate of discharge as of date March 1, 1863.

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

MAJ. JOHN MURPHY.

The bill (S. 3503) to amend the record of Maj. John Murphy was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides that John Murphy, late major of the Fifty-eighth Illinois Volunteer Infantry, shall be held and considered to have been honorably dis-

charged from the military service of the United States as of date October 8, 1865.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to insert at the end of the bill the following:

Provided, That no pay, bounty, or allowance shall accrue by virtue of the passage of this act.

That has been omitted. It was an oversight in the committee, or the bill would not have been reported without the addition of those words.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TALTON T. DAVIS.

The bill (S. 4343) for the relief of Talton T. Davis was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to correct the military record of Talton T. Davis, of Marion, Kans., late of Company H, Twenty-first Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and to grant him an honorable discharge as of date October 8, 1862: *Provided,* That no pay, bounty, or allowances shall be allowed by reason of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACOB NIEBELS.

The bill (S. 716) granting an honorable discharge to Jacob Niebels was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, in line 5, after the name "Jacob," to strike out "Niebels" and insert "Niebels;" and in line 6, after the word "Infantry," to insert "*Provided,* That no pay, bounty, or emoluments shall accrue by virtue of the passage of this act;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to correct the military record of and grant an honorable discharge to Jacob Niebels, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry: *Provided,* That no pay, bounty, or emoluments shall accrue by virtue of the passage of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an honorable discharge to Jacob Niebels."

JAMES B. BOYD.

The bill (S. 2950) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James B. Boyd was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in line 9, after the word "sixty-five," to insert the following proviso: "*Provided,* That no pay, bounty, or other emolument shall accrue by virtue of the passage of this act;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of James B. Boyd, late of Battery I, Fourth United States Artillery, to amend his military record accordingly, and to grant to said James B. Boyd an honorable discharge as of date November 23, 1865: *Provided,* That no pay, bounty, or other emolument shall accrue by virtue of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACOB M'DOWELL.

The bill (S. 2330) to correct the military record of Jacob McDowell was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "service," to insert: "As of date February 23, 1865: *Provided,* That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall accrue by virtue of the passage of this act."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to correct the military record of Jacob McDowell, late captain of Company K, One hundred and sixtieth New York Volunteer Infantry, and issue to him an honorable discharge from said service as of date February 23, 1865: *Provided,* That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall accrue by virtue of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 28, 1904, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 26, 1904.

CONSUL.

Samuel H. Shank, of Indiana, to be consul of the United States at Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, vice William H. H. Graham, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

To be assistant paymasters in the Navy from the 25th day of March, 1904:

Brainerd M. Dobson, a citizen of South Carolina.
William W. Lamar, a citizen of Florida.
Robert B. Lupton, a citizen of New Jersey.
Fred W. Holt, a citizen of Arkansas.
Walter D. Sharp, a citizen of Virginia.
Wilmer D. McCully, a citizen of Oregon.
Henry I. McCrea, a citizen of Indiana.
William T. Sypher, a citizen of Louisiana.
Edwin M. Hacker, a citizen of Tennessee.
Horace B. Worden, a citizen of Montana.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 26, 1904.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

To be assistant quartermaster-general with the rank of colonel.

Lieut. Col. George E. Pond, deputy quartermaster-general, January 20, 1904.

To be deputy quartermasters-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. William W. Robinson, jr., quartermaster, January 20, 1904.

Maj. Medad C. Martin, quartermaster, January 22, 1904.

PAY DEPARTMENT.

To be assistant paymaster-general with the rank of colonel.

Lieut. Col. Charles H. Whipple, deputy paymaster-general, January 25, 1904.

To be deputy paymasters-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. John C. Muhlenberg, paymaster, January 23, 1904.

Maj. George R. Smith, paymaster, January 25, 1904.

To be paymaster with the rank of major.

Capt. William G. Gambrill, paymaster, January 23, 1904.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. Charles W. Raymond, Corps of Engineers, January 23, 1904.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. Charles F. Powell, Corps of Engineers, January 23, 1904.

Maj. John G. D. Knight, Corps of Engineers, January 23, 1904.

To be majors.

Capt. James C. Sanford, Corps of Engineers, January 22, 1904.

Capt. Hiram M. Chittenden, Corps of Engineers, January 23, 1904.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Edward H. Schulz, Corps of Engineers, January 22, 1904.

First Lieut. Harry Burgess, Corps of Engineers, January 23, 1904.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. William G. Caples, Corps of Engineers, January 22, 1904.

Second Lieut. Henry C. Jewett, Corps of Engineers, January 23, 1904.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. John E. Greer, Ordnance Department, January 19, 1904.

Lieut. Col. John Pitman, Ordnance Department, January 21, 1904.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. Daniel M. Taylor, Ordnance Department, January 19, 1904.

Maj. David A. Lyle, Ordnance Department, January 21, 1904.

To be major.

Capt. J. Walker Benét, Ordnance Department, January 19, 1904.

To be captain.

First Lieut. Edward P. O'Hern, Ordnance Department, January 19, 1904.

ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Frank Thorp, Artillery Corps, January 21, 1904.

Lieut. Col. Louis V. Caziarc, Artillery Corps, January 23, 1904.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. Oliver E. Wood, Artillery Corps, January 21, 1904.

Maj. Edward Davis, Artillery Corps, assistant adjutant-general, January 23, 1904.

To be major.

Capt. David Price, Artillery Corps, January 21, 1904.

SIGNAL CORPS.

First Lieut. Henry S. Hathaway, Signal Corps, to be captain, December 30, 1903.

INFANTRY ARM.

Capt. Charles W. Penrose, Twenty-eighth Infantry, to be major, October 15, 1903.

Capt. Daniel L. Howell, Seventh Infantry, to be major, November 24, 1903.

Capt. John Stafford, Eighth Infantry, to be major, November 28, 1903.

First Lieut. Joseph L. Gilbreth, Fourteenth Infantry, to be captain, October 15, 1903.

First Lieut. Charles F. Humphrey, jr., Third Infantry, to be captain, November 21, 1903.

First Lieut. Willey Howell, Fourth Infantry, to be captain, November 24, 1903.

First Lieut. Benjamin J. Tillman, Seventh Infantry, to be captain, November 28, 1903.

Second Lieut. Arthur H. Freshwater, Twenty-eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, September 28, 1903.

Second Lieut. Joseph C. Wilson, Sixth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, October 9, 1903.

Second Lieut. Morris M. Keck, Twelfth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, October 10, 1903.

Second Lieut. Auswell E. Deitsch, Fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, October 15, 1903.

Second Lieut. William Korst, Seventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant, October 23, 1903.

Second Lieut. Joseph C. Kay, Eleventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant, November 16, 1903.

Second Lieut. Walter C. Jones, Eleventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant, November 21, 1903.

Second Lieut. Charles Abel, Eighteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, November 24, 1903.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. George A. Cornish, Twenty-sixth Infantry, January 20, 1904.

Lieut. Col. Charles A. Williams, United States Infantry, inspector-general, January 23, 1904.

Lieut. Col. Marion P. Maus, Twenty-second Infantry, January 24, 1904.

Lieut. Col. Frederick A. Smith, United States Infantry, inspector-general, January 24, 1904.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. William Paulding, Eighteenth Infantry, January 20, 1904.

Maj. Lorenzo W. Cooke, Twenty-sixth Infantry, January 24, 1904.

To be captains.

First Lieut. George J. Holden, Tenth Infantry, December 10, 1903.
 First Lieut. Charles F. Bates, Twenty-fifth Infantry, December 17, 1903.
 First Lieut. Arthur Cranston, Seventeenth Infantry, December 26, 1903.
 First Lieut. John J. Toffey, jr., Fourth Infantry, January 2, 1904.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. La Vergne L. Gregg, Twenty-second Infantry, November 27, 1903.
 Second Lieut. Oliver F. Snyder, Eighteenth Infantry, November 28, 1903.
 Second Lieut. Edward L. Rains, Twenty-fourth Infantry, December 2, 1903.
 Second Lieut. Charles L. Woodhouse, Twenty-eighth Infantry, December 10, 1903.
 Second Lieut. Bertram P. Johnson, Twenty-fourth Infantry, December 17, 1903.
 Second Lieut. Gustave A. Wieser, Fifteenth Infantry, December 26, 1903.
 Second Lieut. Charles R. W. Morison, Fifth Infantry, January 2, 1904.
 Second Lieut. Walter L. Reed, Tenth Infantry, January 8, 1904.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Capt. William W. Gibson, Ordnance Department, to be major, January 21, 1904.
 First Lieut. Edwin D. Bricker, Ordnance Department, to be captain, January 21, 1904.

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

To be quartermasters with the rank of major.

Capt. Winthrop S. Wood, quartermaster, January 20, 1904.
 Capt. Chauncey B. Baker, quartermaster, January 22, 1904.

PAY DEPARTMENT.

To be paymaster with the rank of major.

Capt. Timothy D. Keleher, paymaster, January 25, 1904.
 Capt. William B. Schofield, paymaster, March 3, 1904.

CAVALRY ARM.

First Lieut. John C. Raymond, Sixth Cavalry, to be captain, March 21, 1904.
 Second Lieut. Douglas H. Jacobs, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, March 21, 1904.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Theodore F. Jewell to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 15th day of March, 1904.
 Lieut. Commander James M. Helm to be a commander in the Navy from the 11th day of October, 1903.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Austin Kautz to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1904.
 Ensign Ernest A. Weichert to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 28th day of January, 1904.
 Commander John M. Hawley to be a captain in the Navy from the 15th day of March, 1904.
 Lieut. Commander Frank F. Fletcher to be a commander in the Navy from the 12th day of March, 1904.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Ulysses S. Macy to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 12th day of March, 1904.
 Ensign Claude C. Block to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 28th day of January, 1904.
 Civil Engineer Adolfo J. Menocal to have the rank of lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 6th day of March, 1904.
 Civil Engineer Homer R. Stanford to have the rank of lieutenant in the Navy from the 6th day of March, 1904.
 Lieut. James G. Doyle to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 23d day of September, 1903.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) William C. Asserson to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1904.
 Lieut. Roger Welles, jr., to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 4th day of February, 1904.
 Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frank L. Pinney to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of February, 1904.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Francis H. Parker, of Connecticut, to be United States attorney for the district of Connecticut.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, March 26, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.
 Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.
 The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read, corrected, and approved.

APPOINTMENT OF BOARD OF MANAGERS OF THE NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs to submit the following resolution, with the unanimous report of the committee, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) for appointment of members of Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

Resolved, etc. That Martin T. McMahon, of New York; John M. Holley, of Wisconsin; William Warner, of Missouri; William R. Shafter, of California; Henry E. Palmer, of Nebraska; and Franklin Murphy, of New Jersey, be, and the same are hereby, appointed as members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers of the United States—Gen. Martin T. McMahon to succeed himself, his term of service expiring April 21, 1904; William Warner to fill a vacancy caused by the resignation of Col. Sidney G. Cooke, whose term of service expires April 21, 1906; Gen. William R. Shafter to succeed Maj. William H. Bonsall, whose term of service expires April 21, 1904; Capt. Henry E. Palmer to succeed himself, his present term of service expiring April 21, 1904; Franklin Murphy to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Gen. Alfred L. Pearson, whose term of service expires April 21, 1906.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

ALFONSO ZELAYA, OF NICARAGUA.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 34) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the Military Academy at West Point Alfonso Zelaya, of Nicaragua.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit Alfonso Zelaya, of Nicaragua, to receive instruction at the Military Academy at West Point: *Provided,* That no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby: *And provided further,* That in the case of the said Alfonso Zelaya the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes shall be suspended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HULL. Just a simple word in explanation.

Mr. MADDOX. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. HULL. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. MADDOX. I have only reserved the right of objection. I want an explanation of what this is.

Mr. HULL. This is the usual resolution which is passed by Congress when any of our sister republics make the request of the State Department for the privilege, at their own expense, of sending a cadet to West Point. The State Department refers this matter to the Senate and House in a letter that is submitted with the report, asking that the usual courtesy be given Nicaragua that has heretofore been given to other South American republics. They pay all the expense of the cadet. They can not send one unless this resolution should pass.

Mr. MADDOX. Will the gentleman state how many South American republics now have this privilege?

Mr. HULL. I think there are only two there now. There are always one or two cadets from some of the South American republics who get into the Academy in this way, and unless Congress suspends the provisions of the law it will be impossible for this one to be admitted.

Mr. MADDOX. Where is this one from?

Mr. HULL. He is from Nicaragua.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to object, and I do not know that I will object—I never have to any reasonable request of the gentleman from Iowa; I have never felt called upon to do so—but it is a little remarkable, to say the least of it, that we grant the privilege to some one—a foreigner—when a citizen of our own States, or anybody in the United States, is not permitted to have his son appointed to West Point except in the regular way, no matter how much he might be willing to pay for it. I will not object to this one, but I feel very much inclined to do so.

Mr. HULL. I wish to say to the gentleman that I have no interest in this matter. It is a courtesy we have refused no South American republic that ever requested it. And in connection

with the privilege of educating students from various parts of the United States, every Member of Congress has the privilege of appointing cadets, besides the large number that are appointed at large by the President.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I want to suggest to the gentleman, with this as a precedent and following this theory, we would admit, I presume, all that would apply from any South American republic to get a military training, under which in the event of war we would be furnishing a power against ourselves. Now, I want to see just how much this right is going to be abused.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I have no particular fear of any South American Republic, with one cadet at West Point, so outstripping the United States of America in military prowess that we will ever suffer any military inconvenience therefrom.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. We want to know how much it will carry and how many applicants will be allowed there.

Mr. HULL. They can have but one from any republic at one time. Congress would not consent to more.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. How many have been granted, may I ask the gentleman, in the last ten or fifteen years?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa permit me to submit a suggestion?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. This is a courtesy which has been extended from time to time to various governments. It is one which has never been abused, and there has been nothing suggested which would indicate in the mind of the most timorous that there is danger to be expected from the education in a military way of young men of South American republics at the Military Academy at West Point.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. As bearing upon the point, I asked the question to know how many have been educated there in the last ten or twenty years.

Mr. HULL. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana I am just informed by a gentleman on my right that the last one from Nicaragua graduated from the class in 1894. Of course it would require an act of Congress—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I mean in reference to young men from South America.

Mr. HULL. We have one or two of them—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I mean in the last ten or fifteen years.

Mr. HULL. I have not gone over all that, but I think in the last ten or fifteen years there have been six or eight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LACEY. I will ask my friend if the principal officer now in the Japanese fleet was not educated at Annapolis at the expense of the Government?

Mr. HULL. No; not at the expense of the Government, because all his expenses were paid by his own Government.

Mr. LACEY. But his education is bearing fruit now in the East.

Mr. HULL. Very well; that is a question for Congress to pass upon.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the votes by which both resolutions were passed was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE, DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3015) to provide for an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following Senate bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, who shall reside in said district and who shall possess the same powers, perform the same duties, and receive the same salary as the present district judge of said district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PALMER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, under the order of the House certain bills on the Private Calendar are in order to-day. I ask

unanimous consent that on the day following the disposition of the sundry civil appropriation bill, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the matters which are in order to-day shall be then in order for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that on the day immediately following the passage of the sundry civil appropriation bill bills on the Private Calendar under the order pertaining to pension bills shall be in order. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

GRANTING RIGHT TO DAVENPORT WATER POWER COMPANY IN THE
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IN SCOTT COUNTY, IOWA.

Mr. WADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 4142.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following Senate bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the assent of Congress is hereby given to the Davenport Water Power Company, a corporation created and organized under the laws of the State of Iowa, its successors and assigns, to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a canal along the north bank of the Mississippi River between LeClaire and Davenport, in Scott County, in the State of Iowa, to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a power station thereon, and to project, erect, construct, operate, and maintain such dams and other works as may be necessary within said limits for the development of water power and the generation, use, and transmission therefrom of electric energy and power at, in, and upon the Rock Island Rapids of the Mississippi River: *Provided,* That the said canal and appurtenant works shall be so designed, constructed, and operated as not to interfere in any way with the safe and convenient navigation of steamboats and other vessels or of rafts and barges over the Rock Island Rapids at any stage of water; and the expense of any reconstruction or extension or addition to existing works for the improvement of navigation on the said Rock Island Rapids which may be found necessary, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, on account of the construction, maintenance, or operation of the said canal and appurtenant works, shall be borne by the said company, its successors, or assigns, under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *And provided further,* That detailed plans for the construction and operation of the said canal and appurtenant works shall be submitted to and approved by the Secretary of War before the commencement of the construction of any portion of the said works; and that after the approval of the said plans no deviation therefrom shall be made without the prior approval by the Secretary of War of the said deviation: *And provided further,* That the said works and appurtenances shall be so designed, constructed, and operated as not to overflow or otherwise damage the lands and other property of the United States at Rock Island Arsenal, or injure or diminish the water power of the United States at the said arsenal, or the water power of any person, firm, or corporation having hydraulic works already constructed: *And provided further,* That before entering upon the construction of the said works, compensation shall be made to any person, firm, or corporation whose lands or other property may be taken, overflowed, or otherwise damaged by the construction, maintenance, and operation of the said works, in accordance with the laws of the State where such lands or other property may be situated.

SEC. 2. That the withdrawal of water from the Mississippi River and the discharge of water into the said river, for the purpose of operating the said canal and appurtenant works, shall be under the direction and control of the Secretary of War, and shall at no time be such as to impede or interfere with the safe and convenient navigation of the said river by means of steamboats or other vessels, or by rafts and barges, or to injure or diminish the water power of the United States at Rock Island Arsenal, or the water power of any person, firm, or corporation having hydraulic works already constructed: *Provided,* That if any litigation arises from the construction, operation, or maintenance of the said works, or from the obstruction of any part of the Mississippi River by the said works or any portion thereof, cases may be tried in the proper courts as now provided for that purpose in the States of Illinois and Iowa and the courts of the United States: *And provided further,* That suitable fishways shall be constructed and maintained by the said company, its successors and assigns, at such of the dams and in such manner as may be required from time to time by the United States Fish Commission.

SEC. 3. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the works herein authorized be not commenced within three years and completed within six years from the date hereof.

SEC. 4. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended.

On motion of Mr. WADE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MONONGAHELA RIVER, NEAR RIVESVILLE, W. VA.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3430) to authorize the Buckhannon and Northern Railroad Company, a corporation under the laws of the State of West Virginia, to build a bridge across the Monongahela River, near the town of Rivesville, in the State of West Virginia.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a statement in reference to this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Has it received the approval of the War Department?

Mr. DAYTON. It has. I want to say to the House that this bill was introduced in the House as House bill 9871, sent to the War Department, and received its approval with certain amendments, and was reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A similar bill was introduced in the Senate, was there reported upon under a letter from the Secretary of War approving it, and was passed. The bill which I ask the consideration of at this time is the Senate bill which has passed. It is identical with the one reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I therefore move that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the Senate bill, and I ask that it may be put upon its passage in lieu of the House bill, and that the House bill may lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DAYTON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

The bill H. R. 9871 was laid on the table.

TO OPEN FOR SETTLEMENT CERTAIN LANDS IN OKLAHOMA.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9) to open for settlement 505,000 acres of land in Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian reservations in Oklahoma Territory.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all of that part of article 3 of section 6 of the act of Congress of date June 6, 1900, entitled "An act to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Indians of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in Idaho," and making appropriations to carry the same into effect, which reads as follows, to wit: "That in addition to the allotment of lands to said Indians as provided for in this agreement the Secretary of the Interior shall set aside for the use in common for said Indian tribes 480,000 acres of grazing land, to be selected by the Secretary of the Interior, either in one or more tracts, as will best subserve the interests of said Indians," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

SEC. 2. That the 480,000 acres of land set apart in the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian reservations, in Oklahoma Territory, by the Secretary of the Interior, referred to and mentioned in section 1 of this act, and the 25,000 acres of land set apart as a wood reservation in the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian reservations, in Oklahoma Territory, by the Secretary of the Interior shall be opened to settlement by proclamation of the President of the United States within three months from the passage of this act and be disposed of at public auction to the highest bidder for cash: *Provided,* That no one person shall be permitted to purchase more than 100 acres, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further,* That the money arising from the sale of said lands shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States and placed to the credit of said tribes of Indians, and said deposit of money shall draw 5 per cent interest per annum; and the principal and interest of said deposit shall be expended for the benefit of said Indians in such manner as Congress may direct: *And it is also provided,* That such sales shall be subject to any leases made for agricultural purposes prior to the passage of this act, the rentals accruing after such sale to belong to the purchasers under this act.

SEC. 3. That said lands shall be sold for not less than \$1.50 per acre, and shall be sold upon the following terms: One-fifth of the price bid therefor to be paid at the time the bid is made, and the balance of the purchase price of said land to be paid in five equal annual installments in advance. And in case any purchaser fails to make such annual payment promptly when due, all rights in and to the land covered by his or her purchase shall at once cease, and any payments theretofore made shall be forfeited. And no title to said land shall inure to the purchaser, nor any patent of the United States issue to the purchaser until the purchaser shall have resided upon and improved said land for the full term of five years, without any commutation of time, and shall have in all respects complied with the terms and provisions of the homestead laws of the United States: *Provided,* That such purchaser shall prove up within six years from the date of sale; that aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States may become purchasers under this act, but before proving up and acquiring title must take out their full naturalization papers.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby vested with full power and authority to make such rules and regulations as to the time of notice, manner of sale, and other matters incident to the carrying out of the provisions of this act as he may deem necessary.

The following amendments reported by the committee were read:

In line 11, page 2, strike out the words "at public auction to the highest bidder for cash" and insert in lieu thereof the words "upon sealed bids or at public auction, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, to the highest bidder."

After the word "Interior," in line 14, page 2, add the following: "And such purchaser must be duly qualified to make entry under the general homestead laws."

In line 6, page 3, strike out the word "promptly."

In line 15, page 3, strike out the words "prove up" and insert in lieu thereof the words "make final proof."

In line 19, page 3, strike out the word "full" and insert in lieu thereof the word "final."

In line 18, page 2, strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "four."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER AT YANKTON, S. DAK.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 270) authorizing the Winnipeg, Yankton and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time; was read the third time, and passed.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Indian appropriation bill, to nonconcur in the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the House nonconcur in all the Senate amendments to the Indian appropriation bill and ask for a conference. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the order of business which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That on the day following the day the Committee on Invalid Pensions have had assigned to it by the special order of the House made March 23, 1904, House bill 9548 shall be made the special order after the reading and approval of the Journal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is that a request for the consideration of one bill?

Mr. MAHON. The bill is now in the second reading.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Why does not the gentleman ask for time to be given the War Claims Committee?

Mr. MAHON. This is the bill making appropriations for the findings of the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The omnibus bill?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; I do not think it will take over half an hour to pass it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE CONNECTICUT RIVER.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 4673) to authorize the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Connecticut River.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BRANDEGEE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DISTRICT BUSINESS.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to call up District business one week from Monday next, instead of on Monday next, which is the regular day. I do this on account of the appropriation bill which is to be considered to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to call up District business one week from Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MANUFACTURE, DISTRIBUTION, AND SUPPLY OF ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 7266, which I will send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following bill, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the manufacture, distribution, and supply of electric light and power on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of that bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama objects.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, may I not ask the gentleman to withhold his objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly, I will, if the gentleman wants to make an explanation.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman withdraws his objection, I shall renew it at this time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, I do not withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

DONATING CERTAIN GUN TO GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC POST AT NELSONVILLE, OHIO.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 14110) to authorize the donation of a certain unused and obsolete gun now at Chickamauga Park, Ga., to Phil Kearny Post of the Grand Army of the Republic, at Nelsonville, Ohio, which I will send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to donate one 6-pounder smoothbore bronze gun of 3½ inches caliber, now at Chickamauga Park, Ga., which was issued to the commissioners of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park under the provisions of the act of Congress approved August 5, 1892 (vol. 27, Stat. L., p. 376), and is not now needed by the Commission, to the Phil Kearny Post of the Grand Army of the Republic, Nelsonville, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk has reported. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I think I heard in the reading of that bill something with reference to Chickamauga Park. I will ask the gentleman from Ohio to explain.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, a number of these small guns were donated by Congress for the adornment of Chickamauga National Park. They were so set out as to have two guns together. This is an odd gun, and a report is made by the commissioners of the park that they do not want the gun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GROSVENOR, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DONATION OF LOTS IN FORT DALLES MILITARY ADDITION TO THE DALLES, OREG.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9985) providing for the donation of lots A, B, K, and L, in block 39, in Fort Dalles military addition to The Dalles, Oreg., as shown on the plat of the city of The Dalles and surroundings, and filed in the local land office at The Dalles, Oreg., to the Oregon Historical Society, which I shall send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue to the Oregon Historical Society, an organization duly incorporated under the laws of the State of Oregon December 17, 1898, a patent in the name of the United States for lots marked "A," "B," "K," and "L," in block 39, in Fort Dalles military addition to The Dalles, in the State of Oregon, as shown on the plat of the city of The Dalles and surroundings, now on file in The Dalles land office, such patent to issue only after the said Oregon Historical Society shall have filed with the Secretary of the Interior proper and satisfactory proofs of its incorporation. And such patent to be conditioned that the said lots and buildings thereon shall be held and maintained solely for historical purposes, with a reservation that the Secretary of the Interior shall be empowered to declare a forfeiture to the United States whenever he shall find the same has been converted to other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

ALLEGHENY COLLEGE, MEADVILLE, PA.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 10208) for the relief of Allegheny College, of Meadville, Pa., which I shall send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on account of the burning of one of the buildings of Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., on Friday, December 18, 1882, known as Culver Hall, whereby a shortage of \$358.23 was incurred to ordnance and ordnance stores issued to said college under its bond, dated March 2, 1877, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to relieve said Allegheny College, at Meadville, Pa., from any further money responsibility under said bond not exceeding the above-named amount.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just reported. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BATES, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ALLOTMENT OF DOCUMENTS.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 10866) to amend section 68 of volume 28 of the United States Statutes at Large with an amendment, which I shall send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 68 of volume 28 of the United States Statutes at Large be, and the same is hereby, amended so that it shall read as follows:

"Whenever in the division among Senators, Representatives, and Delegates of documents printed for the use of Congress there shall be an apportionment to each or either House in round numbers, the Public Printer shall not deliver the full number so accredited at the respective folding rooms, but only the largest multiple of the number constituting the full membership of each or either House, including the Secretary and Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, and Clerk, Sergeant-at-Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House, which shall be contained in the round numbers thus accredited to each or either House, so that the number delivered shall divide evenly and without remainder among the members of the House to which they are delivered; and the remainder of the documents thus resulting shall be turned over to the superintendent of documents, to be distributed by him, first, to public and school libraries for the purpose of completing broken sets; second, to public and school libraries that have not been supplied with any portions of such sets, and, lastly, by sale to other persons; said libraries to be named to him by Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress; and in this distribution the superintendent of documents shall see that as far as practicable an equal allowance is made to each Senator, Representative, and Delegate."

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

In line 3, page 1, after the word "sixty-eight," insert the words "chapter twenty-three," and amend the title.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, this is the same bill that was read several days ago, and objection was made to it by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX] because he desired an explanation of the amendment to the statute. I would say in explanation that it simply amends the law now in operation relative to the distribution of public documents and gives the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House a share in the distribution, the same as the Clerk of the House, and the Sergeant-at-Arms and Secretary of the Senate. This allotment was made up to the Fifty-first Congress, when, because of a lapse in conduct of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House, it was taken from him.

Mr. MADDOX. If the gentleman will permit me, I will state to him that I have examined the matter, and I have no objection to it, as I understand it.

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 SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended.

IRRIGATION IN UTAH.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the desk.

The joint resolution (S. R. 28) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Agricultural Bulletin No. 124, being the report on irrigation in Utah, was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there shall be printed from the stereotype plates of the Report of Irrigation Investigation in Utah, under the direction of Edward Mead, chief of irrigation investigation, Office of Experiment Stations, Department of Agriculture, 4,000 copies, of which 400 shall be for the use of the Senate, 600 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 3,000 for the use of the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRODUCTION OF PRECIOUS METALS, ETC.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for present consideration of the concurrent resolution of the House which I send to the Clerk.

The Clerk read concurrent resolution No. 32, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed 6,000 additional copies of the Report of the Director of the Mint on the Production of the Precious Metals for the calendar year 1902, 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 for the use of the Director of the Mint.

Resolved. That there also be printed 8,000 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, 1903, to be bound in cloth and wrapped, 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,000 for the use of the Senate, and 3,000 for the use of the Director of the Mint.

The amendments proposed by the Committee on Printing were as follows:

In line 2 strike out the word "six" and insert the word "three."
Strike out all after the word "wrapped," in line 3, down to and including the word "thousand," in line 7.
Strike out the word "eight," in line 9, and insert the word "three."
Strike out all after the word "wrapped," in line 13, down to and including the word "thousand," in line 16.

So that the resolution as amended will read as follows:
"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 3,000 additional copies of the Report of the Director of the Mint on the Production of the Precious Metals for the calendar year 1902, bound in cloth and wrapped, for the use of the Director of the Mint.
"Resolved, That there also be printed 3,000 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, 1903, to be bound in cloth and wrapped, for the use of the Director of the Mint."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. MADDOX. I wish to inquire how many copies of these documents are to be printed under the resolution as now proposed to be amended, and how they are to be distributed?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. This resolution provides for the printing of 6,000 copies of these documents—3,000 of each report.

Mr. MADDOX. What I want to understand more particularly is why are we proposing to give so many of these copies to the Director of the Mint.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. This resolution proposes the printing of an additional edition. The copies of the previous edition and of previous reports intended for the Director of the Mint have long since been exhausted, while an examination of the condition of affairs in the folding room discloses the fact that the allotment to the credit of Members and Senators has by no means been exhausted. We therefore think it useless to have this distribution include the House and the Senate.

Mr. MADDOX. Does this provide for the usual distribution?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. The usual distribution was made to the Senate and House on previous editions of these reports, but the Congressional allotment was not largely distributed.

Mr. MADDOX. What is the usual proportion of these documents? The same proportion ought to be maintained now.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Allow me to repeat that this is an additional edition, for distribution by the Director of the Mint, whose supply of these documents is exhausted.

Mr. MADDOX. But it strikes me that the same proportion ought to be observed in the distribution of this additional edition.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. That would have been provided for in the resolution by the committee had not an examination of affairs in the folding room demonstrated that to give an allotment to Members of the Senate and House would have been simply wasting the documents.

Mr. MADDOX. I reckon not; we could distribute them all right. If I knew the proportions here proposed, I would move to amend.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. If the gentleman desires any additional numbers of the publication, he can secure them by making a requisition on the Director of the Mint.

Mr. MADDOX. I would rather have the documents entered up to my own account here at the folding room.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. The distribution provided in this resolution was adopted simply in the interest of economy and to provide against wastefulness.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Will the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX] allow me a word? As I understand, under the general printing law the Director of the Mint is allowed 1,000 copies of each of these reports for his use. He finds that the demand for each of these reports is greater than the number allowed to him, and annually he has come to Congress asking authority for the printing of this additional number. The copies already printed have been distributed in the ordinary proportions among members of the House and Senate and the Director of the Mint. It is found that the full number allotted to Senators and Members has not been called for, and the amendment to this resolution has been occasioned by that fact. As I understand, the resolution as now presented makes no allotment to Senators and Members, but authorizes the printing of 3,000 copies of each of these reports for the use of the Director of the Mint. I ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] whether I am right about that?

Mr. MADDOX. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Printing if it is the purpose of that committee to supply all of these Departments that wish these books with a sufficient number to fill all demands that may be made upon them from the outside?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I would say to the gentleman that this is in line with the recommendation of the committee in two previous Congresses.

Mr. MADDOX. I understand them to say this is an addition to the original bill that has been passed for this purpose.

Mr. SOUTHARD. No.

Mr. MADDOX. Why not stand on the original proposition?

Mr. SOUTHARD. A resolution was introduced in the Fifty-seventh Congress and passed the House, as I understand it, but failed to pass the Senate, and the time of the large or frequent call for this report having passed, it is altogether likely that the number ordinarily needed by the House and Senate will not be required.

Mr. MADDOX. I do not think it is right, but I am not going to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the several propositions were agreed to was laid on the table.

WESTERN ALASKA CONSTRUCTION COMPANY'S RAILROAD.

Mr. LOVERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 13740) for the relief of the Western Alaska Construction Company's railroad.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time of the Western Alaska Construction Company to comply with the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of chapter 239 of the laws of the United States, entitled "An act extending the homestead laws and providing for the right of way for railroads in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved May 14, 1898, in acquiring and completing its railroad now under construction in Alaska, is hereby extended as follows:

First. That time to file the map and profile of definite location of its first section of at least 20 miles with the register of the land office in the district of Alaska, as provided in said sections 4 and 5, is hereby extended to and including the 31st of December, 1904.

Second. The time to complete the first section of at least 20 miles of its railroad, as provided in said section 5, is hereby extended to and including within one year after the filing and approval of the definite location of said section of said railroad as in said chapter and by this act it is provided; and such railroad company shall be entitled to all the benefits conferred upon it by the provisions of such act upon its due compliance with all the provisions thereof, excepting only the provisions thereof relating to the filing of the map and profile of definite location of its first section of not less than 20 miles of its road within twelve months after filing with the Secretary of the Interior a preliminary actual survey and plat of its proposed route, as prescribed in said sections 4 and 5 of said act, and the provisions thereof relating to the completion of the said first section of its road within one year, as originally provided in section 5 of said act: *Provided,* That such railroad company shall file with the proper register of the land office for the district of Alaska a map and profile of the first section of its road of at least 20 miles on or before December 31, 1904, and shall complete such section of its said road within one year after such definite location has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, as provided in said section 5 of said act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the gentleman in charge of the bill make some explanation of it. It is a long bill, and we could not hear it read.

Mr. LOVERING. The Western Alaska Construction Company ask simply for the extension of time in which to build their railroad. There are only four months in the year in which they can work up there, and they have not had time to comply absolutely with the requirements of the Government in this respect. I would say that this bill has the entire approval of the Department of the Interior and the General Land Office and is unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Is the purpose of it simply to hold their road?

Mr. LOVERING. Oh, they have already constructed 10 miles of road and have the material on the spot to construct 40 miles. They are acting in perfect good faith.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. This is to prevent the forfeiture of their rights?

Mr. LOVERING. Yes.

Mr. LACEY. They should have built 20 miles last year to come within the provisions of the Alaska right-of-way act. They only built 10 miles. The season is very short there, only three or four months. The material is on the ground, and this gives them until next January to complete what they ought to have completed by last January. They are going on in good faith and have the material there and are constructing the road.

Mr. WYNN. I should like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whether any extensions of time have been allowed before?

Mr. LOVERING. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

FORT WALLA WALLA MILITARY RESERVATION, WASH.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12685) for

the reappraisal and sale of the undisposed lands within the Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation, in the State of Washington.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the lands originally embraced within the Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation, in the State of Washington, remaining undisposed of shall be reappraised, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, by legal subdivisions, and the appraisers, in their report, shall note the character of each legal subdivision and state whether it is chiefly valuable for stone, mineral, timber, agricultural, or grazing purposes, and if any of the legal subdivisions of said land is improved the appraisers shall appraise separately the improvements on said land and the land independently of such improvements, and they shall describe generally the character of such improvements, and also report the names of the persons who made such improvements and the parties claiming to own the same.

Sec. 2. That upon the approval of such reappraisal by the Secretary of the Interior said lands shall be offered for sale to the highest bidder, for cash, at such times and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may determine: *Provided*, That the land and improvements shall not be sold at less than the appraised value: *Provided further*, That if the highest bidder shall be the person who made the improvements upon such land, or his assigns, the appraised value of the improvements shall be deducted from his bid, and he shall be required to pay only the remainder to the United States, and if the highest bidder is some one other than the party who made such improvements, or his assigns, then the appraised value of the improvements shall be paid to such party, or his assigns, and the remainder to the United States, and the Secretary of the Interior must be satisfied that the improvements shall have been paid for, as herein provided, before patent is issued to the purchaser of any of said lands.

The following committee amendment was read:

Provided also, That this act shall not affect the lands in the existing Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation, area 619.57 acres.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDOX. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We should like to hear some explanation of this bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this military reservation was set aside in 1859. It consisted then of about three sections of land, the post, the meadow, and the timber reserve. The post reserve is the land referred to in the last amendment to the bill, and there is still reserved something over 600 acres.

Subsequently the other two parts were turned back to the Interior Department for disposal, and Congress passed acts providing for the appraisement of them; but pending the enforcement of it Congress passed some legislation for the relief of persons who settled upon the land before it was set aside by Executive order as a military reservation, leaving a little over 400 acres still in the hands of the Interior Department.

In 1897 this land was appraised, with the improvements which were put there by four or five settlers who went onto the land about thirty years ago, after it had been set aside as a reservation, but who, owing to the unsettled condition of the country, believed that they would get title from the Government. When the land was appraised the improvements that these men had put upon it were included in the appraisement. If they were to acquire the title to the land under the appraisement heretofore provided for, they would have to pay for the land and also for the improvements that they themselves had put on it. That hardly looks fair, and this bill simply provides for the reappraisal of about 400 acres of land, according to the report of the Secretary of the Interior, appraising the land and the improvements separately. The provision is that if the purchaser, the highest bidder, is the owner of the improvements, he shall not have to pay the appraised value of his own improvements.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Suppose he does not get it. Does the other party pay for these improvements?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The other party pays for the improvements and he gets it, and the Government gets the value of the land. It is recommended by the Interior Department and has the unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. MADDOX. You say you have a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is unanimously reported from the committee.

Mr. MADDOX. Was it referred to the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was referred to the Secretary of the Interior, and his report is printed in the report of the committee, and he suggests the last amendment put in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendments recommended by the committee were 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.

On motion of Mr. JONES of Washington, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

HOUSE ELEVATOR CONDUCTORS.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution No. 228.

Resolved, That the Committee on Accounts be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to provide for the payment to the following conductors of the House elevators in the Capitol the following sums, to wit: L. B. Cook, \$200; George Winters, \$200; M. F. O'Donnell, \$200; S. A. Barnes, \$180.47; R. E. Walker, \$200, and J. K. Duncan, \$200, being the difference between \$1,100 and \$1,200 per annum from July 1, 1902, to July 1, 1904, as has been customary in the past under the general deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman tell us something about this. There seems to be some discrimination made against these gentlemen who operate these elevators.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. The law gives the elevator men \$1,200, but there is no appropriation made annually for that amount. This simply gives them an appropriation for the two years that this appropriation is not made for. It is a supplementary allowance, and has been done before by Congress. I have here the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—

Mr. MADDOX. Do I understand you to say that the law gives it to them, and there is no appropriation?

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Yes, sir.

Mr. MADDOX. And your committee is making the appropriation?

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Yes, sir. There is an appropriation of \$1,100 a year, but not of \$1,200 for the purpose.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I object until I can look into the matter.

Mr. MADDOX. But the gentleman says it is a privileged report. It is a matter that your committee ought to look after.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do not think it is privileged.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana it is done every year, and I will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—

Mr. HEMENWAY. But I understand you are going back with this.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. We are only appropriating for the next year.

Mr. HEMENWAY. You are going ahead and not confining it to this fiscal year.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Yes, sir. It is for this fiscal year. If the gentleman will permit me, here is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15, 1902.

Mr. MADDOX. It is subject to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair misapprehended the terms of the resolution. The Chair supposed that it was a resolution directing the payment of this amount from the contingent fund. If so, it would be privileged. But it does not seem to be a resolution for that purpose. It is really a resolution directing the Committee on Appropriations to include in the deficiency appropriation bill this amount. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will withhold his decision with reference to the privileged character of the resolution just a moment, I would like to call his attention to the fact, having been on that committee for eight years at least, it has been customary for the Committee on Accounts to report such resolutions—not "directing." I have never known that expression to be used before. I was not present when this resolution was considered by the Committee on Accounts last Thursday, and therefore am not familiar with it; but it has been customary for the Committee on Accounts to report a resolution providing that the Committee on Appropriations shall make an appropriation for these matters, and until that has been done by law that the amount be paid out of the contingent fund. That is the usual way of reporting these resolutions.

The SPEAKER. That is not this resolution.

The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, viz: * * * the Committee on Accounts, on all matters of expenditure of the contingent fund of the House.

The Chair thinks this is not a privileged resolution. Is there objection to the present consideration?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I object until I can have time to look into it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have not called the matter up. Your colleague on that side called it up.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I hope the gentleman will not object to this. This is the usual appropriation made every year. This is the same appropriation that is made by the Senate, and for some time these men were cut off by the House from \$1,200 to \$1,100, and it has been provided in this way by the House for the last six or eight years. It is a small amount, and I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do not know what you have got in there, and you seem to seek to provide for two fiscal years. That is unusual. I think we had better let it go over until I have an opportunity to see it.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I ask the privilege of withdrawing the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia withdraws the resolution for the present.

D. S. PORTER.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations is authorized to provide in the general deficiency appropriation bill for the payment to D. S. Porter of the sum of \$500 for extra and expert services to the Committee on Pensions as assistant clerk of said committee by detail.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

HERMAN GAUSS.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations is authorized to provide in the general deficiency appropriation bill for the payment to Herman Gauss of the sum of \$750 for extra and expert services to the Committee on Invalid Pensions as assistant clerk of said committee by detail.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know something about that. I have heard the other case, as we have thrashed this over before in the House. Now, who is this man?

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. He is a clerk from the Pension Bureau detailed to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Porter is detailed—

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. To the Pension Committee. There is a different man in the Committee on Invalid Pensions and the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MADDOX. Why do you give this one so much more than the other?

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Because he has so much more work to do; so many more bills come before the Committee on Invalid Pensions than before the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MADDOX. Then is there any necessity for the clerk detailed to the Committee on Pensions at all?

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me a word? I will say that the gentleman referred to, Mr. Gauss, works more hours than any other clerk of any committee, the Appropriations Committee not excepted. It is expert work, it is careful work, and this is the usual resolution, and I certainly would be very sorry indeed not to see it pass.

Mr. MADDOX. If the gentleman will allow me, in the language of my old friend Cox, who was here, let us get this straight. Which committee is this man assigned to?

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. To the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. MADDOX. Then the other was the clerk to the Committee on Pensions, which we have already passed?

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Yes, sir.

Mr. MADDOX. I presume that is the one I ought to have objected to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

F. R. LANSON.

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which I will ask to have reported at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9135) for the relief of F. R. Lauson.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to issue to F. R. Lauson, of Tionesta, Pa., a duplicate of United States 4 per cent bond No. 100044, the original having been burned; but before issuing said duplicate bond the Secretary of the Treasury shall take from said Lauson a bond in the sum of \$300, with two satisfactory sureties, conditioned to indemnify the United States against said original bond No. 100044, and all claims therein.

The amendments were read, as follows:

In line 4 change the word "Lauson" to "Lanson."

In line 5, after the word "centum," insert the word "coupon."

In line 6, after the word "four," insert the words "funded loan of 1807."

In line 8 change the word "Lauson" to "Lanson."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania which committee reports the bill?

Mr. SIBLEY. The Committee on Claims.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have always understood, Mr. Speaker, the custom of the House was that the Speaker did not recognize for unanimous consent bills coming from the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SIBLEY. I want to say to my friend, if he will pardon me for a moment, that this is not a claim. It merely authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to reissue a bond for one that was burned. It involves no claim upon the Government. The House passed it unanimously in the last Congress, but it did not get over to the Senate. It is an act of tardy justice. If it was a claim upon the Treasury I should think it would be clearly out of place, but as it is I trust the gentleman will not object.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say this, that I do not see anything on the face of the claim of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that would warrant my being opposed to the bill. I believe, though, that each side of this House ought to be kept on an equal footing. If it is going to be a custom of the Speaker to allow Members to take bills from the Claims Committee, to select meritorious bills for unanimous consent, I think it is all right, but if we are not going to enter into proceedings whereby the Members can take up by unanimous consent bills coming from the Committee on Claims and Committee on War Claims, I do not think then any privileges ought to be shown; but as the Speaker has made this the first opening, and as he may hereafter recognize Democrats on this side to take up bills from the Committee on Claims, I will not object to this bill, and if we are going into it by unanimous consent—

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman to ask unanimous consent. The Chair has a well-defined policy touching the laying of bills before the House for unanimous consent, and the Chair will say that policy does not cover the considering of claims so called by unanimous consent, so the Chair would decline to make a bargain about it. So far as recognizing both sides of the House is concerned, the Chair has not kept books; the Chair has been clearing off a good many matters by unanimous consent, at least for the consideration of the House. One side of the House has not been recognized as much as the other this morning because requests have not been made of the Chair. Is there objection?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended.

On motion of Mr. SIBLEY, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RAILROAD BRIDGE ACROSS WABASH RIVER IN VIGO COUNTY, IND.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill H. R. 13480, an act to authorize the Southern Indiana Railway Company to construct a railroad bridge across the Wabash River in Vigo County, Ind., with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

CRANE & CO., DALTON, MASS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 3256) entitled "An act directing the issue of a check in lieu of a lost check drawn by Thomas J. Hobbs, disbursing clerk, in favor of Crane & Co., of Dalton, Mass.," with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8473) to supplement an act of Congress approved February 27, 1899, entitled "An act for the relief of the Fourth Arkansas Mounted Infantry," and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HUNT for ten days on account of important business.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HEMENWAY. 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 sundry civil bill; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that the House agree to ten hours' general debate, five hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] and five hours by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill, and pending that motion asks unanimous consent that general debate be had for ten hours, five hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] and five hours by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. BURTON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 14416, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14416) making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, this is the last of the general appropriation bills to provide for the expense of the Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1 next.

It attracts more interest from the membership of the House and the country at large than does any one of the twelve regular appropriation bills, for the reason that it provides in great or small degree for every one of the many branches of the public service, and in particular for the many civic public works authorized by Congress and in progress in every State of the Union, such as public buildings, that afford to the masses of the people substantial evidence of the wealth and dignity of our great national Commonwealth; for light-houses and the establishment for their maintenance, to aid and encourage the development of our commerce at home and our commerce with the maritime nations of the earth—a system that is to-day the best and most generously equipped in the world, and the only one that is maintained by any country absolutely without direct charge or tribute upon or from commerce; for the continuance of work on the deep-water harbors and waterways of the country, work that is in progress under the continuing-contract system inaugurated by the Fifty-first Congress, that has been handed down and will forever be known to fame as the first Reed Congress; the Life-Saving Service that has proved so beneficent and humane a blessing to our seafaring people and to all who are exposed to the perils of the ocean; the Fish Commission, that has developed the food-fish interests of our seas and inland waters to an extent that is almost incredible; the public-land service, that provides for the disposal of the public domain to the eager homeseeker—a service, also, that has, through the Geological Survey, pointed out the way to incalculable wealth buried beneath the surface of the earth; the maintenance of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, those havens of rest and comfort provided by a grateful Republic for the needy veterans who have fought in its wars.

All of these, together with many other meritorious objects, are provided for in this bill—expenses of the United States courts, the expense of public printing and binding, and of other functions of government that are probably uninteresting to mention now, as well as many purposes not strictly germane to any one of the other appropriation bills, or which have arisen and become necessary since those bills were passed.

This is the result worked out by the committee in the preparation of this bill, namely: A reduction under the estimates submitted of \$17,147,116.09, and of \$28,915,208.99 under the like appropriation for the current fiscal year, which must be gratifying to the House, and will, I am sure, meet the approval of the country.

This large reduction is made and is proper, notwithstanding the bill carries every dollar that is required for each public building now authorized and in the course of construction and the exact amount stated to be necessary by the Engineer Department for all river and harbor improvements in progress under the contract system.

The sum total of all the annual supply bills, including the one

under consideration, as reported to the House by the committee charged with their preparation, is \$597,802,324.26. Adding to this sum the requirements estimated at \$84,971,820, under permanent appropriations for interest on the public debt, the expenses of collecting customs, and other purposes, exclusive of the sinking fund, we have the total adjudged to be necessary to conduct the Government next year, namely, \$682,774,144.26.

No appreciable increase that would materially affect the latter sum has been made by the House in the consideration and passage of the bills.

In January last it was my privilege to call the attention of the House to the serious situation then confronting Congress, demanding the consideration of estimated expenditures submitted by the Departments in the regular annual Book of Estimates, amounting, exclusive of the sinking fund, to \$727,474,206.79, a sum which I predicted then, and which subsequent events have verified, would be augmented by supplemental estimates that would swell the whole to not less than \$747,317,922.79, or an excess of \$42,845,862.07 over the revenues, which are estimated at \$704,472,060.72 for the fiscal year 1905.

By the omission to pass a general river and harbor bill at this session of Congress and by the wise economy exercised in the preparation of the appropriation bills, notably in the case of the bill under consideration, where a reduction of more than \$17,000,000 is made under the estimates, the sum total of all our proposed expenditures is reduced, as stated, to \$682,774,144.26, or nearly \$22,000,000 under the estimated total revenues. This reduced sum is sufficient to meet all reasonable additions that may be or have been made to the bills by amendments of the Senate and sufficient also to cover all legitimate deficiencies that may have to be provided for next session.

The large and unprecedented reduction of nearly \$29,000,000 made in this bill compared with the appropriations for the current year was made possible, in the first place, by reductions in amounts for each of three objects, namely:

For public buildings, from \$12,511,783.79 to \$4,556,233.79, a reduction of \$7,955,550. A careful inquiry into the exact status of each building and the ascertainment of available balances under previous appropriations justify this reduction.

For river and harbor contract work the total is reduced from \$20,228,150.99 to \$7,872,200, or a reduction of \$12,355,950.99. The committee ascertained that there were balances available for river and harbor works amounting to \$37,000,000, and with the unqualified concurrence of the Chief of Engineers that the amount in each case carried by the bill was amply sufficient, the whole has been thus reduced.

For the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers the total is reduced from \$4,894,813 to \$3,782,689, making a net reduction of \$1,112,124, which was possible for the reason that the sundry civil act for the current year carried two unusual amounts under the heads, namely, "For completing the Mountain Branch, at Johnson City, Tenn., \$900,000," and "For completing the Battle Mountain Sanitarium in South Dakota, \$350,000."

In the next place, the last sundry civil act carried an unusual number of items that are not necessary to be continued for another year, such as the following items, each of which carried \$100,000 or more:

Agricultural Department building.....	\$250,000
Denver mint, furniture and machinery.....	200,000
Garfield and Providence hospitals, new buildings.....	200,000
Great Britain, to carry out treaty of January 24, 1903, with.....	100,000
House of Representatives, office building.....	750,000
Louisiana Purchase Exposition, exhibits.....	175,000
Manila military posts.....	1,000,000
Chicago military post.....	280,000
Fort Snelling military post.....	110,000
Schuykill Arsenal building.....	125,000
Relief of destitution in the Philippines.....	3,000,000
National Museum building.....	250,000
Newport, R. I., wharf.....	100,000
Revenue-cutter steamers.....	220,000

[Mr. BENTON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS].

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Interior on March 15, 1904, issued an order governing the granting of pensions under the June, 1890, act, to take effect April 13, 1904. I have had a great many inquiries from soldiers over the country and from Members of the House as to what the effect of this order will be—how much it will cost to execute it, how many and what class of soldiers would be benefited, and similar questions. I have had a good deal of curiosity, as well as a very great desire, to know for myself, and to that end I have made a calculation that I desire shall go into the RECORD for the information of the House and to the country concerning these inquiries.

It may seem a little presumptuous that a Member of the minority should attempt that responsibility, but having waited since the 15th of March and no gentleman from the majority and no one

from the Bureau having undertaken to furnish information, I thought I might venture to make some suggestions along that line. I desire that the order itself shall be inserted in the RECORD, which is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 15, 1904.

The COMMISSIONER OF PENSIONS.

SIR: Your letter has been received, submitting for my consideration an order touching the rate of pension allowed under the act of June 27, 1890. The order in question is as follows:

Order No. 78.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
March 15, 1904.

Whereas the act of June 27, 1890, as amended, provides that a claimant shall "be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$12 per month and not less than \$6 per month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support, and in determining such inability each and every infirmity shall be duly considered and the aggregate of the disabilities shown to be rated;" and Whereas old age is an infirmity, the average nature and extent of which the experience of the Pension Bureau has established with reasonable certainty; and

Whereas by act of Congress in 1887, when thirty-nine years had elapsed after the Mexican war, all soldiers of said war who were over 62 years of age were placed on the pension roll; and

Whereas thirty-nine years will have elapsed on April 13, 1904, since the civil war and there are many survivors over 62 years of age: Now, therefore, Ordered, 1. In the adjudication of pension claims under said act of June 27, 1890, as amended, it shall be taken and considered as an evidential fact, if the contrary does not appear, and if all other legal requirements are properly met, that when a claimant has passed the age of 62 years he is disabled one-half in ability to perform manual labor and is entitled to be rated at \$6 per

month; after 65 years, at \$8 per month; after 68 years, at \$10 per month, and after 70 years, at \$12 per month.

2. Allowances at higher rate, not exceeding \$12 per month, will continue to be made as heretofore where disabilities other than age show a condition of inability to perform manual labor.

3. This order shall take effect April 13, 1904, and shall not be deemed retroactive. The former rules of the Office fixing the minimum and maximum at 65 years and 75 years, respectively, are hereby modified as above.

E. F. WARE,
Commissioner of Pensions.

In response thereto I have to state that one copy of the order has been approved by indorsement thereon, and is herewith transmitted for the files of your Office.

Very respectfully,

E. A. HITCHCOCK, Secretary.

Under this order it is provided that when a soldier shall have attained the age of 62 years he shall be deemed to be one-half disabled and shall be admitted to the pension roll at \$6 a month. At 65 years of age he shall receive \$8 a month; at 68, \$10 a month, and at 70, \$12 a month. I desire next to place in the RECORD an estimate furnished by the Pension Bureau, giving the number of soldiers, the age, and the service, in order that we may make an estimate as to how many will have arrived at the ages of 62, 65, 68, and 70 years.

According to an estimate furnished by the Commissioner of Pensions, there will be surviving July 1, 1904, 870,000 pensioners.

ESTIMATE.

The following table shows the estimated number of soldiers of the civil war surviving July 1, 1904, and the length of service at each age (compiled from records in Pension Office):

Age.	Years of service.						One-half and less.	Total survivors each age.	Annual death rate.	Deaths first year.
	Three and up.	Two and one-half to three.	Two to two and one-half.	One and one-half to two.	One to one and one-half.	One-half to one.				
56 and less	6,500	3,200	1,900	2,700	3,500	4,500	3,800	25,000	1.80	450
57	5,800	2,900	1,100	2,400	3,000	4,000	2,800	22,000	2.02	444
58	8,800	4,400	1,700	3,700	4,800	6,100	4,500	34,000	2.16	734
59	12,700	6,400	2,500	5,400	6,800	8,800	6,400	49,000	2.31	1,132
60	15,300	7,700	3,000	6,500	8,200	10,600	7,700	59,000	2.47	1,457
61	17,200	8,600	3,500	7,200	9,200	11,900	8,600	66,000	2.65	1,749
62	16,100	8,100	3,100	6,800	8,700	11,100	8,100	62,000	2.85	1,767
63	15,600	7,800	3,000	6,600	8,400	10,800	7,800	60,000	3.07	1,842
64	15,100	7,500	2,900	6,400	8,100	10,400	7,600	58,000	3.31	1,920
65	14,300	7,100	2,800	6,000	7,700	9,900	7,200	55,000	3.57	1,964
66	13,500	6,800	2,600	5,700	7,200	9,400	6,800	52,000	3.86	2,007
67	12,800	6,400	2,400	5,400	6,800	8,800	6,400	49,000	4.18	2,048
68	12,000	6,000	2,300	5,000	6,400	8,300	6,000	46,000	4.53	2,084
69	11,000	5,400	2,100	4,600	5,900	7,500	5,500	42,000	4.90	2,058
70	9,900	4,900	1,900	4,200	5,300	6,800	5,000	38,000	5.32	2,022
71	8,600	4,300	1,700	3,600	4,600	5,800	4,300	33,000	5.78	1,907
72	7,300	3,700	1,400	3,100	3,900	5,000	3,600	28,000	6.28	1,758
73	5,700	2,900	1,100	2,400	3,000	4,000	2,900	22,000	6.82	1,590
74	4,200	2,100	800	1,700	2,200	2,900	2,100	16,000	7.41	1,186
75 and up	14,000	7,000	2,700	6,000	7,600	9,700	7,000	54,000	11.50	6,210
Total	226,400	113,200	43,700	95,400	121,300	156,400	113,600	870,000	4.17	36,239

In this inquiry there are two questions involved. The first is, What proportion of the soldiers will have arrived at the ages indicated in this order on the 13th of April, 1904? For that purpose I use this estimate, furnished by the Bureau, and the best one I can find, with the date of July 1, 1904. From that estimate I ascertain that those who have arrived at the age of 62 are 78 per cent; those who have arrived at the age of 65 are 68 per cent; those who have arrived at the age of 68 are 49 per cent, and those who have arrived at the age of 70 are 29 per cent. I find that to be true from this table, and I think it is a matter of demonstration from the public history and from the knowledge of man. The war began in 1861, forty-three years ago. A man who is 62 years old now was 19 years of age then and 23 at the close of the war. As a matter of history, you will remember this is about correct. Those who went into the service in 1862, a large portion, were 19 or more years of age.

At the close of the war, in 1865, I think the public history will prove the fact that a large portion of them—about the number found here, 78 per cent—were 23 years of age. So that for the purposes of this argument I shall assume the figures and the percentages that I stated a moment ago to be correct. The next question is, What class of soldiers will be affected when this order is executed? There are, as it were, three classes of soldiers. One class, which is drawing a pension under the general law, is the soldiers who have proven their disability of service origin. Another class, which is drawing under the act of June, 1890, by reason of their disabilities, although not proven to be of service origin. Under this order there will be another class to take into account. That class will be the soldiers who heretofore have not proven any pensionable disability and are not on the pension roll.

By data furnished by the Pension Bureau—and, I believe, conceded to be approximately correct by all gentlemen—there are 180,000 or 200,000 soldiers living who have never proven their disabilities and are not pensioned. Let us see how the execution of

this order will affect this class. First, we ought to determine out of 180,000 or 200,000 soldiers how many will probably, under this order, be admitted to the pension roll. It is the intent of this order that all a soldier has to do is to prove that he is 62 years of age, without proving any disability, and he will then be entitled to a pension at \$6 a month, or \$72 a year.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to know the gentleman's idea of this proposition: Under the order that he is speaking of will it be necessary for the applicant for a pension, in his judgment, to be examined by the medical board?

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. As I understand this order, it will not be unless the soldier wants to go on the roll at a higher rate than that authorized by the limit of age. In other words, if he is 62 years of age and he is satisfied with \$6, then no other proof is necessary. If he is 65 years of age and is satisfied with \$8, no further proof than his age and ninety days' service is necessary, and the same with respect to 68 and 70 years of age; or at least I think that is the intent of the order.

Mr. NORRIS. My question, if the gentleman will allow me, was prompted by a newspaper article which I read on the subject. That article quoted the law with reference to applications for an increase. The law, as I understand it, provides that the increase shall date from the day of the medical examination. Then the question recurred as to whether it would always be necessary in getting an increase, even under this order, to go through the formality of a medical examination.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I would much prefer to answer that more fully a little later.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I think myself that unless section 4698½ of the Revised Statutes is amended the gentlemen over at

the Pension Bureau will find great difficulty in executing this order, but if necessary this section can be amended.

Mr. NORRIS. That was my idea.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I think the law must be changed in order to properly execute the order. I prefer to take this subject up a little later in the discussion.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. On that subject, Mr. Chairman, the Department, under the rule of practice followed over there, has no difficulty in considering 75 years an age at which they will allow \$8, unless unusual disability is shown in the case. Now, I think, under the same practice, they will have no difficulty in this.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I think that is not the question presented by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

The data furnished by the Pension Bureau lead us to conclude that there are about 180,000 soldiers of the war of the rebellion that are not on the roll. Assuming that of this number 100,000 would take advantage of the order, the increased expenditure at \$6 per month, \$72 per year, would require \$7,200,000.

The order further provides that when the soldier becomes 65 years of age he shall be placed on the roll at \$8 per month. This is an increase of \$2 per month, or \$24 per annum. By the foregoing table we have determined 68 per cent of the soldiers have arrived at the age of 65. Then we have 68,000 to be increased by \$24 per annum, requiring \$1,632,000.

The order further provides that at the age of 68 the soldiers shall be put on the roll at \$10. This is an increase of \$2 per month, \$24 per annum. Forty-nine per cent have attained the age of 68. There would be 49,000 to be increased by \$24, and this would require \$1,176,000.

The order further provides that when the soldier becomes 70 years of age he shall be placed on the roll at \$12 per month. This would be an increase of \$2 per month, or \$24 per annum. Twenty-nine per cent have attained the age of 70. There would be 29,000 more who are to be increased \$2 per month, or \$24 per annum. This would require \$696,000. Total, \$10,704,000.

Thus it will be seen that it will require an increase of \$10,704,000 to execute this order in favor of the men who are not on the roll at all; over \$10,000,000 per annum for the men who have no present pensionable standing, for the men who presumably have not an ache or a pain, men at least who have never established any at the Bureau. With such a liberal order without the warrant of law giving this enormous sum to this class, we would be led to expect great things for those who wear the scars and have established their claims by proof on file at the Pension Bureau. I do not at this time care to discuss the right of the Bureau to make such an order, further than to say that if it establishes a service pension it is certainly legislation, and the Bureau would not claim the right to legislate.

If it is a matter of proof, it has been the privilege and duty of the Bureau to apply the proof all these years; and if it has not done it, it has been very derelict in duty. I prefer to proceed with the inquiry as to the effect of the order and see what it proposes for the men that carry the wounds and injuries from long and hard service and for the men who have established their disabilities under the June, 1890, act.

First let us see how many are drawing pensions under the old law less than \$6. See the report of the Commissioner of Pensions of June 30, 1903, and it will be ascertained that four men are drawing \$2 per month. This would be an increase of \$4 per month or \$48 per year, and, there being four of them, it would require \$192. There is one man drawing \$3 per month. This would be an increase of \$3 per month, or \$36 per annum. There are eight men drawing \$4 per month. This would be an increase of \$2 per month, \$24 per year. This would require \$192. There are seven men drawing \$5 per month. This would be an increase of \$1 per month, or \$12 per year, and would require \$84. Total, \$504.

This is the amount for those on the roll by reason of the general law. We will next ascertain how many on the roll whose claims have been established under the same act are drawing less than \$6. By an inspection of the report of the Commissioner of Pensions of date June 30, 1903, at page 73, it will be ascertained that there is not one. If there are only twenty soldiers all told who are drawing less than \$6, why fix an age limit of 62 for \$6? The order fixes the age limit of 65 in order to draw \$8? The real age limit is therefore 65, and 62 is inserted in the order to fool and mislead the public.

Let us proceed with the investigation.

Next, those at 65 are to be increased to \$8 per month. To determine how many are drawing between \$6 and \$8 under the general law, see report of Commissioner of Pensions of June 30, 1903.

There are 37,410 that are drawing \$6. If they are to be increased to \$8, the increase would be \$2 per month, or \$24 per year. Sixty-eight per cent have attained the age of 65, and 68 per cent of 37,410 is 25,438. At \$24 would require \$610,532.

There are 290 others drawing \$6.25 to \$7.75. Would be an average increase of less than \$1, but we will count it \$12 a year. Sixty-

eight per cent of 290 would be about 200. That number at \$12 would require \$2,400.

Next those at 68 are to be increased to \$10 per month. This would be \$2 per month, or \$24. Same report shows that 34,156 are drawing \$8. Forty-nine per cent have reached the age of 68. Forty-nine per cent of 34,156 is 16,636. At \$24 would require \$401,664.

There are 558 drawing between \$8.75 and \$9.75. Counting the average of \$1 per month, \$12. Forty-nine per cent of 558 would be 275. At \$12 per annum would require \$3,300.

Next those at 70 are to be increased to \$12 per month. This would be \$2 per month, or \$24 per annum. Same report shows that 23,739 are drawing \$10. Twenty-nine per cent have reached the age of 70. Twenty-nine per cent of 23,739 would be 6,884. At \$24 would require \$165,216.

There are 273 drawing between \$10.20 and \$11.75. With this average increase at \$1 per month, \$12 per annum. Twenty-nine per cent of 273 would be 80. At \$12 require \$960. Total under general law, \$1,184,072.

Next we will determine the amount of increase under June act. (See same report.)

Those at the age of 65 are to be increased to \$8. There are 87,984 drawing \$6. To increase to \$8 would be \$2 per month, or \$24 per annum. Sixty-eight per cent of 87,984 is 59,829. At \$24 would require \$1,435,896. There are 6 drawing from \$7 to \$7.50. Take \$1 as the average—\$12 per year—would be, if all are 65, \$72.

Next, those at the age of 68 are to be increased to \$10—\$2 per month, \$24 per annum. There are 141,203 drawing \$8. Forty-nine per cent of 141,203 would be 69,189. At \$24 would be \$1,660,536, and 1 at \$12 would be \$12.

Next, those at the age of 70 are to be increased to \$12 per month, an increase of \$2 per month, or \$24 per annum. There are 53,744 drawing \$10. Twenty-nine per cent of 53,744 is 15,585. At \$24, \$374,040. One at \$1 per month, \$12 per annum, would make \$12. Total, under June act, \$3,470,568.

RECAPITULATION.

To those not now on the roll.....	\$10,608,000
To those under June, 1890, act.....	3,470,568
To those under the general law (\$504+\$1,184,072).....	1,184,576
Total increase	15,263,144

You have under this hurry-up order an increase on account of the soldiers who have no pensionable standing, without a wound and without any disease, with no disability of any kind that can be established—at least, never has been—\$10,704,000.

First, \$10,704,000 to those with no pensionable standing, then \$3,470,568 to those under the June, 1890, act, and only \$1,193,606 to those who trace their disabilities to service origin. This is the reverse of what we should expect. It gives an increase of \$14,174,568 to men who do not show their present disability to be of service origin.

To the great army of men making up the present great roll of honor, some limbless, armless, blind, totally disabled by rheumatism, locomotor ataxia, or any and all other causes, many of whom are unable to dress or undress themselves, many unable to feed themselves. Many gave three and some four years of the best part of their lives. Many spent months, some years, in rebel prisons; all drawing under the general law, where all their disabilities are established and of record. The sum total of all their increases is \$1,184,072 + 504; total, \$1,184,576.

They say that thirty-nine years after the close of the Mexican war the Mexican soldiers were given a service pension of \$12 a month. I would first of all call your attention to the fact that it was not done by an Executive order that can be ignored, changed, or repealed by the next Administration, or ignored by the present one. It was done by law, as this House would have done except for this Executive order. Congress passed a law by which the executive department should be governed. The precedent was both just and patriotic; but as to the old heroes of 1861-1865, who fought for four years as no other men have ever done in any controversy in any country, their limit at 62 years is fixed at \$6. You cite the precedent of the Mexican soldiers, who met all the responsibility that came to them within about a year, and their pensions were fixed at \$12. So much for the precedent. The harder the service the less the recognition.

Some gentlemen have asked, has the Bureau the right to issue the order? I am not prepared to say the Bureau had no such authority. There was already by a former administration an age limit of 65 fixed as one limit and 75 as the other. I think they therefore had the right by reason of precedent.

I think they had the right for another reason. That is this: In this great Department that has been in existence for over forty years they have been taking proof, have been examining disability, and if it is ascertained as a matter of public history, by reason of examinations made and records kept, that a man at 62 years of age is half disabled, and if at 65 he is two-thirds disabled, I

think it would be right to apply this as evidence. "History has proven that fact and should make a prima facie case."

It is not so much the right of which I am complaining, but the circumstances under which it was done. There had been a great demand from the Grand Army of the Republic for a service-pension bill. The Invalid Pensions Committee had wrought in season and out and was about ready to conclude and report on a service pension, with other legislation that would have been wholesome, when the Executive order came and stifled the will of the Grand Army of the Republic and of the House, including the fifty-odd Members who had introduced bills looking toward the liberalization of the pension laws.

The President of the United States or the Secretary of the Interior, Congress in session, charged with the duty of enacting legislation, with legislation already formulated and ready to present to the House, issued this order. I submit it was, at least, in very bad taste, and if the Executive order has carried this House away from legislation on this subject, where is it to end? If an Executive order may do what is done in this case, another Executive order may change the rule, and that Department may execute pension orders just as it pleases, without reference to law or the right of the soldier.

As an American citizen, as a Representative charged with a duty, I would have much preferred that this House should have done this by orderly legislation, even if the present order was to be executed. And I am quite sure this House would never have approved this order. If this order establishes a service-pension law, it is legislation, and the Department did not have the right. If it is simply an application of evidence, they might and should have applied it years ago.

None receiving pensions above \$12 can be reached by this order, no difference what their condition may be—limbless, armless, or what the nature of the injury may be, this order gives them no relief. I ask you, gentlemen, who are charged with legislation, are you willing to see an Executive order go into force that will spend \$14,174,568 for the men who have no disability of service origin and only \$1,184,576 for the great army of men who have proven their disabilities to be of service origin?

To me it looks like the case is wrong end first. I would rather have enacted some legislation that would have given \$10,000,000 to the men who can prove and have proven and placed on record their disabilities of service origin. And this House on pension days has universally increased the pension of an old soldier who is found to be totally disabled to the extent of requiring the aid and assistance of another to \$30 per month. Not a dollar is given to this class.

Would you not rather have given to that class a pension of \$30, what we are doing on every pension day? It would take less than \$2,000,000 to do it. Yet this order takes \$10,000,000 and places it on those who have no disability which they can prove of service origin and leaves this class entirely out. Would you not, if you had been permitted to meet the responsibility, rather have done something for the men to whom we are giving on every pension day, and thereby have relieved the House of a great many of these special pension bills and placed the money where it is needed the worst?

I approve every bill we pass. Whenever you point me to an old soldier who is totally disabled to the extent of requiring the aid and attention of another, by special bill or otherwise, I shall always vote to increase his pension. But I do not like to do it for one and leave the others in the same condition all over the country without any relief. I prefer that this House, after a report from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, shall consider the whole matter, and in a high patriotic spirit enact some legislation that will not only relieve the House, but will be of some service to the old soldiers of all classes and conditions.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not the gentleman think the same responsibility rests on the House to legislate as he suggests is done under this order as if the order had not been made?

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I welcome the inquiry, and answer yes. I want to say further, in answering the question, one purpose I have in this argument and in putting these figures in the RECORD is that this House may understand what the order is, and thereby see the necessity of doing just what the gentleman from Nebraska suggests.

Why this hurry-up order, and who is the author of it? In the Washington Post of March 18, in speaking of the Senate steering committee, it was said:

The committee discussed an order of business for the rest of the session, and decided to sidetrack the general building measures, the several labor bills, the Hepburn-Dolliver liquor bill, and all similar legislation. The meeting yesterday was the first session the steering committee has held for the purpose of deciding on an adjournment programme. It lasted nearly an hour and was attended by all but one member.

It is said one of the reasons for meeting at this early date was the issuance of the Executive order in lieu of service-pension legislation, which removed one of the principal factors which might lengthen the session of Congress. It had been known that Members of the House were urging that a service-pension bill be enacted, and that their insistence would result in delaying a final adjournment. With this out of the way and nearly all other obstacles to early adjournment, there is believed by the steering committee to be less likelihood for a demand for Congressional investigations of the Post-Office and other Departments.

So all building bills are to be sidetracked. All labor bills are to be laid aside. By whom? By the majority. Why? Is it to show its friendship for labor, or is it because it is afraid to meet the issue and leave it to the country?

Does anyone believe this will satisfy the soldiers? Will this satisfy that great organization, the Grand Army of the Republic? Will this satisfy the country? Will this satisfy the fifty Members who have introduced bills to liberalize and increase pensions? If I were to answer, I would say "No."

But the author says there is a precedent, and cites the act of 1897 that gave to the Mexican soldiers at 62 years of age a pension of \$12 per month. I grant the law and approve it as wise and patriotic. How does this order follow the precedent? At the age of 62 it only gives relief to twenty soldiers now making the great pension roll, and only grants \$504 of relief to those at the age of 62. It offers to the soldiers who fought more hard battles, made greater sacrifices than any other class of soldiers ever did, the sum of \$6 per month, and, while pretending to fix the age limit at 62, in fact establishes the minimum age limit at 65 years; cites the Mexican law that gave \$12 absolute at 62 to uphold the order that gives to twenty of the heroes of the rebellion \$6, and fixes the age limit at 65.

Shame on such mockery!

And the "Executive order in lieu of the service-pension bill." "Members of the House were urging a service-pension bill." "In order to avert the service-pension bill the Executive order was promulgated." Do you sanction an adjournment to defeat labor legislation? If you do, don't go to the country declaring that you are the friend of labor. If this Executive order is your idea of the obligation of the Government and your duty to the soldier, you must explain to them and to the country.

"Members were urging the service-pension bill." Yes, and we were so urging it that it could not be put off any longer. It would have been reported to this House before now. It remains to be seen whether your President can kill pension legislation this way. It has been talked for days that he advised such an order. I do not believe this House will approve any such sharp practice. It has been said it was a shrewd political move; that your President is a man of action; that he does something. I grant you that he is a man of action; but don't he sometimes act too quickly, before considering what the result will be? Don't you think in the matter of the Executive order he acted without knowing that it would cost the country nearly \$11,000,000 to place names on the roll that had no pensionable standing?

Don't you think he acted without knowing that he was offering an affront to the great army of veterans now on the pension roll by killing their bill? Don't you think he acted unwisely when he advised the adjournment of Congress to avoid the responsibility of further investigating post-office frauds and to avoid the responsibility of taking a position in favor of or against the Hepburn-Dolliver bill?

Don't you think he acted hastily when he advised adjournment of Congress to avoid action on labor bills? Don't you think if you act on the advice of this man who does something, for effect and for political advantage, that it may cost you the next House of Representatives and his sure defeat for reelection? Don't you think that because he is a man that does so many ill-considered and poorly advised things is the reason why the country, and especially the business interest of the country, is afraid of him?

Don't you think such double dealing and doing so many rash acts may cause the Democratic party to elect to the Presidency some safe, conservative man who is the friend of capital and labor alike? Don't you think you better consider the Hepburn bill before you adjourn? Don't you think you better take up these bills introduced by the friends of labor and let the country know how you really stand toward these great questions? Don't you think you better reconsider and act on the pension legislation now formulated and ready for action?

Or won't you think at all, and will you follow without thinking this man, who acts on impulse and is ready to defeat legislation by a trick and scuttle away to avoid responsibility? Is that what this House is organized for, or is it to meet and transact the public business to the best interest of the whole country? Such conduct is more like madmen than Representatives of the people. Remember that whom the gods would destroy they first make mad.

This body of Representatives to be adjourned! Why? Because it is about to be called upon to vote on labor legislation. This House has had pending before it the eight-hour bill and the anti-

injunction bill ever since I have been in Congress, and the Republicans have been in the majority, and under some pretext or another have prevented consideration.

Adjourn Congress! Why? Because the Republican managers are not willing to say how they stand on labor legislation; because they are not willing to say how they stand on public building bills; not willing to say how they stand on the Hepburn-Dolliver liquor bill; adjourn while a great many Members of Congress were urging the passage of a service-pension bill. We were—Members were—urging and the committee was ready to act, and an Executive order came for the purpose of cutting off legislation on that subject.

I would therefore answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Nebraska: Yes; I think the House is duty bound to enact a pension law that will express the judgment of the House on this subject. The responsibility rests with every Member of the House, and so far as I am concerned I am willing to meet it, and if need be remain in session for not only one month, but two, three, or four months, and I am glad to accept the responsibility with others Members of this House and show how we stand on labor legislation and all these other bills. So far as my influence is concerned I shall insist that we stay here and meet these responsibilities, so that labor, the old soldier, and the country may know what we represent. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I ask leave, then, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and leave is granted.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Under the leave to extend, and in conclusion, I would urge that the House of Representatives proceed to perfect and pass a bill that meets with the judgment of the House. If that can not be done, then I favor the execution of the Executive order in the way that will be equitable and give the greatest relief to the old soldiers. To that end, if it is necessary to amend section 4698 $\frac{1}{2}$, so as to certainly exempt the applicant from examination I am heartily in favor of doing so.

I would further enact a provision that will make the application so simple that there need be no delays on that account, and suggest the following as a form for an application:

HON. COMMISSIONER OF PENSIONS.

SIR: Having reached the age of — years, I hereby apply for such increase of pension as may be warranted under the act of June 27, 1890, under order No. — construing said act.

I am a pensioner under the act by certificate No. — at the rate of \$ — per month.

I served as — Company —, — Regiment, — Volunteer —, from —, 186—, to —, 186—, and in Company —, — Regiment, — Volunteer —, from —, 186—, to —, 186—.

I was born in —, State of —, on the — day of —, 18—.

My post-office address is —, county of —, State of —.

Very respectfully,
Witnesses to signature: —

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DALZELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 691. An act granting an increase of pension to Rebecca C. Shurlock; and

H. R. 11169. An act granting an increase of pension to Reuben Griffith Porter.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2650. An act to transfer Capt. Seth Mitchell Ackley from the retired list to the active list of the Navy;

S. 4480. An act granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Fuller;

S. 2194. An act granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Buch;

S. 4727. An act granting an increase of pension to W. W. Tanner;

S. 2508. An act granting an increase of pension to Morris H. Jones;

S. 4635. An act granting an increase of pension to David Misener;

S. 2645. An act granting an increase of pension to Lay Roy B. Church;

S. 2380. An act granting a pension to Jane Smith;

S. 3493. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Van Campen;

S. 2975. An act granting a pension to Claude C. Swafford;

S. 3490. An act granting an increase of pension to Bucklin H. Wood;

S. 4528. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda M. Hand;

S. 4529. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse N. Jones;

S. 4531. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia C. Vanzant;

S. 2252. An act granting an increase of pension to David Inches;

S. 2248. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Sommers;

S. 3988. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Hughes;

S. 3352. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Nash;

S. 3956. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick Fleming;

S. 2458. An act granting a pension to J. H. Oney;

S. 4708. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Bailey;

S. 4308. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Pillow;

S. 1570. An act granting an increase of pension to Jasper Robinson;

S. 2030. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias L. Fidler;

S. 4363. An act granting an increase of pension to Eli Veazie;

S. 4514. An act granting an increase of pension to John P. Whitehouse;

S. 2582. An act granting an increase of pension to Harry M. Sherman;

S. 3227. An act granting a pension to James F. Mears;

S. 3084. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen F. Nichols;

S. 4773. An act granting an increase of pension to Juliette Minez;

S. 2361. An act granting an increase of pension to Clara E. Daniels;

S. 4602. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram Imus;

S. 3327. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Moore;

S. 4428. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin W. Ford;

S. 4275. An act granting a pension to Nancy Noxon;

S. 3561. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Draper;

S. 4759. An act granting a pension to John M. Manlove;

S. 2657. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Wood;

S. 4139. An act granting an increase of pension to John D. Henderson;

S. 4827. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Burkholder;

S. 3308. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse C. Lott;

S. 4815. An act granting an increase of pension to Angeline P. Root;

S. 4776. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse Maurer;

S. 4496. An act granting an increase of pension to Harvey Fletcher;

S. 460. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Nicholson;

S. 3198. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Reynolds;

S. 4487. An act granting an increase of pension to Aaron M. Mason;

S. 4777. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas McCormick;

S. 4001. An act granting a pension to Benjamin A. Provoost;

S. 4242. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Fisher;

S. 4381. An act granting a pension to Mary P. Wilson;

S. 4936. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Smith;

S. 2569. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Allen;

S. 4621. An act granting an increase of pension to George Draper;

S. 4731. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Brown;

S. 2636. An act granting an increase of pension to Alvin D. Lane;

S. 4695. An act granting an increase of pension to Horatio P. Abbott;

S. 2372. An act granting an increase of pension to David M. Davis;

S. 3986. An act granting a pension to Cynthia Speaks;

S. 2124. An act granting an increase of pension to David W. Johns;

S. 2046. An act granting an increase of pension to William G. Scott;

S. 4511. An act granting an increase of pension to James L. Porter;

S. 4507. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis G. Hoffmire;

S. 3236. An act granting a pension to John McDermid;

S. 4249. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Gilroy;

S. 3018. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Sullivan;

S. 4192. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Whaley;

S. 76. An act granting a pension to Mary H. Cornell;

S. 4678. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Paris;

S. 3385. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Blair;

S. 3485. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Bedford;

S. 5077. An act granting an increase of pension to Agnes Harmon;

S. 3777. An act granting a pension to Sarah S. Smith;

S. 4364. An act granting an increase of pension to Joshua McCormick;

S. 25. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Frybarger;

S. 2727. An act granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Stafford;

S. 4670. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Devine;

S. 5110. An act granting a pension to Cornelia K. Smith;

S. 3305. An act granting an increase of pension to James K. Deyo;

S. 3778. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Cotey;

S. 725. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda L. Mardin;

S. 4915. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Taylor;

S. 5032. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Edick; and

S. 4935. An act granting a pension to John Waarsteson.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 2491. An act granting a pension to Larkin Maynard;

H. R. 6848. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Plattenburg;

H. R. 11557. An act granting a pension to Alfred D. Burton;

H. R. 10935. An act granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Mayo;

H. R. 10576. An act granting a pension to Lulu E. McKee;

H. R. 2490. An act granting a pension to John Maynard;

H. R. 1268. An act granting an increase of pension to John B. Hart;

H. R. 790. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver A. Filman;

H. R. 5648. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret Herold;

H. R. 8482. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Foos;

H. R. 5395. An act granting a pension to Mattie Aten;

H. R. 8180. An act granting an increase of pension to William Smith;

H. R. 133. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Smith;

H. R. 6087. An act granting an increase of pension to Anthony Bracklin;

H. R. 4114. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Carns;

H. R. 1519. An act granting a pension to Thomas P. Moore;

H. R. 2371. An act granting a pension to Sarah J. Herman;

H. R. 7079. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Fleming;

H. R. 8220. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward B. Nugent;

H. R. 10267. An act granting a pension to Florence R. Russell;

H. R. 10580. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Longberry;

H. R. 7754. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Myers;

H. R. 2767. An act granting an increase of pension to John E. Neary;

H. R. 11141. An act granting an increase of pension to John B. Keller;

H. R. 5091. An act granting an increase of pension to William Kennedy;

H. R. 2557. An act granting an increase of pension to James Carr;

H. R. 1352. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel McClure;

H. R. 10264. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Amberg;

H. R. 12036. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Wetzel;

H. R. 5682. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Hunt;

H. R. 8742. An act granting an increase of pension to Jason Robinson;

H. R. 6258. An act granting an increase of pension to Theodore C. Putnam;

H. R. 8010. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Deeter;

H. R. 9398. An act granting a pension to John Lindsey;

H. R. 6249. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick J. Fairbrass;

H. R. 3027. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Vickers;

H. R. 6501. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Robinson, jr.;

H. R. 2122. An act granting a pension to Orlo H. Lyon;

H. R. 194. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Bradley;

H. R. 2189. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Spindler;

H. R. 1285. An act granting an increase of pension to Adam Gosage;

H. R. 11606. An act granting an increase of pension to Caleb J. May;

H. R. 153. An act granting a pension to Harriet Snyder;

H. R. 10171. An act granting an increase of pension to Josiah H. Tyack;

H. R. 6611. An act granting an increase of pension to Austin Murphy;

H. R. 10847. An act granting an increase of pension to James O. Knowles;

H. R. 1176. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Kimble;

H. R. 967. An act granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Gruber;

H. R. 805. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. McConkey;

H. R. 11066. An act granting an increase of pension to Joshua D. Griffith;

H. R. 5693. An act granting an increase of pension to Joel M. Street;

H. R. 8725. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Parker;

H. R. 8387. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma R. Wallace;

H. R. 8287. An act granting an increase of pension to Abram T. Carney;

H. R. 5873. An act granting an increase of pension to Sirbrina Palmer;

H. R. 5700. An act granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Richards;

H. R. 5824. An act granting an increase of pension to Casper J. Schoer;

H. R. 11175. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac S. Drummond;

H. R. 1528. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Joralemon;

H. R. 5476. An act granting an increase of pension to William Davis;

H. R. 10179. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Bell;

H. R. 10822. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Smith;

H. R. 5527. An act granting an increase of pension to Frances Reck;

H. R. 6416. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna S. Dunn;

H. R. 936. An act granting an increase of pension to William Millian;

H. R. 10912. An act granting an increase of pension to Leonard J. Whitney;

H. R. 7411. An act granting an increase of pension to Matthew Caldwell;

H. R. 6880. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles T. Preston;

H. R. 8050. An act granting an increase of pension to John I. Lose;

H. R. 5855. An act granting an increase of pension to Herbert M. Blackwell, alias Levi W. Moar;

- H. R. 7438. An act granting an increase of pension to Corinne Tolman;
- H. R. 1515. An act granting a pension to Lucy Warren;
- H. R. 2110. An act granting a pension to Mary Farrell;
- H. R. 729. An act granting an increase of pension to Freeman O. Hodge;
- H. R. 742. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Darrah;
- H. R. 8044. An act granting an increase of pension to Seymour F. Burlingame;
- H. R. 10919. An act granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Oliver;
- H. R. 1170. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis L. Bean;
- H. R. 10399. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis Marshall;
- H. R. 10531. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Farr;
- H. R. 11428. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustus Fellows;
- H. R. 11229. An act granting a pension to Francis M. Good;
- H. R. 8789. An act granting an increase of pension to George K. Knowlton;
- H. R. 5952. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Kent;
- H. R. 8611. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. De Motte;
- H. R. 2589. An act granting a pension to Susanna Cosgrove;
- H. R. 10209. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret Delaney;
- H. R. 10901. An act granting an increase of pension to John Quinn;
- H. R. 8025. An act granting an increase of pension to James Payton;
- H. R. 8078. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Mosier;
- H. R. 3806. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. Sweet;
- H. R. 6371. An act granting an increase of pension to Catharine M. Wonderly;
- H. R. 6024. An act granting an increase of pension to Calisto Castro;
- H. R. 6563. An act granting an increase of pension to John Baragar;
- H. R. 10792. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Lockley;
- H. R. 2852. An act granting an increase of pension to Abraham J. Yeomans;
- H. R. 2855. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Hill;
- H. R. 6432. An act granting a pension to Ellender C. Miller;
- H. R. 4994. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Sheets;
- H. R. 4997. An act granting a pension to Franklin B. Lippincott;
- H. R. 9082. An act granting an increase of pension to Chester F. Kimball;
- H. R. 9815. An act granting an increase of pension to Ephraim O. Gilbert;
- H. R. 9592. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Steinmann;
- H. R. 9081. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Miller;
- H. R. 9726. An act granting an increase of pension to John McElice;
- H. R. 9117. An act granting a pension to George T. Young;
- H. R. 7353. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Schreiner;
- H. R. 7244. An act granting an increase of pension to Williamina R. Allenbaugh;
- H. R. 2121. An act granting a pension to Gertrude Merrill;
- H. R. 4943. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Morgan;
- H. R. 7066. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Constant;
- H. R. 9979. An act granting an increase of pension to Ezra Nichols;
- H. R. 9709. An act granting an increase of pension to Louis De Witt;
- H. R. 9820. An act granting an increase of pension to Vincent Anderson;
- H. R. 9392. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Robbins;
- H. R. 11845. An act granting an increase of pension to David C. McVicker;
- H. R. 4941. An act granting a pension to Mary J. Wilson;
- H. R. 5008. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry McCord;
- H. R. 4874. An act granting a pension to Charles V. Billig;
- H. R. 2928. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Bushman;
- H. R. 4955. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Day;
- H. R. 9741. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Dale;
- H. R. 1179. An act granting an increase of pension to Jasper Richey;
- H. R. 9390. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Louis Tyner;
- H. R. 6956. An act granting an increase of pension to Ellis House;
- H. R. 6653. An act granting an increase of pension to Josiah Standley;
- H. R. 12550. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma R. Lamb;
- H. R. 6823. An act granting an increase of pension to Seneca R. Pollard;
- H. R. 1882. An act granting an increase of pension to James Durkee;
- H. R. 9581. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Lloyd;
- H. R. 12056. An act granting an increase of pension to Kezia Cherry;
- H. R. 9576. An act granting an increase of pension to Eli M. McElwain;
- H. R. 4798. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret F. Harris;
- H. R. 7726. An act granting a pension to Jasper N. W. Rogers;
- H. R. 12457. An act granting an increase of pension to Nannie J. McGuckin;
- H. R. 7664. An act granting an increase of pension to George P. Malloch;
- H. R. 11074. An act granting an increase of pension to Merritt R. Simpson;
- H. R. 11227. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Walls;
- H. R. 8836. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Pitman;
- H. R. 1575. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Davis;
- H. R. 11654. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustus Wagner;
- H. R. 4968. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Clary;
- H. R. 3288. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathan L. Meands;
- H. R. 11575. An act granting a pension to Abel N. Button;
- H. R. 7221. An act granting an increase of pension to John Ryan;
- H. R. 5296. An act granting an increase of pension to Horatio M. Price;
- H. R. 12417. An act granting a pension to Hiram Parker;
- H. R. 6589. An act granting a pension to Jacob B. Mock;
- H. R. 7568. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert Costigan;
- H. R. 7501. An act granting an increase of pension to Emily Catlin;
- H. R. 11660. An act granting an increase of pension to James Dason;
- H. R. 11649. An act granting an increase of pension to Malinda A. Myers;
- H. R. 3167. An act granting an increase of pension to James Littleton;
- H. R. 9801. An act granting a pension to Jane McNeil;
- H. R. 11558. An act granting an increase of pension to James E. Luckey;
- H. R. 2572. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Steffey;
- H. R. 7308. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucius E. Mills;
- H. R. 7778. An act granting a pension to Frank H. Clark;
- H. R. 9756. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse T. Bennett;
- H. R. 3035. An act granting an increase of pension to William D. Hall;
- H. R. 2862. An act granting an increase of pension to Henrietta A. Pryce;
- H. R. 9307. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh S. Smith;
- H. R. 7500. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Springer;
- H. R. 7470. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Goforth, alias Napoleon B. Gordon;
- H. R. 6859. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Sheridan;

- H. R. 5373. An act granting an increase of pension to Moten M. Pitts;
 H. R. 4889. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Beltz;
 H. R. 3902. An act granting a pension to Martha J. Derrington;
 H. R. 12050. An act granting an increase of pension to David R. Luttrell;
 H. R. 9996. An act granting a pension to Henry Mason;
 H. R. 9990. An act granting a pension to John Bartmann;
 H. R. 6420. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Mehring;
 H. R. 12191. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Filkins;
 H. R. 12073. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Gardner;
 H. R. 12053. An act granting an increase of pension to James Large;
 H. R. 11894. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Sheldon;
 H. R. 11655. An act granting an increase of pension to James Lynch;
 H. R. 4634. An act granting an increase of pension to Randolph T. Stoops;
 H. R. 5262. An act granting an increase of pension to Irving Holcomb;
 H. R. 6824. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Manning;
 H. R. 9789. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Morrison;
 H. R. 7394. An act granting an increase of pension to Amelia Hutchins;
 H. R. 7698. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin R. W. Mockabee;
 H. R. 620. An act granting an increase of pension to George D. Boyd;
 H. R. 2914. An act granting an increase of pension to Charity M. Farmer;
 H. R. 3266. An act granting a pension to James M. Simms;
 H. R. 4230. An act granting an increase of pension to Jasper M. Griggs;
 H. R. 11629. An act granting an increase of pension to Nannie J. McDowell;
 H. R. 11563. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Allison;
 H. R. 12805. An act granting a pension to Margaret J. Snook;
 H. R. 4353. An act granting an increase of pension to George Brown;
 H. R. 1905. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias Holliday;
 H. R. 1877. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. Suits; and
 H. R. 1861. An act granting an increase of pension to James Wilkinson.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. **POU**. Mr. Chairman, we are told that the present session of Congress will soon end. Before the short session shall convene the American people will be called upon to decide whether the party in power has been true to its pledges and whether it shall be continued in power. In the last Presidential election the Republican party was successful. It went before the people of the country upon a platform which was approved at the polls. It has occurred to me that it would not be improper to consider some of the pledges made in that platform and to ascertain, if possible, whether or not those pledges have been performed. Probably the simplest way to consider this question would be to eliminate the promises concerning which there has been an attempt to perform. Certainly the number is few and their importance insignificant.

There has been some extension in the rural free-delivery service, in which the minority heartily concurred. The independence of Cuba has been established in pursuance of a resolution introduced by a Democratic Senator, and a Department of Commerce and Labor has been constituted without protest from the minority. There was really no issue with respect to these matters. The Democratic party had declared for a Department of Labor and for the independence of Cuba, and the earliest and best friends of the rural free-delivery service were to be found upon the Democratic side of this Chamber. There were, however, in the Republican platform of 1900 certain pledges of not only national but of international importance, not one of which has been performed.

Upon the very threshold of the platform we find a declaration renewing the allegiance of the party to the principle of the gold standard, and declaring further that—

We recognize that interest rates are a potent factor in production and business activity, and for the purpose of further equalizing and of further

lowering the rates of interest we favor such monetary legislation as will enable the varying needs of the season and of all sections to be promptly met, in order that trade may be evenly sustained, labor steadily employed, and commerce enlarged.

It will hardly be contended by any Republican statesman that there has been any performance of this promise. Republican journals all over the country for many months have been calling the attention of the country to the insufficiency of our monetary legislation. Your party declared its renewed allegiance to the principle of the gold standard, and yet Republican newspapers are constantly warning you that the gold standard is not safe; that the parity of the different kinds of money issued by the Government is not assured; that this parity could be destroyed by a Presidential order. You admitted in your platform that some legislation accomplishing this purpose was necessary, and yet you permitted the Fifty-seventh Congress to convene and adjourn without putting one line upon the statute books to carry out this pledge, and I predict that you will permit this session of the Fifty-eighth Congress to adjourn without performing that promise.

Time and again we have been told that the remedy had been discovered. Several bills have been introduced by eminent Republican statesmen. The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, during the Fifty-seventh Congress, after much research, introduced a measure intended to carry out this pledge, but up to this time it seems that it has been absolutely impossible to effect an agreement on the majority side of this Chamber. Therefore without indorsing your proposed measures I call your attention to the fact that the Republican party will go before the country in the coming campaign compelled to face a broken pledge with respect to its platform on monetary legislation.

TRUSTS.

Again, you have not only failed to pass any measure curbing their power, but it has been actually demonstrated that your party is the friend of trusts and monopolies. I find these words in your platform:

We recognize the necessity and propriety of the honest cooperation of capital to meet new business conditions, and especially to extend our rapidly increasing foreign trade; but we condemn all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies, to limit production, or to control prices, and favor such legislation as will effectively restrain and prevent all such abuses, protect and promote competition, and secure the rights of producers, laborers, and all who are engaged in industry and commerce.

Let us see what the Republican party has done with respect to the suppression or regulation of the trusts. Like the poor, it seems the trusts are to be with us always. Bear in mind the Republican party is in power. It has the Presidency and both Houses of Congress by large majorities. If it desires to deal with this great national evil, it has untrammelled power. There is absolutely nothing in the way. Aye, more than this, the minority stands ready to help you if you are really honest in your purpose.

When your party swept the country in 1900, few were those who supposed that any attempt would be made to rid the American people of the trust evil. It was charged—and, so far as I know, never denied—that the trusts had contributed immense sums to the Republican campaign fund. It was believed that your party drew life and strength from the trusts. Without their aid you never could have won that victory. Indeed, the victory of 1900 was regarded as a trust victory. It is true you had denounced them in your platform. It is true you had promised relief. It is true you had promised to execute the law, but few people believed you would do it. The creature can not control its creator; consequently your party, it was believed, could not control the trusts. On the contrary, thinking men reasoned that they would control you.

It is a humiliating fact that money is all-powerful in our elections. Very small majorities change results. Human nature is weak. Money is plentiful with the favored few, who stand ready to give it away to those who will serve them. Your party, Mr. Chairman, took their money. What you did with it I leave for the American people to decide. It was charged, and not denied, that your campaign fund amounted to millions. Those in charge of the fund know whether this is true or not. For one I do not believe any political party has legitimate need for even \$1,000,000 in any one campaign. For one I believe the man who sells his vote should be punished, but I believe the man who buys that vote should receive the greater punishment. The penitentiary is the proper home for men who go over the country raising great sums of money to debauch the American voters.

But your party had used the money contributed by these criminals, and it would have been contrary to human nature for that party to legislate its most valuable friends out of existence. So that when the victory of 1900 was won, the trusts felt that for four years more, at least, they were safe. The rich would grow richer. The trusts had found employment for the laboring man, who was told that he must be content, thank God and the Republican party that something had been found for him to do. His dinner pail was full. For four years more he was to have plenty

to eat—a full stomach. He must be satisfied with that. He must not dream of higher and better things. The trust had provided him with work and filled his stomach; therefore he must be satisfied and vote the Republican ticket. How beautifully everything was fixed! How satisfied was the trust. For four years not one wave of trouble was to sweep across its benevolent breast.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not willing to be construed as reflecting upon the honor or integrity of any individual Republican statesman. I am ready to admit that you have in the ranks of your party statesmen who are just as sincere, just as honest, and just as patriotic as can be found in the ranks of the party to which I belong, but it is impossible for your party to conceal the fact that the trusts of the country felt that the victory of 1900 was their victory and that they had nothing to fear from those they had helped to elect. But when the strenuous Colonel Roosevelt was made President by the cruel hand of the assassin the trusts became uneasy. Men all over the country who honestly believed the trusts were oppressing the people, because they were fixing the price not only of what they sold, but of what they bought as well, said that at last a man was President who was bold enough to defy the trusts even if by so doing he was retired to private life.

Colonel Roosevelt had written much against the cruel and unjust practices of the trust. While governor of New York he had declared that—

The man who by swindling or by wrongdoing acquires great wealth for himself at the expense of his fellow stands as low morally as any predatory medieval nobleman and is a more dangerous member of society. Any law and any method of constraining the law which will enable the community to punish him, either by taking away his wealth or by imprisonment, should be welcomed.

He had exhibited on various occasions a great desire to get at these lawbreakers. All over the country he had declared his undying hostility to all enemies of the people. From childhood he had led the strenuous life. He was a soldier—a man of iron. Every drop of his blood was tingling with patriotism. He was the Prince Rupert of the patriots.

He was, it was supposed, the very apotheosis of everything self-sacrificing, courageous, and American, and yet every day since he has been President the law has been violated. The criminals are known, too. His representative in Congress filed an exhibit actually giving the names of 800 trusts. He had learned much about their internal affairs, for this exhibit gave in detail the amount of preferred and common stock, together with the bonds they had issued. This exhibit, which can be found on page 1848 of the RECORD of the last Congress, declared that—

The list as a whole, therefore, contains the grand total of nearly 800 trusts, with a total capitalization of nearly fourteen billions. These totals are fully 83 per cent larger than those of any other lists hitherto published.

Here we have a statement indorsed by the gentleman from Maine, understood to represent the views of the President, that at that time 800 trusts were doing business in the country, in spite of the Sherman law, with a capital more than half as great as all of the money in circulation in the United States.

Until the advent of Mr. Roosevelt it was supposed that the Sherman antitrust law was not sufficient to deal with these great lawbreakers, but Mr. Roosevelt's Attorney-General soon discovered the mistake. It was soon given out that whether Congress legislated or not the Sherman law was sufficient to accomplish the desired result. While all this was taking place, Mr. Chairman, I hazarded a prediction. It was this: That the efforts of the Republican party to suppress the trusts were a sham and a pretense; that the trusts cared but little about the suits threatened and instituted; that at heart the Republican party was in sympathy with the trusts, and that all the noise and clamor of the Administration would practically end in nothing.

You may prevent two certain railroad systems from carrying out a particular deal, but you have done nothing, absolutely nothing, to prevent these two roads from charging their own prices for the transportation of freight and passengers, nor have you prevented the trusts from selling to the people at trust prices and buying what the people sell to them also at trust prices. This is going on now without interruption and will continue just as long as you continue in power a party which uses trust money to carry elections and which chooses trust attorneys to represent the people of America in their efforts to free themselves from the clutches of their oppressors. The truth is, the people of this country are paying to-day more for the necessities of life than ever before. While wages are being decreased, the cost of living is constantly increasing. The truth is that wages have only increased a trifle during all the flush times our Republican friends are boasting about, while the cost of living since 1896 has increased from 33½ to 50 per cent.

The New York Herald of Sunday, March 6, contains the following statement, which is well worthy of consideration:

At a time when there is complaint of contraction in trade and industry and wages are being reduced it is uncomfortable to find that the cost of living is increasing.

Every housewife will peruse with interest the article in this morning's

Herald giving in detail the recent advance in all the necessities of life. The course of prices in the last seven years is reflected in Dun's "index number" showing prices proportioned to consumption.

In making up this index number the prices of all necessities of life are taken, and in each case the price is multiplied by the country's per capita consumption. This precludes any one commodity having more than its proper weight in the aggregate, the price of a pound of coffee, for instance, being taken nine times and the price of a bushel of wheat five and one-half times. Extreme low prices were touched July 1, 1897. Comparison of the index number of that date with more recent ones is interesting:

Per capita cost of living.	
July 1, 1897	\$72.45
March 1, 1900	96.60
March 1, 1901	94.86
March 1, 1902	101.59
March 1, 1903	101.06
October 1, 1903	97.38
March 1, 1904	103.61

These figures, of course, do not show the actual cost of living, because wholesale prices are used and no account is taken of rent or luxuries or extras of any sort.

As showing the tendencies of the times nationally, however, allusion was made to the tabulated data contained in the bulletin of the Bureau of Labor of the Department of Commerce and Labor last November. One table shows that in 1896 the average cost of food per family was \$206.76. Since then, taking the same relative retail prices of food, the average increase has been \$5 a year.

When it is shown that there has been an enormous increase in the cost of living the Republican party, which is the servant of the trusts, at once proceeds to shower congratulations upon the farmers of the country on account of the increase of the price of farm products. But, Mr. Chairman, I will show before I conclude that neither the trusts nor the Republican party is entitled to any credit whatever for the high prices which, thank God, our farmers have been receiving. The truth is the trusts have been advancing the price of manufactured products even when the prices of farm products were declining.

The present high prices which our farmers enjoy came in spite of the trusts, and our sturdy sons of toil, upon whose shoulders rest all permanent prosperity, will hardly be deceived into giving their natural enemy, the trust, credit for the remunerative prices they are receiving. When the price of farm products is fixed by the trust the farmer is no longer a free man, but a slave. When the farmer puts the Republican party in power he puts the trust in power, and when he puts the trust in power he has surrendered up his liberty and is no longer a free man.

Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely nothing in American politics more criminal than the attitude of the Republican party with respect to the trusts and monopolies. You proceed upon the assumption that the American people are a nation of idiots. The man who draws a salary, the man who receives fixed wages, was never in a worse condition than he is to-day. You leave him absolutely at the mercy of the trusts. You say he is prosperous, but his salary and wages have not been increased and he is forced to pay more for the necessities of life than ever before in the history of this country. The man who receives \$1,000 per annum and is forced to spend \$1,000 is not in as good condition as the man who receives \$500 per annum and is only forced to spend \$400. And the thousands of persons in our cities and towns who work for a fixed salary are awaking to the melancholy reality that the prosperity of which the Republican party is constantly boasting is a mockery and a sham; and this is especially true when these very persons see millions of dollars' worth of the necessities of life, which they are forced to consume, shipped across the ocean and to South America and sold to aliens cheaper than the identical goods are sold to them.

I repeat that there is absolutely nothing in the whole history of American politics that is more criminal than this. You are punishing these people because they are Americans. They are forced to patronize the trusts or do without the articles the trusts sell. All competition is shut out from abroad and all competition at home is strangled to death. In the midst of the many and varied remedies which are offered to meet these conditions the Democratic party, which you abuse as incompetent and unfit to rule, offers one which is so simple that a child can understand. We suggest what you yourselves invoked as your best and only remedy. It is this: Reduce the import duty upon the trust-made articles to that point which will force the manufacturer to sell as cheaply to Americans as he does to foreigners.

When the coal strike was on and thousands were almost freezing in the cities, when men faced each other in grim despair, when the horrid specter of revolution appeared here and there in our great commercial centers, what did you do to meet conditions which then surrounded us? Were you then willing to "stand pat?" No, Mr. Chairman, you were forced to do something, and do it quickly. In that black hour the world saw the Republican leaders in this House report a Democratic measure, a measure demanded by the Democratic platform, suspending import duty on coal, I believe, for one year. When you reported that measure you acknowledged your own impotence, as well as the justice of the Democratic contention.

It is not denied that to-day all sorts of manufactured articles

which the people are forced to use are being sold cheaper abroad than at home. If the removal of the import duty upon coal had a tendency to relieve the situation during the coal strike, why will not a reduction of the import duty upon these articles have a tendency to relieve the situation now? Is there any reason why the trust can not sell its goods as cheap to the American as it does to the Austrian or the Russian? If the manufacturer can sell his goods 5,000 miles away from home at a certain price and make a profit, can he not sell the same goods at home for the same price and still make a profit? Your position upon this question is not only immoral, it is actually criminal. Why not rise to the necessity of the hour? Why not rise above party and report a measure which will provide some relief to millions of American toilers? Ah, Mr. Chairman, the question suggests its own answer. The Republican party is afraid of the trusts. It is afraid to offend the trusts. In a few months that party will be knocking at the door of the trusts begging for money. To do what? To buy up votes to elect Theodore Roosevelt President of the United States.

You know if you reduce the duty upon trust-made articles you will get little or no help. Without money to buy votes, without money to corrupt our elections, without money to distort and nullify the will of the people the Republican party is in a hopeless minority. Without a huge corruption fund you would certainly have been defeated in 1896; and without a huge corruption fund I believe it will be impossible to reelect Mr. Roosevelt. Mark the prediction, Mr. Chairman! You will pass no antitrust legislation at this session of Congress. Look out for the announcement. In a few short months the Republican party will be begging money from the very men whom Mr. Roosevelt, before he was President, denounced as "standing as low morally as any predatory mediaeval nobleman." Mark the prediction, Mr. Chairman! In a few short months you will see campaign managers of this strenuous moralist crawling about the country begging help from the very men he has time and again denounced.

But there is another plank in your platform which shall not escape notice. In that platform I find the following:

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION, AND OTHER LABOR LEGISLATION.

In the further interest of American workmen we favor a more effective restriction of the immigration of cheap labor from foreign lands, the extension of opportunities of education for working children, the raising of the age limit for child labor, the protection of free labor as against contract convict labor, and an effective system of labor insurance.

Have you done anything to restrict immigration? If so, what? You made the promise. Did you mean to carry it out when you made it, or did you include it in your platform simply to catch votes? The responsibility is upon you, not upon us. But if you will propose any proper legislation restricting immigration, I think you will find no opposition upon this side of the Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, the section from which I come is the recipient of much advice. We are frequently told that we are too conservative; that we are behind the times; that we are not "up-to-date." I admit that we are conservative, and I thank God it is so. It is well, I think, that at least one great section of the Republic has protected itself against the poison that comes from the influx of indiscriminate foreign immigration, and for one I rejoice that the State from which I come has a smaller percentage of foreign population than any other State in the Union. The last census gives us less than one-tenth of 1 per cent of foreign population.

More than once in the history of this Republic the distorted form of revolution has appeared within our borders. Once in our history the people of the South attempted to leave the Union. They believed they were exercising a constitutional right. Perhaps this attempt was an error of judgment. God knows our punishment has been great. It seems the penalty has not yet been paid. But, Mr. Chairman, if the hour ever comes when the horrid specter of revolution shall rise up amongst us, I predict that our great commercial centers, weakened as they may be in their Americanism by poison from foreign lands, will turn their eyes first of all to the conservative old South for both moral and physical support; and I predict that, if such an hour ever comes, the first volunteers in the defense of law and order and government will be men of the South—posterity of the heroes who followed Stonewall Jackson and Robert E. Lee. [Applause.]

The day is not far distant when we will pay the penalty for our generous laws with respect to immigration. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, 448,572 alien immigrants arrived in the United States. Of these, 54,288 brought with them \$30 and upward, while 271,821 brought with them less than \$30. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, I believe that somewhere near 800,000 foreign immigrants arrived in the United States. These figures are alarming in themselves. The census of 1890 shows that our foreign-born population, constituting one-seventh of our total population, furnished one-third of all insane persons of the country and one-half of all the paupers supported by public institutions.

In 1891 three-fourths of all prisoners in New York City prisons were foreign born and nine-tenths of the balance were of foreign

parentage. In Massachusetts the report of the prison commissioners for the year ending September 30, 1894, shows that 85 per cent of all commitments for that year were persons of foreign parentage and that the foreign population of that State furnished ten times as many criminals as the same number of persons who were native born. The average number of criminals furnished by our native-born population is 2.7 per cent for every thousand. The average number of criminals furnished by foreign population is 5.4 per cent per thousand. Below I give a table showing the number of criminals furnished by each thousand of our foreign population:

	Per thousand.
Germany.....	8.6
Austria.....	10.4
England.....	7.2
Russia.....	7.9
Hungary.....	15.9
Poland.....	16
Italy.....	18.2

Most of this information is obtained from House Document No. 46.

There are at the present time about eleven and a half millions of foreign-born persons in the United States. In some communities they are actually in the majority, while in many communities they hold the balance of power. It is our solemn duty to see to it that the American laborer, the highest and best type of the man who toils, is protected from the competition of these half-fed, half-starved, weak-minded paupers and criminals from foreign lands. The Republican party, Mr. Chairman, promised to give this protection, and you have broken that promise. You may rest assured that the laboring people of America will hold you responsible.

SHIPPING LEGISLATION.

I am forced to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to still another broken pledge. I find the following in the platform of your party:

Our present dependence upon foreign shipping for nine-tenths of our foreign carrying trade is a great loss to the industry of this country. It is also a serious danger to our trade, for its sudden withdrawal in the event of European war would seriously cripple our expanding foreign commerce. The national defense and naval efficiency of this country, moreover, supply a compelling reason for legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade-carrying fleets of the world.

The disappearance of American commerce from the sea has been melancholy indeed. Our registered ocean fleet in 1810 was 108,000 tons larger than it is now. The testimony of Mr. Winthrop L. Marvin, of Boston, before the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is well worthy of consideration.

Not since June, 1901—

Declared Mr. Marvin—

has a keel been laid in any American shipyard on either coast of the United States for one steel steamship designed and built for the purpose of foreign commerce. There has never been a time in our history—not even in the Revolution, not even in the war of 1812, not even in the war between the States—when ocean shipbuilding in the United States was in such a condition of absolutely arrested development. The ocean tonnage of United States registry for foreign commerce is smaller now by a few tons than it was in the year 1893. The proportion of American commerce carried in American ships has sunk from 12 per cent in 1893 to 9 per cent in 1903.

We are sending into foreign lands nearly \$5,000,000 worth of American products and commodities every day, of which less than 9 per cent are carried upon American bottoms, and during the year 1903 the tribute paid to foreign ships for carrying merchandise to and from the United States amounted to more than \$100,000,000.

I give below a table which shows how the tonnage of fleet registered for deep-sea commerce of the United States compares with that of other nations:

	Tons.
United States.....	873,000
Italy.....	1,180,000
France.....	1,480,000
Norway.....	1,680,000
Germany.....	2,960,000
British Empire.....	14,800,000

I believe that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has reported a bill providing for a commission to investigate the United States merchant marine. This is what might be called "do-nothing legislation." But for the arrogant demands of the trusts we might hope to see a law passed giving a rebate off the Dingley tariff rates on goods imported into this country on American bottoms. But the Republican party will not pass any such legislation. It would tend to injure the trusts, and the Republican party belongs, body and soul, to the trusts. So here is another, Mr. Chairman, which you must add to the list of broken pledges of your party.

RECIPROCITY LEGISLATION.

I find also in the platform of 1900 a plank headed "Reciprocity favored," in the following words:

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets.

Will any gentleman rise upon this floor and say that this promise has been performed? I believe that some twelve or thirteen reciprocity treaties were negotiated during Mr. McKinley's Administration and sent by him to the Senate for ratification, which still sleep in the Senate archives. It is true that with our assistance you passed a reciprocity measure for the benefit of Cuba, but this, I believe, is all. The truth is, the Republican party is in a dilemma with respect to reciprocity legislation. When that party is in a dilemma there are three or four gentlemen upon the majority side of this Chamber who are always put forward to speak, either the distinguished gentleman from New York, the leader of the majority, or his lieutenants.

The distinguished gentlemen from Ohio and Pennsylvania are always put forward when the party is in a real dilemma, and we must all bear testimony of their artful success in extricating their party from its difficulties. Realizing that trouble was ahead of the party in the next campaign, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] the other day undertook to define the Republican position with respect to reciprocity. In a nutshell it amounted to this: That reciprocity was only desirable with respect to non-competing articles. When this doctrine was announced amazement as well as amusement was apparent on both sides of the Chamber. What sort of reciprocity would you have, Mr. Chairman, between noncompeting articles? To what extent do you suppose we would reciprocate?

Reciprocity, as I understand it, is the equity of protection. It was intended by Mr. Blaine to relieve protection of its harshness. It was intended to level down the injustice of protection. There is no need for reciprocity unless we impose import duties, and there is no need for the protection afforded by import duties unless there is competition between articles brought into this country and those manufactured at home. What sense is there, Mr. Chairman, in imposing a duty for the purpose of protection upon articles from abroad with respect to which there is no competition at home? If there is no competition, then there is no need of protection, and if there is no protection there can be no need for reciprocity. The speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will hardly excuse the Republican party from the denunciation which awaits it for its failure to perform this promise.

There are other promises, Mr. Chairman, which the Republican party made of lesser importance, which have also been broken. The truth is, the record of that party during the Fifty-seventh and Fifty-eighth Congresses is one of broken pledges. During the short time allotted to me to-day it is impossible to discuss all of the broken promises of the party, for there are other matters which I desire to discuss briefly before concluding my remarks.

When the Republican party is arraigned for its failure to do these things, with seeming confidence it invariably answers, "Notwithstanding all this, the country is prosperous." It seems that no matter what takes place, if the country is prosperous we must all be content. No matter what injustice is being perpetrated, no matter how vicious, how criminal, the laws that are in force, you must not dare to change them because the country is prosperous. We must let well enough alone. We must "stand pat." Yes, Mr. Chairman; stand pat even though you are robbed while you are standing pat. The rich are getting richer. The poor have work and a full stomach. What more could anybody ask? They tell us tariff schedules must be amended by the friends of protection. Would it not be better if they could be amended by the friends of the American people? [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, the plain truth is, no political party can legislate a people into prosperity. All that any political party can do is to administer the Government as economically as possible, pass no law which discriminates against any class or section, stimulate as far as possible our trade with foreign nations so that our surplus products may find a market, and see to it that public servants are honest and faithful in the discharge of their duties. The man who tells the people that his political party is entitled to the credit of the high price of cotton or wheat is a demagogue.

I admit that a party can advance the price of any article people are forced to consume by enacting laws which strangle competition. I admit that the Republican party has brought prosperity to the trusts by tendering to them the American people as their legitimate prey. I admit you have brought prosperity to the manufacturer by giving him a monopoly. And this is the only prosperity for which the Republican party is justly entitled to credit. But on various occasions during the present session we have been entertained in this House by speeches from eminent Republican statesmen, claiming credit for whatever prosperity the country has enjoyed. We of the South are congratulated on our participation in this prosperity. It is gratifying to us to know that our progress arouses such enthusiasm amongst our brethren of other sections. We of the South congratulate our brethren of the North and West upon the prosperity they enjoy. We assure them that their interest in our welfare is fully reciprocated and that the people of the South contemplate with pride the progress

of the American Republic everywhere. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Now, let us analyze this prosperity argument a little. The Republican party is in power. The country is prospering. Therefore the Republican party brought about this prosperity. The Republican party is in power. Wheat sells at a dollar per bushel. Therefore the Republican party is entitled to the credit of dollar wheat. Again, the Republican party is in power. Cotton sells for 15 cents per pound. Therefore this party is entitled to the credit of 15-cent cotton. Post hoc; propter hoc. Is there any human being so blind that he can not see the fallacy of this argument?

The Panama Canal treaty was ratified a few days ago. Shortly thereafter the price of cotton advanced 2 cents per pound. Therefore the ratification of this treaty caused the advance in the price of cotton. The man who employs logic of this kind can prove anything.

In 1898 the Democratic party regained control of the State from which I come. Since then the price of cotton has been almost constantly advancing. Therefore the Democratic victory in my State—not the Republican victory in the nation—caused the advance in the price of cotton. One argument is just as sound as the other. No man but a demagogue would employ either; and yet, Mr. Chairman, it is a dangerous argument. Let me submit some statistics which clinch this fallacy.

If it be true that the Republican party can advance the price of wheat or cotton it can maintain that advance; and if it fails to do so, then it should be condemned as unworthy of the support of the American people. I am not as familiar with the prosperity of other sections as I am with that of my own, but I assert, without the slightest fear of successful contradiction, that the prosperity which the South has enjoyed and is enjoying to-day has been accomplished by the pluck and energy of the people of that section under the smile of Providence, in spite of unjust sectional legislation. [Applause on Democratic side.]

God knows, Mr. Chairman, there has been room for progress in the South. Eighteen hundred and sixty-five found her prostrate and her wealth destroyed. A mighty conquering army had destroyed much, but there were some things which could not be destroyed—the pluck of her people and the natural advantages vouchsafed by Almighty God.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the South is prospering. Emerson's analysis of the law of compensation is not more beautiful than it is true. The South suffered, but she learned. If you could stand upon some mountain peak and with one sweep of the eye take in our beloved land, you would see quite a different picture from what you would have seen had you stood on the same spot forty-four years ago. You would to-day behold fertile fields which produce everything needful to man; you would hear the morning ushered in by the din of many thousands of factory whistles; and as the day wore on you would hear the remotest ends of that favored land linked together in one unbroken chain by the ringing of our school bells.

But the Republican party puts in an appearance just here and says, "I did it all." And yet during all these years of our progress we have been paying a penalty. Being large consumers, we have been taxed to make the manufacturer rich. You force our farmers to buy in a protected market and to sell in an unprotected market. In my State there were in 1870 only 39,897 cotton spindles. In 1900 the number had increased to 1,133,432. You say we should thank the Republican party for this mighty increase. What! Thank the Republican party when that party has forced our manufacturers to pay a tax of 45 per cent upon every one of the million of spindles turning to-day, upon every spindle to be put hereafter in motion, and upon every piece of machinery used in our cotton mills? For what must we thank you—for taxing us?

I respectfully submit that no sufficient reason can be given why any man engaged in the business of manufacturing cotton should vote the Republican ticket. At the last session of Congress I had the honor to submit certain statistics showing that the price of cotton-mill machinery was cheaper in England than it was in this country, and that the difference was just about covered by the Dingley tariff rates upon machinery of that kind.

Everybody, Mr. Chairman, knows the reason why the present prices of wheat and cotton are high. The demand is far greater than the supply. For thirty years, every time the southern farmers have received high prices for their cotton these prices have been accompanied by a greater or less calamity to the crop. I believe the same may be said with respect to the wheat farmers of the West, but I know it is true with respect to the cotton farmers of the South.

Let us take the crop of 1893. The crop of that year was 7,549,817 bales. It brought to the southern people in money \$292,937,899. The next year, 1894, there was an increase of over 2,000,000 bales in the crop, but the farmers did not receive as much money for

that crop as they did for the crop of 1893. In 1894 they produced 9,911,251 bales, which brought \$288,918,504. Thus we see that the southern people did not receive as much money for nearly 10,000,000 bales in 1894 as they did for seven and one-half million bales in 1893. The crop of 1898 was greater by nearly 100,000 bales than the crop of 1897, and yet the crop of 1897 yielded the southern farmers \$56,000,000 more in money than did the crop of 1898. The crop of 1899 was nearly 2,000,000 bales less than the crop of 1898, but it brought the southern people about \$81,000,000 more than did the record-breaking crop of 1898.

So that we see there is no relation between Republican rule and high prices for farm products. If there were, the question might be asked why the price of cotton touched the lowest point during Mr. Harrison's Administration it had ever touched up to that time since the civil war. Only a demagogue, Mr. Chairman, employs such argument. But in our country, unfortunately, sometimes demagogues must be answered.

The record of the Republican party is not only one of broken pledges, but one of great extravagance. Year after year our expenses increase. A few years ago the newspapers were full of the "Reed billion-dollar Congress."

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have none but billion-dollar Congresses. It is quite the practice during these latter days to treat with ridicule almost any man who dares to speak for economy. Some day, probably when a panic is upon us, it will be ascertained that the Republican party, intoxicated with power and continued success, is now engaging in a perfect carnival of extravagance. The fatal mistake was made when those in power were tempted away from the safe and conservative pathway marked out by the founders of the Republic. This used to be a republic, not an empire. At one time in our national life the idea of owning colonies several thousand miles across the sea, governed from Washington, was abhorrent to the average American citizen.

Over in Arlington, Mr. Chairman, are buried those who gave up their lives for the Republic. There are others buried over there also. A few gave up their lives in an effort to divide the Republic. Were it required of us we could assign a sufficient reason for the sacrifice of all of these brave men except one. Passing along the silent avenues of that doubly sacred spot you come to the grave of the man who lost his life in defense of the Union. Why was this man sacrificed? Let the poet answer:

In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea;
As he died to make men holy, so this man died to make men free.

Passing on to the grave of the dead Confederate, you ask the same question: Why was this man sacrificed? And the answer comes back: His home was invaded; he believed his constitutional rights were violated, and he died that his constitutional rights might not be taken away from him. His death is not without its compensation. Let him sleep; let him sleep. No victor's crown pressed down upon his pallid brow, but a brighter crown, woven from God's perennial flowers, awaits the awakening of him who died for the right. [Prolonged Applause.]

Ah, Mr. Chairman, here is another grave. The granite that marks it is not quite so dark, nor the sod that covers it quite so thick. It is the grave of the poor unfortunate who lost his life in our efforts to subjugate a people who for centuries had been struggling to be free. This man was just as brave as the Federal; just as brave as the Confederate. Can we morally justify his sacrifice? Let history answer. We never needed the Philippine Islands. We do not need them to-day. They will always be a source of expense and irritation. There is nothing American about them, nor can they ever be made American. But if it is our destiny to retain them, we of the South, Mr. Chairman, will willingly help bear the burden. If any nation dares to attack them, we will help defend them. As long as they are under the Stars and Stripes let it be understood that they are to be developed and protected. In every war the country has ever fought the South has done its part. It stands ready to-day to do its full duty if any inch of soil under the Stars and Stripes is imperiled.

But there is a better conception of a republic. It is a republic extending from ocean to ocean, from the Arctic pole to Panama Canal, with the outlying islands of the sea as sentinels to give warning in case of attack. Let its motto be, "Equal and exact justice to all men; equal opportunity for all citizens, States, and sections," for these are the symbols of permanent union and everlasting political life. This, Mr. Chairman, would be a genuine American republic, and then indeed we would fulfill the poet's description of the ornamental border of the buckler of Achilles—

Thus the broad shield complete—the artist crown'd
With his last hand, and pour'd the ocean 'round;
In living silver seem'd the waves to roll
And beat the buckler's verge, and bound the whole.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DALZELL 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 insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 12684) 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, 1905, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. STEWART, Mr. PLATT of Connecticut, and Mr. DUBOIS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

- H. R. 4990. An act granting a pension to Georgia R. Demarest;
H. R. 12434. An act granting an increase of pension to Rebecca McKinney;
H. R. 12436. An act granting a pension to Ida E. Nerber;
H. R. 12439. An act granting a pension to Lydia Gavitt;
H. R. 12965. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Dailey;
H. R. 11313. An act granting a pension to Anna C. Ray;
H. R. 11610. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander S. Hill;
H. R. 11597. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanthus P. Joyner;
H. R. 11562. An act granting a pension to Lucretia Davis, formerly Hamilton;
H. R. 11612. An act granting an increase of pension to G. H. Abney;
H. R. 11615. An act granting an increase of pension to Socrates Moore;
H. R. 11616. An act granting a pension to August Bockenman;
H. R. 11692. An act granting a pension to Mary J. Neely;
H. R. 11838. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Mann;
H. R. 11846. An act granting an increase of pension to David Kinsey;
H. R. 11906. An act granting a pension to Margaret Jones;
H. R. 11939. An act granting an increase of pension to C. C. Fisher, alias John C. Pickerell;
H. R. 12134. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert Haldeman;
H. R. 12326. An act granting an increase of pension to Matthew Curran;
H. R. 4405. An act to correct the military record of Carl W. Albrecht;
H. R. 9504. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustus Johns;
H. R. 9562. An act granting an increase of pension to Warren R. Herrell;
H. R. 9834. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth McL. Haughey;
H. R. 9862. An act granting a pension to Mary Yaw;
H. R. 8713. An act granting an increase of pension to Elam Allen;
H. R. 8462. An act granting an increase of pension to James Walts;
H. R. 2929. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Gates;
H. R. 11177. An act granting an increase of pension to George Manypenny;
H. R. 4565. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen N. Leach;
H. R. 4599. An act granting a pension to Ella F. Whitehead;
H. R. 4623. An act granting a pension to Electa L. Willard;
H. R. 4539. An act granting a pension to Jane E. Tatum;
H. R. 544. An act granting an increase of pension to Leather St. John;
H. R. 725. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander M. Ballou;
H. R. 728. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Evans;
H. R. 732. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. B. Thompson;
H. R. 744. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Carr;
H. R. 1267. An act granting an increase of pension to D. Miller Gordon;
H. R. 1568. An act granting an increase of pension to James V. Tabor;
H. R. 2041. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Adams;

- H. R. 2144. An act granting an increase of pension to Minerva A. Pool;
- H. R. 2922. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Ford;
- H. R. 3033. An act granting a pension to James M. Hurley;
- H. R. 3149. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Mavity;
- H. R. 3171. An act granting an increase of pension to George N. Crawford;
- H. R. 3434. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Parmley;
- H. R. 3533. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert M. McLroy;
- H. R. 3642. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Martin;
- H. R. 3832. An act granting an increase of pension to Eli T. Hoyt;
- H. R. 4120. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Guss;
- H. R. 4141. An act granting a pension to Mary Shiver;
- H. R. 4252. An act granting an increase of pension to George M. Gibbons;
- H. R. 4330. An act granting a pension to Catherine Tully;
- H. R. 4565. An act granting an increase of pension to Carrie Keefer;
- H. R. 4718. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Ballard;
- H. R. 4877. An act granting an increase of pension to Mathias C. Mills;
- H. R. 4892. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias Veatch;
- H. R. 4928. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Masterson;
- H. R. 4949. An act granting an increase of pension to George L. Bixler;
- H. R. 4980. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Connor, alias B. Smith;
- H. R. 5330. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert D. Gardner;
- H. R. 6365. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Hay;
- H. R. 6706. An act granting an increase of pension to James Bliss;
- H. R. 7482. An act granting an increase of pension to Jennie Pettit Morrison;
- H. R. 7487. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis Knapp;
- H. R. 9504. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustus Johns;
- H. R. 10478. An act granting an increase of pension to William T. Hayter;
- H. R. 10845. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Webb; and
- H. R. 11498. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Porter.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield fifteen minutes' time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I propose to-day to address myself to the consideration of the ship-subsidy commission bill.

If this bill were the most innocent bill that ever came into this House, yet the conditions which gave it birth and the antecedent circumstances which led up to the introduction of the original ship-subsidy bill in the Fifty-sixth Congress should have stamped that bill with an indelible stain of dishonor, which should have precluded the possibility of any man, not blindly partisan, supporting it. The history of the events which preceded the appearance here of this commission bill clearly prove that it is but one of the ever recurrent efforts to still further rivet the shackles of monopoly upon the people.

I am well aware that denial will be made that this is the repayment to an organized band of unscrupulous but wealthy plutocrats, who were appealed to during the campaign of 1898 to "save" the country and incidentally the Republican party from that annihilation in the then pending Congressional elections which the chairman of that committee foresaw and which he pictured in glowing language, if terror can be so pictured. Organized plutocrats at that time did not so completely understand as they do now how insincere was the advertised statement of the chairman of the Republican committee that he favored certain reductions in the tariff schedules, particularly those affecting steel and iron. Because of this they refused to contribute to the Republican campaign fund of that year, and therefore the "honor"

of the country, which had been "saved" at such tremendous cost two years before, was in serious danger. The outlook was appalling. It really seemed then, to those in charge of the Republican campaign, that there was great danger of the people again coming into their own, at least of taking the first step forward in that direction by the election of a Democratic Congress.

Whether the "business interests" felt that they had been "touched" too heavily in the campaign of 1896 I do not know, but certain it is, and no one familiar with the facts upon the other side of the House will dare deny it, that those interests were not "coming to time" as the Republicans had a right to expect they would during the Congressional campaign of 1898. They were evidently deluded with the idea that there was at least some element of sincerity in the ostentatious demand of a certain gentleman for the revision of the steel and iron schedules, and therefore refused to put up the "stuff" through which alone the "honor" of the country could again be saved.

In this situation of dire distress, and with the imminent possibility of the appalling calamity that would happen if the Democrats should have a majority in the Fifty-sixth Congress and thereby prevent the consummation of some of the contracts entered into two years before and which had not been entirely carried out, there was but one thing to do, and that was to enlist the active efforts of the man who, in 1896, raised the most colossal corruption fund which a political party ever had. These "business" interests—the plutocrats—had entire confidence that any contract they might enter into with him would be lived up to to the letter; aye, that they would not merely be able to get their "pound of flesh" out of the American people, but a large part of their hide if they felt disposed to foreclose their mortgage to that extent.

The contract was duly entered into, \$400,000, or was it \$500,000, was turned over by the "right" people and placed in the right hands, but not, as I am informed, into those of the usual committee. However, that is a mere matter of detail, and it is not for those on this side of the House to worry as to who dispensed this corruption fund. It is sufficient for us to know that that fund was provided; that it came almost entirely from a few men, and that the contract provided that the legislation which these men demanded should not only be theirs, but that every word of the bill, the passage of which would constitute the execution of the contract, should be written by them. They were not content, as the protected manufacturers had been in the case of the McKinley bill, merely to write the particular schedule which had to do with their industry, but they insisted upon the right to write every word of the bill, dot every i, cross every t, and this right was accorded them.

In an article written while the ship-subsidy bill was before this House, Royal Meeker, secretary of the tariff-reform committee of the Reform Club of New York, speaking of the ante-election bargain of 1898, out of which that bill sprang, said:

The history of the ship-subsidy bill, which recently passed the Senate and is now pending in the House, dates back to December of 1898, when Senator Hanna introduced the bill prepared by the notorious "committee" of experts, composed of the shipowners who would receive the bounty granted by their own little bill. It is usual for the beneficiaries of protection to prepare the measures by which they profit in the seclusion of the committee room, but never before did such a gang of raiders so openly and arrogantly demand public money. No attempt at concealment was made. It was well known that the steamship companies made a large donation (said to be \$500,000) to the Republican campaign fund for that year on the stipulation that they were to write their own subsidy bill and that Senator Hanna would exert his power and influence to put through this gigantic raid on the National Treasury.

That Democrats were not the only ones who learned of the ante-election bargain, under which a large corruption fund was provided, in return for which the contributors were assured of the passage of a ship-subsidy bill, is seen in a statement prepared and extensively circulated at that time by a prominent Republican and a protectionist. I regret that time will not permit me to do anything more than quote a few of its more salient paragraphs. The document is headed:

SOME FACTS REGARDING THE HANNA-PAYNE SHIPPING BILL.

[By Samuel Adams Robinson, M. D.]

To those who know me it is not necessary to explain the incentive of this appeal in order to prevent them from misunderstanding my position, but for those who do not I will say that as I own property in New York City, including deep-water front, which this bill would surely increase the value of, and have no property or other interest, except my interest in the general welfare of the country, that it could injure, its enactment into law would certainly benefit me pecuniarily.

* * * * *

Knowing that a committee largely composed of representatives of the most powerful transportation lines in the United States and Europe had been for a number of years working to secure legislation in the interest of those great corporations, I could but infer that they were the authors of this bill, and thought it fair to conclude that it was intended to benefit the interests they represented, regardless of all else.

* * * * *

During the six years in which I have devoted my time and income to economic work I have always been able to secure a fair presentation of my

views in such newspapers as I selected, and although, owing to a desire to avoid notoriety, I rarely signed an article, and, indeed, seldom presented my views in my own words, thousands of newspapers all over the land have published what I sent them. Though an active advocate of the gold standard and currency reform, I have very seldom found a man or paper advocating free silver that would not give a fair hearing to my side of the case.

It has remained for those who advocate this bill to teach me that a large part of the press of the United States can be so muzzled as to make it well-nigh impossible to get the truth before the public. Only inability to get what I have said and will say in this circular to the people in the usual way has induced me to publish it in this manner. I am by no means alone in this experience, as will be seen by the following, which is one of numerous instances that have come to my knowledge.

So that, according to Doctor Robinson, these gentlemen have added the crime of suppressing free speech to that of corrupting the suffrage.

This is what the Doctor has to say on that subject:

One of the most prominent, able, and honorable officers of labor organizations, members of which are engaged in the shipbuilding trades as well as in other industries, informs me that in his long experience he has always found newspapers ready to print any information which he gave them and anxious to interview him upon subjects in which the organizations he represents were interested, but that he has seen the editors of many papers that had heretofore been anxious to publish his contributions, and has been unable to induce one of them to print a line against the Hanna-Payne bill, though he knew that some of them were personally opposed to it.

I know instances in which newspapers have been compelled by those advocating the bill to stop the publication of anything calculated to teach the people its true character. Men in very high positions have amazed me by their efforts to muzzle the press with regard to this bill.

Mark, "Men in very high positions" have been "muzzling the press" so that the public should not know the real facts concerning this bill. We hear a great deal about terrorism nowadays. Can there be any worse terrorism than that which can prevent the great organs of public opinion from expressing their views on proposed legislation?

What can possibly be the relation between the plutocratic subsidy hunters and newspapers which they can "compel" to stop publishing matter tending to enlighten the public mind on this subject? Nothing that has been said on this side of the House in denunciation of this bill can compare in severity with this assertion of Doctor Robinson. It, however, but "lifts the lid" and discloses how unscrupulous are the methods employed by these financial "magnates" when they are interested in legislation. Bill Tweed's methods were crude and uncouth compared with theirs.

Doctor Robinson continues:

Never before in a long and busy life, during which I have always kept in reasonably close touch with the press of my country, have I had reason to suspect that the brutal power of capital and corporations could so suppress the truth, and I warn them that our free schools have taught our people the importance of a free press.

Doctor Robinson evidently foresaw the attempt to form a shipping trust which would gain strength from this policy of ship subsidies, as he says:

The vast sum which this bill would take from the taxpayers of the United States for subsidies is not its most dangerous feature. The gigantic monopoly which it would create is much more to be feared.

That the International Mercantile Marine Company has been less of a financial success than its sponsors expected is probably largely due to the fact that they overcapitalized the bounty which the Griscom Company—the International Navigation Company, a large constituent element of the International Mercantile Marine Company—now receives from the United States Treasury. The extent of this bounty is indicated in the fact that it received in 1902 for carrying the United States mail two and one-half times as much as the Cunard Line was paid by our Government, although it carried only half as much first-class mail (letters) and only three-quarters as much printed matter. Great is "patriotism," especially when it is capitalized at cent per cent!

Doctor Robinson also says:

Mr. Edmunds probably feels that he has a perfect right to advocate this bill notwithstanding the fact that he voted in the Senate against the bill under which the Griscom, which is our only subsidized line, now runs; he was then a Senator from Vermont, and being now a Philadelphia lawyer his position is of course entirely different; indeed, I am told by one of the men on the inside of shipping circles that he now receives only \$1,000 for each time he goes to Washington to promote the passage of the bill.

And concludes with this very truthful characterization:

The genesis of this bill is greed, its mask enterprise and patriotism, and its purpose monopoly.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February, 1899.

SAMUEL ADAMS ROBINSON.

The present Speaker of this House hit the mark when he said a few years ago:

To give a bonus to assist certain persons to make a sale of steamships at a price greater than their value would encourage individuals to knock at the doors of Congress for profit at the general expense.

As a resident of the rural West he is apparently unfamiliar with the ways of "Wall street." The gentlemen there don't sell ships; they have found it much easier to sell stocks, trebly inflated.

SAME OLD CROWD! SAME OLD STORY!

A very noteworthy fact in connection with the whole procedure at this session in relation to the ship-subsidy question is this:

The men who were back of the original plan to profit at the expense of their fellows in the Hanna-Payne ship-subsidy bill are the same men, or at least represent the same interests, that clamored for subsidies in the earlier years. They are the same men who have been clamoring for subsidies ever since this proposed malodorous legislation was initiated. They are the same men who appeared before committees of Congress at all subsidy hearings of late years. They are the same men, or certainly representative of identical interests, who appeared at the hearing in advocacy of the pending bill to provide a ship-subsidy commission. They are the same men who have appeared before House and Senate committees in advocacy of the bill to extend the coastwise laws to the Philippine Islands, and thereby give a monopoly of this business to the ships that some of them control; the same men who have advocated the bill to force the carriage of all governmental supplies in American vessels regardless of cost.

These two Philippine shipping bills would affect comparatively few ships and very few lines. They are not worth to the shipping interests anything like the legislative value placed upon their passage. The cardinal point of the whole agitation is that the commission bill and both Philippine shipping bills are steps in the direction of a general ship subsidy, and therein lies their strength and their enthusiastic and united support among the beneficiaries of these particular measures and those who expect to benefit from the general subsidy measure which is designed to be passed at the next session of this Congress. All of the arguments that have been made at all of the hearings have been subsidy arguments. The same old crowd, the same old subsidy, the "same old story—nothing new."

RESULTS ABROAD.

The subsidy system has many earnest advocates in this country who never fail to point in a general way to results obtained in foreign countries through the fostering care of their governments, it being stated that wherever there has been an extensive development of the merchant marine this was due to the systematic appropriation of large sums from the state treasury for the special object of encouraging shipping. These assertions have been made so frequently by newspapers, on the platform, and in Congress that a great many people consider them a matter of record, and no longer question them. An examination will, however, show that they have no foundation in fact. Take the

EXPERIENCE OF FRANCE.

France and Italy are conspicuous examples of the negative result of subsidies. The French ship-subsidy system dates from the year 1881, and was rearranged in 1893. The payments in the year 1896 (the latest date contained in the United States special consular reports) were:

	Francs.
For bounties to navigation	9,574,720
For bounties to construction	4,106,848
For postal subsidies	26,183,000
Total	39,864,568

Thus the yearly payment from the French treasury for the encouragement of shipping reached in 1896, an average year, the great sum of nearly 40,000,000 francs (\$8,000,000).

Now, let us see the result. According to the report of the United States consul at Havre of September 6, 1889 (made to the State Department and published in the Special Consular Reports, Vol. XVIII), the total increase of French mercantile tonnage in the five years from 1883, the year of the enactment of the new law, until 1888 was 66,961 tons, "the increase being limited to vessels which receive no benefits from the bounty law of 1883, while the steam tonnage engaged in meeting foreign competition actually showed a decrease."

After eighteen years of bounty payments, a committee of the French Parliament in 1898 reported as follows:

We do not hesitate to say, without fear of contradiction, that our merchant marine is in such a state of decadence that there is reason to be uneasy about our naval fleet.

After quoting the above in his report of September 6, 1899, to the State Department, the United States consul at Havre, says:

Many other extracts might be quoted from the reports of various chambers of commerce, from speeches made in the two houses of Parliament, and from lectures delivered by experts in economics, all lamenting the depressed state of the merchant navy of France.

As appears from the figures given above, the French Government pays postal subsidies, premiums on the construction of French ships, and premiums on voyages made by French ships. The effect of this policy is thus described by the United States

consul at Marseilles in his report to the State Department of July 20, 1899 (Special Consular Reports, Vol. XVIII, p. 36):

The shipowners, at first disposed to give orders to domestic builders, found the latter constantly increasing their prices, until the point was reached where the builders were accused of calculating the amount of premium which proposed constructions would command and adding that amount to their own cost price, thus absorbing the premium for navigation and the one for construction.

This consul concludes that—

The merchant marine of France is in an unsatisfactory condition—and expresses the opinion that—

The inferiority of the French merchant marine is attributable to the timidity or indifference of French capital.

FAR FROM SATISFACTORY.

The Italian Government pays navigation subsidies and construction bounties, but the United States consul-general at Rome, in his report to the State Department of July 25, 1899 (Special Consular Reports, Vol. XVIII, p. 72), makes the following comment:

In view of the efforts of the Government to encourage Italian shipping, the long seaboard, and the necessity of shipping to the economical life of the country, the results are certainly far from satisfactory; and it is particularly remarkable that the tonnage of Italian steamers remains generally so low, while in other countries the tendency has been toward the employment of larger ships as more economical in working. The bulk of the subsidies are paid to two or three companies, which by constant favor have established a sort of shipping monopoly and successfully use their influence to crush all possible rivals.

Here in this country, where we are told "there are no trusts," of course no shipping monopoly can ever be created.

GREAT BRITAIN'S MERCHANT MARINE.

Great Britain has, according to latest reports, a merchant marine consisting of 8,352 steamers, with a total of 13,652,455 tons. By far the greatest part of the world's ocean carrying trade is conveyed in British bottoms, and there is hardly a port in any part of the globe where British ships do not ply and the British flag is not a frequent visitor. But has this result been brought about by Government bounties? Let us see what United States consuls say on this point in their reports to the State Department in response to a Department circular instructing them to investigate the condition of the merchant marine in the countries where they are located and the policy adopted by the Government for its promotion. Presumably they were expected to find everything that would constitute an argument for ship subsidies; and yet the United States consul-general at London—a cousin of President McKinley—on September 12, 1899 (Special Consular Reports, Vol. XVIII, p. 107), reports as follows:

The Government of this country does not pursue any particular policy for the purpose of promoting its merchant marine. Subventions are paid for the use of certain vessels as armed cruisers in case of war, and payments are made for the carriage of mails.

And (p. 108):

The policies of the other nations toward their merchant shipping do not meet with much discussion or criticism in this country, nor are they copied.

He might have added that British shipbuilders are able to underbid French shipbuilders both as to cost and in time of construction, although the latter pay their workmen a much lower per diem wage than is paid in British shipyards.

The United States consul at Liverpool, on August 30, 1899 (Special Consular Reports, Vol. XVIII, pp. 111 and 112), makes the following statements:

The Government does nothing to promote the merchant marine in the way of subsidizing it or the builders who construct it. Payments, aggregating some \$243,000 per annum, are made for the call of certain steamers (eleven) as armed cruisers in case of war. The mail subsidies (toward which the colonies pay a part) are put up to competition, and the cheapest bidder, having regard to efficiency, secures the contract.

And—

While much interest is taken in shipping circles in Liverpool regarding the policies of other nations toward their own merchant shipping, there is no perceptible sign that the British policy has been influenced, beyond stimulating British shipowners to greater efficiency and economy in the working of their fleets.

NO GOVERNMENT ENCOURAGEMENT.

Irrespective of the payments for postal service and the compensation to the eleven steamers that may be used for cruisers, no subsidy or bounty has been paid by Great Britain to steamship lines for their support or encouragement. For a country like Great Britain, with its vast system of colonies and military and naval posts, the maintenance of constant and efficient mail communication is of the utmost importance, which has been paid for since the day of the sailing vessel, when it surely never occurred to anyone to consider such payments as in the nature of subsidies for the encouragement of shipping. I quote the following from an editorial in the well-known English shipping journal *Fairplay*, of December 3, 1903:

No man living could be found to say that any English Government ever offered encouragement directly or indirectly to English shipping in any shape or form. Much misapprehension has arisen from the use of the word "subsidy," which implies a fixed payment for no specific work. As pointed out again and again, our Government is charged with the delivery of the mails,

and also with the delivery of stores for different parts of the world. In each case the work is put up to tender, and, provided the contractors tendering are in a position to ensure the proper performance of the contract, the lowest bidder gets the work. Payment for the carriage of mails no more constitutes what is understood as a subsidy for the encouragement of shipping than payment for the carriage of stores, and the sort of encouragement shipowners get from our Government in the latter connection may be inferred from a study of the terms recently issued by the Government for the carriage of stores to the Cape.

But leaving aside the question to what extent, if any, the payments made by the British Government for postal service are in aid to the steamship lines that receive them, the indubitable fact remains that these lines represent only a small part of the great ocean tonnage of Great Britain's merchant marine, and that by far the greatest part of it receives no consideration whatever from the Government. It has grown up and prospered because of the enterprise of the British people and because the Government has given it a fair field and no favor without putting difficulties and obstructions in its way. If the British Government has deviated from its long-established policy, in granting a large subsidy to the Cunard Line for the construction of two very large and very fast vessels, it has no doubt done so because the situation created by Mr. Morgan's steamship merger seemed to require extraordinary measures in order to relieve public apprehension, which, as time has shown, was entirely unjustified. The action of the British Government in this respect is an exceptional one, and the two steamers to be built with Government aid do not affect the general policy of Great Britain under which, with its fleet of over 8,300 steamers of over 13,500,000 tons, it has reached its preeminence in the world's shipping traffic.

GERMANY'S EXPERIENCE.

The experience of Germany also proves that a country can obtain a large and steadily growing merchant marine without offering a reward for it. Up to the year 1885 Germany paid no subsidy whatever to any steamship line. In that year, however, following the French example, a system of subsidies for the carriage of foreign mails was adopted by the Government. In what light the payment of subsidies was considered by the German shipping trade is splendidly illustrated by the following protest, published at the time by the Hamburg Merchants' Society.

After a formal preliminary, it says:

Thus far German commerce and navigation have been able to compete with those of other nations, and their present strong position is chiefly due to their own exertions. Even if the French Government should extend larger monopolies and subsidies to their national trade and commerce, the Hamburg shipping merchants are not afraid that, if let alone, their own development would be injured or suffer under such adverse legislation. The growth and prosperity of national trade are, before all, created by the natural talent and disposition of a people.

Governmental measures, whether they consist in throwing artificial obstacles in the way of foreign competition or in direct support of the national flag, may here and there bring temporary advantages to individual enterprises, but they will never be able permanently to raise and elevate the shipping interest. On the contrary, as experience has shown in France, they paralyze individual energy and endanger the spirit of enterprise and effect the decline if not the ruin of trade. In the interest of German commerce and of the national flag, the Hamburg merchants most earnestly and respectfully pray that all governmental measures for their protection be definitely set aside.

The German law granting subsidies for a mail-steamship service to Asia and Australia was enacted on April 6, 1885, the beneficiary being the North German Lloyd, whose first steamer on this service left Bremerhaven on June 30, 1886. The contracts under the first subsidy enactment were made for fifteen years; the Hamburg-American Line did not submit offers for these contracts, but preferred to remain unfettered by Government regulations.

HOW THE HAMBURG-AMERICAN LINE FARED.

How did the Hamburg-American fare without the subsidy payments? At the beginning of the bounty period in 1886, that line had 26 ocean steamers of 66,000 tons. During these fifteen years when, according to the arguments of the subsidy hunters who are clamoring for this bill, it would not be possible for it to compete, the line steadily grew and expanded, until in 1901 it had 127 ocean steamers of 630,091 tons and maintained 35 different services to all parts of the world. Without any aid from any state or government whatsoever it grew to be the largest steamship enterprise in the world.

In 1900 the German subsidy contract was renewed, and the Hamburg-American Line, believing that the interests of Hamburg required a participation in the east Asiatic fast mail service, agreed to construct two steamers in accordance with Government regulations and place them in this service. These two steamers, the *Hamburg* and *Kiawtschou*, ran for two years on this route in connection with the service maintained by the North German Lloyd.

The Lloyd placed altogether thirteen steamers in the Imperial mail service and received at first \$1,047,500 and by the law of 1899, \$1,330,420 per annum for this service. (Report of the United States consul-general in Berlin, of October 25, 1899, Special Cons. Rep., Vol. XVIII, p. 59.)

The two steamers built by the Hamburg-American Line, which joined the service in 1901, received a proportionate share of the subvention, but in the fall of last year the Hamburg-American Line voluntarily withdrew from the contract, preferring to maintain its own service to eastern Asia without Government restrictions.

They do things differently here. We never hear of men who have been given the power to draw a subsidy, or any other form of governmental assistance, surrendering such a privilege. Today the Hamburg-American Line, after an existence of nearly fifty-seven years, has a fleet of 125 ocean steamers of 619,916 tons and 155 other vessels of 31,235 tons, or a total of 280 vessels of 651,151 tons. These are employed in thirty-nine different services. During its whole life it has received no subsidy from any source with the single exception noted above, viz, that out of its whole fleet of 125 ocean steamers but 2 ships, and for only two years, participated in a subvention which the German Government gave for a fast service to the Far East.

Nothing can better illustrate the value of subsidies than the voluntary withdrawal of this line from participation in it. Evidently the company discovered that their business was not stimulated by the subsidy.

The New York Herald of November 21, 1903, contained a letter from Senator FRYE, written in reply to an interview with Mr. Ballin, director-general of the Hamburg-American Line, published in the Herald of November 17, 1903. Referring to the report of United States Consul-General Mason, at Berlin, published in Special Consular Reports XVIII, for the year 1900, the Senator says:

Our consul-general goes on to show how subsidy and the accompanying requirements that the subsidized ships should be built in German yards so stimulated construction in the Empire that both the North German Lloyd and Hamburg-American companies were enabled to order home ships like the *Kaiser Wilhelm der Grosse*, *Friedrich der Grosse*, *Koenigin Luise*, *Auguste Victoria*, *Furst Bismarck*, *Patricia*, and *Palatia*.

"That they did this at all," Consul-General Mason declares, "was mainly due to the fact that they were forced into it by an act of legislation."

Granting that this represents Consul-General Mason's meaning, then he is in error upon his own showing, for how can the Hamburg-American Line have been forced by legislative acts to patronize home builders, when, as the consul states in the same connection, the imperial statute enacted in 1884 (actually 1885) granted subsidies to the North German Lloyd only?

Second. The Hamburg-American liners mentioned above were constructed in the years 1889, 1890, 1899, and 1895, respectively, while the Hamburg-American Line "enjoyed the benefits" of a subsidy for two steamers (out of a fleet of 125), together with thirteen Lloyd steamers, from 1901 to 1903.

Third. Regarding the advantages of this subsidy, attention is called to the report of the United States Commissioner of Navigation for 1899, which shows on page 155 that the North German Lloyd "thus far has not only made no profit from its contract to carry the mails, but rather has lost 5,258,563 marks."

That the Hamburg-American Line was not "forced by legislative action to withdraw its patronage from British constructors" (Vice-Consul-General Mason's report) is amply proven by the fact that during all this period it has repeatedly ordered ships in British yards, notably the *Pennsylvania*, sister ship of the *Patricia*, mentioned above, in 1896, and has now contracted for its latest and largest vessel at the yards of Harland & Wolff, in Belfast.

I want to quote from the statement of a former Member of this House, Hon. John De Witt Warner, representing the tariff reform committee of the Reform Club, made to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on January 30, 1900, and over which the gentleman from Ohio, General GROSVENOR, presided:

STATEMENT BY EX-CONGRESSMAN JOHN DE WITT WARNER.

Mr. WARNER. I represent my own opinions, of some years' standing, and the Reform Club. Our tariff-reform committee has taken decided action against the bill, and has asked me to come here and oppose it.

At "(f)," on page 10, the provision is that a vessel shall not take the subsidy when less than one-half of the whole length of her outward and homeward voyages shall have been on the seas between a port of the United States and a foreign port. In one sense every mile of a vessel, even though it went all around the world, would be between a port of the United States and a foreign port.

I take it, however, that what is meant is that it must have been on the sea between a port of the United States and the first foreign port on her outward voyage or the last foreign port on her homeward voyage. But, gentlemen, if you want the bill to mean that, you have got to say so. Otherwise that provision leaves a ship to wander around the world, to take a journey around the world, if you please, and do practically all its work in carrying foreign goods between different foreign ports and then collect the American subsidy from the United States, and the longer it stays away the more it collects.

I take it for granted that your committee will amend that. I do not suppose you mean anything like that, but it seems to me that is a very serious objection to the bill, unless you want to make it a great deal more preposterous than its enemies have ever suggested that anyone really meant to make it.

Now, there is a clause providing that the Secretary shall "contract." What does that mean? It either means that there is some discretion left to the Secretary of the Treasury as to the contract he shall make, or else it does not. If it does not mean that the Secretary is to have any discretion whatever—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GROSVENOR). It says in plain terms "any," and it mandatorily and specifically means any owner of any ship.

Mr. WARNER. I accept the Chairman's conclusion; and that is just exactly what I thought would be claimed by the friends of the bill. Now, if that be true and the Secretary of the Treasury has no discretion whatever, then the word "contract" here is a farce, and can only mean a bogus contract upon which a claim may be made that this bill and its provisions can not be repealed, thereby to get around the plain hint of the decision of the court in the case of the Louisiana sugar bounties. Take either horn of the dilemma, gentlemen. Either this word "contract" is a farce, put in there for this purpose, or else it gives the Secretary of the Treasury a power which no Congress will ever dare knowingly to give any administrative officer.

Mr. WACHTER. Can all American ships be manned by American sailors? Is the supply large enough?

Mr. WARNER. The supply of American sailors is as adequate to man all American ships, if an opportunity is to be given American labor, as the supply of American capital is to corral the whole American trade, if the aim is to foster the export trade in our produce and manufactures.

Mr. WACHTER. I do not want any "ifs." Is it?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, unquestionably, if you pay enough. If you will put in a subsidy in this bill providing for minimum wages to seamen and carrying, say, one-quarter or even one-tenth of the amount you propose to pay capital, you can have manned by American sailors every single ton of American ships entitled now to registry in the foreign trade.

The CHAIRMAN. You would provide a scale of wages in an act of Congress, then?

Mr. WARNER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Why not?

Mr. WARNER. Because I do not believe in subsidizing or pauperizing either capital or labor.

The CHAIRMAN. But if you were going to pass this—

Mr. WARNER. Yes; if I were going to do that, I would make a fairer division than is here proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. You would regulate by the law the price of clothing, and so on?

Mr. WARNER. I certainly should take as good care of the American seaman as I did of the American millionaire.

The CHAIRMAN. That is another thing.

Mr. WARNER. And I would not give a dollar to one unless there was a dollar provided for the other, and at the same time pretend that I was looking out for the seaman and not the millionaire.

Mr. FORDNEY. You object to the bill from beginning to end. Have you anything to offer in its place?

Mr. WARNER. Yes; free trade in ships.

The CHAIRMAN. And free trade in goods also?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. This country has had free trade in men ever since the Republican Administration during our war time sent over and arranged for foreign laborers to come here and take the place of those in the field. You have a little bit of a contract-labor arrangement which, if it were proposed in regard to goods as an alternative for the tariff, there is not a protectionist in the country but what would go wild. We have free trade in labor. So long as we have that, let us have free trade in goods.

Mr. HOPKINS. That is not a fair statement.

Mr. WARNER. That is the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. I have heard you talk this way about free trade before, but I do not recollect of ever hearing you agitate the question of keeping that foreign labor out.

Mr. WARNER. No; I am in favor of keeping our ports open for labor and for goods, but I am not in favor of keeping goods out and letting labor in free.

Mr. WACHTER. * * * You do not mean to say you are the only friend of the workman in this room?

Mr. WARNER. No; not in the slightest. I am free to say I do not imagine that even the authors of this bill got it up in order to swindle labor. I don't think they cared what it did to labor. * * * I have no doubt it is drawn to meet the precise views of the gentlemen who drafted it. I am not for one moment impugning their intelligence.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it customary to amend a bill by the adoption of the amendments proposed by its enemies?

Mr. WARNER. Do I understand that this committee proposes to report this bill in the shape the friends of the bill want it? If so, there is no use of this hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. I have no doubt that those who want to report the bill at all will take the advice of the friends of the bill rather than those who want to load the bill with dynamite to kill it.

Mr. WARNER. I have been trying to entertain a doubt of that. I have been trying to believe that this committee was not committed, but that it would listen as thoroughly to the enemies of the bill as it would to the friends of the bill.

Mr. WARNER. I want to call attention to the fact that although it is claimed by some of the promoters of the bill that the subsidy is not sufficient to tempt ships to run expressly for that purpose, yet there are two facts which the committee should keep in mind: First, that under any conditions, so far as they last for any great length of time, there is a great deal of running in ballast now by unsubsidized ships. If there is a great deal of running in ballast now by unsubsidized ships, then under a subsidy which pays a premium for running even in ballast, no argument is needed to show that the amount of running in ballast would be vastly increased.

Mr. WARNER. The second point I want to make is this: It will have the tendency to induce ships not engaged in legitimate commerce between two ports to abandon that regular trade and, under the provisions in this bill, allowing them to continue their voyage, to go tramping around the world. The cost of the actual voyage being small in comparison to the cost of starting and going back for call with demurrage, and so forth, the ship will find it profitable under this subsidy to keep on around the world half empty.

SHIPPING INDUSTRIES ALREADY PROSPEROUS.

President McKinley, in his speech at the Chicago Commercial Club banquet on October 10, 1899, said:

"Our shipbuilding has been greatly increased. For the first time in all our history the tonnage of our steam vessels exceeded on June 1 the tonnage of all our sailing vessels, barges, and other craft. We built in 1897 and 1898 more vessels of steel than of all other materials combined. Our tonnage increased during the year 100,000 tons, and is without a parallel in our recent history. More large ocean steamships are under construction in the United States than ever before. Our shipbuilding plants are being enlarged and new establishments projected."

SUBSIDY NOT PROPORTIONED TO CARGO.

Though prefaced by canting "whereases," professing great solicitude for the farmer, laborer, etc., and especially for the American seaman and the American Navy, it is so drawn as to give no benefit to those classes, but in their name to secure additional profits to capital already profitably invested. As a result it has been expressly repudiated and condemned by the greatest

labor organization, the Federation of Labor; by the leading farmers' association, the National Grange, and favored by so few and comparatively petty interests as to make its "popular" support a farce.

The spirit in which this bill is drafted is indicated by the fact that while typical freighters, capable of carrying cargoes equaling in actual tons their registered tonnage and making 14 knots an hour, are subsidized at 2 cents per registered ton per 100 miles for the first 1,500 miles and at 2 cents per registered ton per 100 miles for the remainder of the voyage, swift passenger steamers, so constructed as to carry of freight not more than one-fourth to one-sixth of their registered tonnage, but running 21 knots an hour, are subsidized at 3.8 and 3.3 cents, respectively, for registered ton per 100 miles; that is, in proportion to American exports carried the subsidy is from six to ten times as high on passenger steamers as it is on freighters.

COLOSSAL IMPUDENCE.

The impudence with which the proposed extortion is demanded is unique even in a history of scandals, including that of the sugar trust. If the claim had not been openly made that, provided the subsidy grabbers were agreed upon division of the spoil, Congress ought to be satisfied and objectors considered impertinent, it would be almost incredible that it should be pressed. This is, however, precisely what the subsidy beggars are doing. For example, at page 30 of the committee's printed hearings, 1900, Mr. Griscom admits that his company would receive, say, \$1,500,000 in subsidy within a year after the passage of the bill. (Other calculations make it about \$2,500,000.)

At page 33 of the same hearings, Mr. Clyde, also a proposed beneficiary, refers to the "committee," including Mr. Griscom and himself, "which prepared that" (subsidy) "bill," states that "the committee is satisfied with the amount that Mr. Griscom's company" (International Navigation Company) "is to receive," and adds:

If we are satisfied, we who expect to share the direct benefits of this bill, to begin with, if we are satisfied to see one single member of that committee receive that much money, in whose affairs we have no interest whatever, we think you can be sure that he is not getting more than the services he renders are fairly worth. If we can agree among ourselves as to how that money can be distributed (to themselves) so as to do the most good and build up the largest possible merchant marine, I do not think that you should give weight to the adverse criticisms of people who have had no practical experience in the ownership or operation of ships.

It is not that the claims of these gentlemen are more preposterous than have been those of some others, but that they, more than others, have not seen fit, in this one particular, to assume a virtue that they did not have.

SURRENDER TO TRUST BLACKMAILERS.

The worst feature of this subsidy scheme, as shown by the personnel of its backers and admissions and statements of hearings already had, is, however, this: It indicates a final and hopeless surrender on the part of a great industry, blackmailed by our most indefensible trusts into cooperation with them, and an acceptance of their aid to secure for itself equal plunder from the Government instead of demanding Government protection against their rapacity.

LABOR BOUNTY GOES TO CAPITAL.

Similar also is the contrast between the \$2 yearly for full registered tonnage, no matter if employed for only three months in the year, that is assured deep-sea fishing vessels, with the requirement of only one-third American crew, and a bounty to each of \$1 per ton "during his time necessarily employed" on the voyage.

This is more delightful when it is recalled that, since no minimum wage is specified and the employer gets his men in the open market, this \$1 bounty to sailors is really an additional contribution to the vessel owner, since a sailor can, on even terms, otherwise ship with the subsidized owner at a dollar less a month.

A feature of Senator Edmund's argument is the stalwart character of the United States Constitution in sustaining the strain of anything subsidy grabbers want, and its fragility when faced with anything which would actually carry out what they profess they are after.

SUBSIDY COMBINE A NEW YORK CONCERN.

I take it that no one is expected to believe that Mr. Griscom's little romance of how a thoughtful statesman, dreaming of our export trade, inaugurated this movement by calling in a dozen interested investors, the very gentlemen whom the thoughtful statesman in question already knew from legislative experience were the most unscrupulous grabbers on earth.

The fact is that this subsidy is essentially a New York concern, the profits of whose schemes would inure most largely to New York and to interests centered there. The source of its energy is on the opposite side of Trinity churchyard upon which my office looks. The office of its figurehead and fogleman, Mr. Smith, is also at New York—naturally and for the convenience of the great New York interest—and will doubtless remain there under the new appointment he has just received as special agent of the census in charge of shipbuilding inquiry. Mr. Smith has thus been added to those whom Government position gives special opportunities to aid this shipbuilding combine and to make its arguments "official."

I sincerely disclaim any objection, in case the rest of the country is willing to be taxed to have its avails poured into the coffers of New York capitalists. Inasmuch as any distribution of such largesse could scarcely be on the basis of merit, I do not even complain that you have picked out the least needy and least deserving gentlemen among us. I do want to make it plain, however, that if the rest of the country is willing thus to sacrifice itself for some of our fellow-citizens, it is not by our request; and the rest of the country will not be thanked by us for it.

HAUTE FINANCE.

As an evidence of the kind of "haute finance" that is induced by legislation of this character may be cited that in an address before the Senate Committee on Commerce January 12, 1899 (page 29 of official report), Mr. Clement A. Griscom, president of the International Navigation Company (a large constituent element of the International Mercantile Marine Company), in speaking of what would have to be done under the provisions of the then pending bill, said his company would have to build 66,000 tons of ships, at a cost of \$7,500,000, if the bill became a law. This was equivalent to saying that they would cost \$125 a ton.

And yet we are told that the 1,000,000 tons of shipping taken over by the International Mercantile Marine Company—Morgan's shipping trust—is capitalized at \$190 a ton, although most of the ships are said to be 10 years old and over. What the value of 20-year old ships is is indicated in the recent sale of the *City of Rome* (originally one of the finest liners traversing the Atlantic), which

cost \$1,500,000, for \$85,000, to break up. It is claimed that more than half of the Morgan-Griscom fleet are over 12 years old.

It is no wonder that being capitalized at \$190 a ton the bonds of the combine have within a few weeks sold down to 84½. Nor is it surprising that the combine demands its pound of flesh in the form of a ship subsidy. The only thing that surprises is that these modern Shylocks should have consented to postpone its collection in view of the uncertainties of the pending Presidential election. It would be more natural for them to foreclose their mortgage now and insist upon this largesse to boost the bonds of the combine and to give a little life to its preferred stock. But perhaps they have not yet shaken out all of the innocents who bought that stock because of their sublime, if childlike, faith in the "high" character, "deserved" reputation, "great" ability, "commanding" influence, etc., of the eminent financiers who recommended the shipping water as a desirable investment—the water being ample to float the largest of the combine's ships.

In discussing this question of subsidies the *Journal of Commerce*, one of the great commercial papers of the country, said only a few days ago:

[*Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin*, New York, Saturday, March 5, 1904.]

It has been maintained that in spite of the high standard of wages in this country the materials for shipbuilding can be produced at less cost than in any other country, and that even the labor in using these materials in construction does not cost substantially more.

In commenting on a magazine article by Mr. Cramp, the Philadelphia shipbuilder, an advocate of subsidies, it further says:

He puts the stress entirely upon the cost of operating after the ship is built. But supposing it is true that building ships costs 25 to 30 per cent more and operating them costs 30 to 40 per cent more under the American flag, what is the logical argument so far as American commerce is concerned? It proves, of course, that it is much cheaper to have our exports and imports carried in foreign vessels. It enables us to get more for the exports, as less will have to be deducted for transportation, supposing that cost to come out of their value, and to pay less for the imports, as it will cost less to bring them to our ports; in other words, the real balance in the trade will be more in our favor. It pays us to have the carrying done rather than to do it ourselves.

In speaking of the mooted question of the comparative return to capital in the United States and in Europe, it says:

So far as return upon capital is concerned, it is doubtful whether there is any material difference now between the demands of this country and the most advanced countries of Europe.

I assume it refers to capital engaged in non-monopolistic enterprises, for there can be no question that capital invested in monopolies is receiving a very large return, the earnings of the United States Steel Corporation for the two years 1901 and 1902 being probably equal to the actual capital (not capitalization) invested in its plants, railroads, wharves, etc., while the "captains of industry" who manipulate such companies as the Brooklyn Union Gas Company, the Consolidated Gas Company, and the Metropolitan Traction Company, of New York, get back the sum of their original investment in from three to five years, while retaining their stock. It continues:

But if capital does not go into building and operating ships for the ocean carrying trade, it is because it can under present conditions do better in other employments. If our higher standard of wages is what makes it impracticable to build and operate ships for this trade in competition with others, it is solely because that standard can be maintained in other employments and is not in that. Both capital and labor do that which will give them the best return, and from the proceeds they hire others to do what it will not pay them to do.

SOUND ECONOMIC POLICY.

This is the only sound, economic policy. It is equally as sound for aggregations of individuals (nations) as for individuals, and never would be departed from if shrewd men had not learned that the surest way to success, if they had "an axe to grind," was to talk "patriotism," as they could then rely upon prejudice taking the place of reason, and thus could more surely put into effect their plan of taxing others, of course, solely for the good of those they taxed.

The *Journal of Commerce* then goes on to puncture the claim that ship subsidies would place no added burden on commerce. It says:

It is said that under the subsidy policy Americans would be able to pay the high wages and build ships, and pay the high cost of operating and sail the ships, in competition with those of other countries and without increasing the cost of ocean transportation, and thereby the mercantile marine would be built up, labor and capital would have increased employment, and there would be no added burden upon our commerce. But the cost of transportation has to be paid, and it has to come out of the production of the country.

It well says:

If subsidies could have the promised effect, which they could not without an enormous annual cost—far beyond that calculated by the advocates of this policy—it would only be because the Government paid a large part of the cost of transportation directly to the shipowners.

Of course to the gentlemen on the other side of the House this will not appear as particularly objectionable, first, because campaign contracts must be lived up to—they are debts of "honor," which even the supporters of the "Iowa" idea must stomach as the price of the party's success in 1898; and second, because it is in no sense a change of principle (or lack of it) in the operation of "protection." Instead of conferring the power through a tariff

schedule to levy an indirect tax upon consumers in the form of an enhanced price which the protected manufacturer is enabled to exact because of the duty upon the foreign competing article, the Government first collects the tax and then turns it over to the subsidy-hunting shipowner.

The Journal of Commerce continues:

If the Government paid it the people would have to furnish the funds, and the burden would be transferred from shippers to the general body of producers and would be largely increased in the process. Freight rates would not be visibly higher, but there would be an invisible charge upon the industries and trade of the country much larger than that which now goes to foreign shipping. We admit that this is a purely economic and commercial consideration, but it is intended to meet arguments which pretend that subsidies would be an economic and commercial benefit. These proceed upon fundamental fallacies.

It is more than a fundamental fallacy. It is more even than a selfish, cold-blooded proposition to "coddle" one industry at the expense of other industries. It is even more than the consummation of a shameful bargain to permit these ship-subsidy "beggars" to get direct from the United States Treasury a hundred dollars for every one they contributed to the Republican campaign chest to save the "honor" of the country in a Congressional election. It is an attempt upon the part of an insatiable band of monopolists to get the people to enter into contracts (?) to pay out millions of dollars annually, so that should the Democrats regain control of the Government the assistant Republicans as well as Republicans will plead the inviolability of this contract as an excuse for maintaining the "sacred" tariff.

The New York Commercial, in its issue of December 6, 1902, less than a month after the election of the Members of the present Congress, in a dispatch from this city dated the day before and headed

FRIENDS OF SHIP SUBSIDY TO MAKE A STRONG FIGHT,

has the following significant comment upon the relations which had been established with this band of greedy cormorants, the ship-subsidy "beggars":

It is asserted, moreover, that the managers of the Republican Congressional committee have come back from their recent campaign feeling very friendly to the subsidy idea, and that this will be a new and potent influence, operative in States where the subsidy has hitherto been weak.

It would be interesting to know how much it cost the hunters for ship subsidies to secure this "very friendly" feeling.

Evidently the potency of this influence was overrated, or perhaps the contribution was not large enough to call forth the most strenuous efforts, for I find from an editorial in the New York Commercial Bulletin of February 25, 1903, some ten weeks later, that this "cause," this "holy and unselfish" cause of the ship-subsidy grabbers, has lost ground. It says:

IS THE BLOW TO SHIP SUBSIDIES FINAL?

The Frye ship-subsidy bill of the Fifty-seventh Congress has gone the way of the Hanna-Payne bill of the Fifty-sixth Congress, and it is plain that the "cause" has lost ground, notably so since the Frye bill passed the Senate on the 17th of last March.

I had always heretofore assumed—at least it has been repeatedly so preached to me—that the Republican party was the especial guardian of the "honor" of the country. This being so, have we not a right to expect that "honor" should be kept with them; that they should get the "goods" and get 'em quick. Why this failure on the part of the Republican party as represented in this House in the Fifty-seventh Congress to live up to the terms of the contract entered into in its behalf by those who had the management of its campaign and solicited the funds which enabled the party to retain its control of this House? The Republican Members were the beneficiaries of that corruption fund and should have honored the contract that their agent entered into with the ship-subsidy hunters on their behalf, or else they should have publicly repudiated the acts of their agent in this matter and deposited from positions of power in the party those who had entered into the contract.

Was this done? Not at all. On the contrary, the agent, the go-between, the solicitor of the corruption fund which gave the party control of the Fifty-seventh Congress was canonized, while the providers of the "stuff" got nothing for their pains, their efforts, and their "infloence." Well may they exclaim, "How ungrateful are republics," or, rather, the Republican party, which is the same thing here.

The Commercial Bulletin, in commenting upon the refusal of the House committee "by a vote of 10 to 6 to give the bill a favorable report," says:

This is the death blow of this particular measure, due to a recognition by a majority of the committee that it had no vital support in public sentiment. It sprang from no demand of the people, but was an attempt to forestall matured judgment; to get something for the benefit of certain aggressive interests before the people of the country fully realized what it meant, what it would cost, and what benefit or injury it would bring them.

Of course "it had no vital support in public sentiment." Of course "it sprang from no demand of the people." Of course it was an attempt "to get something for the benefit of certain 'aggressive' interests." But is that any reason why the ship-subsidy hunters shouldn't get what was promised them? Haven't

they done their part? Why should they be treated different to the manufacturers of "blowhole" armor? Why are they not as much entitled to their pound of flesh as were the protected manufacturers who wrote their own schedules and had them inserted in the McKinley bill? Why should ship-subsidy campaign contributors be treated differently from the Pittsburg nabobs, who are permitted to keep a tariff of \$7.84 a ton on steel rails while they are underselling foreign competitors, laying their products down at the very gates of English steel mills at a lower price than the English manufacturer can produce them? Wasn't the schedule of the Dingley bill so fixed at the behest of the wire-nail people that they could charge twice the price for their goods that they sold them abroad for? Hasn't the sugar trust been permitted to squeeze some \$30,000,000 a year out of the American people as its part of the "swag"?

WHAT MR. E. M. BREWER SAYS.

I also want to read to the House some excerpts from a pamphlet printed and circulated by Mr. E. M. Brewer, of Boston, but written by Mr. Edward Kemble, a former president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce.

In an introductory note Mr. Brewer says, among other things:

As a citizen of Massachusetts and a shipowner, engaged in the foreign trade for many years, I take pleasure in availing of the opportunity which has been kindly allowed me of publishing and circulating the accompanying article on subsidies for ships, which was prepared by Edward Kemble, esq., an ex-president of the Chamber of Commerce of Boston.

I am also of the opinion that it is not good policy for the individual at this late day to establish himself in any line of business or to make any investment which can not flourish without Government support in the shape of subsidies or bounties.

I am also opposed to the principle of shipping subsidies as a matter of sentiment. The sight of a stately vessel bearing the flag of one's country would of course be pleasant and gratifying when it is known that she has been built and maintained by individual capital alone. To know that she has been built or operated in part by Government subsidy must "take the shine off." In short, the larger the subsidy or bounty the less the glory.

What old-fashioned ideas to express in these "get-there" days! How obsolete and out of date they must appear to the gentlemen who want to raid the Treasury through ship-subsidy legislation.

He concludes thus:

I have read nothing in opposition to shipping subsidies which has appealed to me so forcibly as Mr. Kemble's article, and I do not see how I can better help the good cause than in an effort to give it circulation in pamphlet form and in a different field.

E. M. BREWER.

27 KILBY STREET, BOSTON, March 20, 1903.

THE SHIP-SUBSIDY PROPOSAL—COGENT REASONING OF A BOSTON MERCHANT—HE SCOUTS THE SUGGESTION OF SENATOR FRYE'S BILL THAT A SUBSIDY IS NEEDED—THE AMERICAN AND THE FRENCH ARE THE ONLY TRANSATLANTIC LINES WHICH ARE SUBSIDIZED.

[By Edward Kemble, former president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce.]

The new subsidy bill which has been submitted to the Senate by Senator FRYE seems to have for its chief object the making of a gift of public money to several existing lines of prosperous American steamships. At all events, this will be the result should it become law.

The International Navigation Company is already receiving from the United States a subsidy of \$750,000 per year. This bill will increase this amount and increase the number of years during which a subsidy shall be paid to it. This line is prosperous, or if it is not it ought to be so. No one can travel by it or read its freight and passenger lists who knows anything about the shipping business and come to any other conclusion.

Next is the old Pacific Mail Company. We are reminded that this company once received from this Government, years ago, a subsidy of \$500,000 per year. Not satisfied with this, it proceeded to lobby in Washington for more. Its methods excited so much scandal an investigation was ordered, and it was found that the greater part of this munificent sum had been expended in lobbying for a greater sum; and so it was cut off from any subsidy at all.

We do things differently now. These are the days of "economies" in business. It is easier, more direct, and usually more effective to deal with campaign managers rather than with mere Congressmen. There is no risk of "squealing," and therefore no danger of scandal. The Collis P. Huntington methods are out of date.

Mr. Kemble then says:

During our civil war, when our Government could not protect our great fleet engaged in foreign trade, our citizens were compelled to sell; the subjects of Great Britain and other countries, availing themselves of their privilege to buy ships anywhere, bought ours and took the business with them. We have never been allowed to buy them back, or any others to replace them; or, if we did buy any, we have been obliged to sail them under a foreign flag, with two exceptions!

Would Senator FRYE have us believe that our American line, when it takes men at Southampton, as it does sometimes, and they come on board at the market price, perhaps \$30 per month, says to them: "This is an American ship, and we shall pay you \$50 per month!"

Mr. FRYE says, and it is often said: "Other nations pay subsidies, and the United States must do as other nations do." But it can not with truth be said that other nations do this. It is the exception wherever and whenever it has been done. There is not a nation on the face of the earth which pays subsidies as Mr. FRYE proposes to pay them—France alone possibly excepted. What all other nations do, however—and I don't know of one exception—is to permit their people to buy ships anywhere and put them under the home flag.

TWO LINES ONLY SUBSIDIZED.

There are ploughing the Atlantic ocean, between Europe and the United States, possibly fifty lines of steamships, and most of them never received one penny of government money, even for mail carriage! Only two of them receive a subsidy; one is our own "American line," the other the "French

line." No others in this service receive one dollar of subsidy. The Cunard Line none, the White Star Line none, the two great German express lines none. These four lines last named are the fast lines of the world. They own some twenty-five or more of the fleetest ships in the world, besides many others. Not one of these fast ships receives any subsidy from any government. These lines, however, are paid for the amount of mail they carry, both by the United States and Great Britain, at so much per pound. Bids are received by the Government of Great Britain for mail carriage, and the market price is paid for it.

* * * The United States pays yearly to the Cunard and White Star lines and to the German lines, and others, the market price for the amount of United States mail they may carry at so much per pound; but these amounts are not subsidies. It pays to its own American line \$750,000 per year, whether it carries any mail or not. This is a subsidy.

Listen to this!

These subsidy gentlemen are never tired of telling us all other nations pay subsidies, which is not true; but they never allude to the fact that all other nations permit their subjects to buy or build ships anywhere, and put them under the home flag, which is true.

Surely these ardent patriots, these subsidy hunters, would not be guilty of fibbing, or even of permitting their sleek and well-fed agents to do so.

Mr. Kemble says that the argument that we pay out \$200,000,000 annually for foreign freight which Americans may get by a policy of ship subsidies is misleading. He very properly asks whether these ship-subsidy hunters believe that should America put a hundred ships in the foreign trade in one year then "foreign shipping lines would retire from the field!" As he says, of course nothing of the kind would happen. This new competition would be met by a reduction of rates, with the probable result that where \$200,000,000 is now claimed to be paid on the foreign commerce of the United States there would be but \$100,000,000 paid.

MORGAN'S "COMMUNITY OF INTERESTS."

The advocates of this subsidy scheme also ignore the fact that, despite the existence of the International Mercantile Marine Company, competition yet exists in the matter of ocean freights. Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan has organized a "community of interests" among the great railroads of the country, but the Atlantic Ocean is still comparatively free, and foreign purchasers of American merchandise can yet say by what line it shall be transported. If the rates are the same and an American and British ship are competing for the business, he will probably select the British vessel.

He further calls attention to the fact that there are probably a hundred foreign-built ships sailing under foreign flags which are owned by Americans; that a portion of these belong to three great lines plying between the United States and Europe which earn a large portion of this money paid for foreign freight, which thus already falls into American pockets; that this sum is overstated; that a further portion is already secured by foreign ships, American owned, but sailing under a foreign flag; that it will be further reduced if American ships are subsidized to go into the business; that a large portion will inevitably be retained by foreigners in any event; and then very cogently asks, What becomes of the argument that "we pay this great sum to foreigners, and that it may be gathered back to us by means of subsidized ships?"

In discussing the matter of American-owned foreign ships to become registered here, and for Americans also to be permitted to buy other foreign-built ships and sail them under our flag and thus get not only the ships, but the business, Mr. Kemble says:

How much easier and how much more businesslike it will be if we not only permit these foreign ships now owned by Americans to be registered under our flag, but invite our countrymen to buy other lines to be put under our flag also (but for foreign trade only), and so get not only ships, but the business with them. This will build up our merchant marine and send our flag over the seas—a matter which some public men talk much about.

I will not take the time to read any further, but will insert the balance of this excellent article, which has a good deal of the ring of that true Americanism which simply asks a fair field but no favor.

It continues thus:

But Mr. FRYE says this will not protect our shipyards; that if foreign-built ships are admitted to American registry, even for foreign trade only, "our shipyards will not increase; they will build only for coastwise, lake, and river trade," and cries out, "What shall we do for the dying industry?" But these shipyards have not built ships to any great extent for foreign trade for forty years or more. They say they have not been able to do so, at least not for the European trade; and yet, behold their enormous growth within that period! There is no more successful or flourishing line of business in this country than this "dying industry," as he calls it. Our shipbuilding plants are growing in size, have doubled in number within a short time, are equal to any in the world, are turning out some of the finest ships in the world, and are full of business.

What more does he want? The American Shipbuilding Company stands third on the world's list of shipbuilding plants in amount of tonnage turned out last year! But they can not or will not turn out ships at prices which will enable us to go into competition for the European trade. We have, in late years, exported iron and steel plates to be built into ships abroad. It would seem, therefore, that we can buy a ship made of American iron in England cheaper than we can buy one of American iron in the United States!

Mr. Kemble might have added that that "American iron" is sold abroad at free-trade prices, while, because of the tariff, the Steel Trust squeezes American shipbuilders by compelling them to pay protected—trust—prices for the steel plates they use.

\$750,000 A YEAR, BUT WANT MORE.

One of Mr. FRYE's arguments for a new subsidy bill is this: He says that "the four ships of the American Line, although receiving a subsidy of \$750,000 per year, have never realized any profit, but have been supported by the company's ships (called the Red Star Line) which sail under the Belgian flag." This is a most extraordinary statement, and by it he condemns the whole subsidy system by words out of his own mouth. If this were true, it would be a conclusive argument against any subsidies whatever. Here is a line of first-class ships running between New York and Southampton and receiving from the United States a subsidy of \$750,000 per year, which, according to Mr. FRYE, not only makes no money, but is maintained by another line running between New York and Antwerp, which receives no subsidy at all. Both lines have weekly sailings and are owned by the International Navigation Company. The only logical inference is that subsidies are an obstacle to success and that steamship lines are more prosperous without them.

Furthermore, he declares that these "American Line steamers each carried, according to sworn statements, last year \$4,200,000 worth of farm products, while the same tonnage slow steamer could not have carried more than \$2,250,000 worth of wheat." Since the steamers of the Antwerp, or Red Star Line, are not only slower but smaller than those of the American Line, I presume they are covered by this statement. So it transpires that, although slower and smaller and without any subsidy, and, I may add, with passenger lists insignificant when compared with those of the American Line, they not only supported themselves, but helped support the others!

Mr. FRYE says subsidies will put more ships afloat and so make rates lower. How low would he have them? It has been possible lately to contract for grain to Europe at 1d. per bushel, which is less than \$1 per ton! Hundreds of thousands of tons have been carried during the past five years at 2d. and 3d. per bushel, or less than about \$1.50 to \$2.50 per ton! And provisions and cotton on the same low basis. Cotton to-day can be contracted to Europe at about 12 cents per 100 pounds.

There is a feeling of pride in the desire that our flag may wave in foreign seas, but what satisfaction or what honor is there when it flies from the masthead of a subsidized ship? Sentiment is robbed of all nobility when it is supported by the force of money.

Commerce is in the line of individual enterprise, not of governmental favor, and while it should be fostered and encouraged and protected by Government in all legitimate ways, it is of no credit or importance when supported by Government money. Our flag at the masthead of a man-of-war signifies power, on a subsidized merchant ship the vulgarity of riches.

"FLABBY" ECONOMICS.

A few weeks ago, in a previous speech, I took occasion to commend the lucidity of expression of the editor of one of the leading Chicago weeklies—the Public. In Mr. Post's article on this subject, from which I now quote, the House will observe that he has fully maintained his deservedly high reputation as an expounder of economics, of economics that mean something, not those of the usual flabby professorial style that commence nowhere, lead nowhere, and end nowhere, but usually whose most marked characteristic is a demand for the preservation of the sanctity of "vested rights." The article has but recently been called to my attention, and is entitled:

SUBSIDIES THE CLIMAX OF THE PROTECTIVE SUPERSTITION.

[By Louis F. Post, editor of the Public.]

At the risk of being suspected as a Greek bearing gifts, I should like to ask protectionists—those who believe in protectionism upon principle, of course, and not the trusts that seek protection merely for their own interests and whose members greedily appropriate its benefits to their own private use—to consider very thoughtfully the probable effect of ship subsidies upon the popularity of their cherished doctrine.

Subsidies are unquestionably in line with the protective idea, for they are one of the modes of "encouraging domestic industry" by means of taxation. But they are altogether too candidly direct in method and too recklessly transparent in purpose. The masses of the people may feel their burdens, even under our indirect system of taxation, and are certain to recognize their plundering character. Is it wise, then, for sincerely philanthropic and patriotic protectionists to risk the possibilities of exposure of the essential nature of protection to which this all too candid mode of application will subject it?

I am glad to observe that one of the leading Republicans, one of the few who have shown occasional hesitancy in responding to the party whip—the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH—has just come over to this side of the House to hear what I have to say as to the absurdities of the protective policy. I submit to him how difficult it must be for any sincere believer in that principle to reconcile these inconsistencies.

When we remember some of the "recklessly transparent" statements that were for years unblushingly made by protectionist orators and newspapers, such as, for instance, "the foreigner pays the tax;" "protection raises wages," while also "inducing competition, and consequently reducing prices;" and "there are no trusts," etc., I fear Mr. Post is a little too confident when he asserts that the masses "are certain to recognize their (subsidies) plundering character."

He continues:

For my part, I am quite willing to concede the superiority, for the purpose of protection to home industry, of subsidies paid directly out of the public Treasury over subsidies paid by consumers of domestic goods indirectly to the beneficiaries under compulsion of protective tariffs. The direct subsidy is better for many reasons.

In the first place, it is open and above board. Everybody can know who gets it and how much he gets.

In this I fear he also exhibits an unwarranted confidence. The astute gentlemen who are responsible for this commission bill are taking good care that the people shall not know, if they can help it, how deep they are going to put their hands into the public Treasury under the plea of building up the American merchant marine.

He proceeds:

Everybody can know also whether those who do get it divide up fairly with their workmen, according to the true intent of the law. Of the indirect or protective tariff subsidies that is not true. The beneficiaries can, and in practice actually do, conceal their plunder. It comes from so many individual sources, and in ways so various and complicated, that no one can keep track of it except the beneficiaries themselves. In consequence their workmen are systematically robbed of the share which protective laws design that they should receive.

The only resource of workmen is to strike when they suspect an unfair division, and that is very unsatisfactory all around. In this respect alone the direct subsidy has marked advantages over the protective-tariff subsidy. Another of relative advantages is its effect upon the public at large.

The object of both methods is to encourage domestic production. In this respect the tariff method operates with great and harassing awkwardness. In order to encourage the production of woolen goods, for instance, obstructions are put in the way of the importation of foreign wools. Those that are imported commercially are subjected to import taxes, which increase the price not only to the amount of the tax, but also to the amount of several commercial profits upon the tax, while those that are imported by travelers cause their owners no end of annoyance, to say nothing of the expense, when they land at a home port.

I have never been able to understand how a sincere protectionist—one who really believes that it works out as its advocates claim—could square his belief in protection with his action in returning from abroad loaded with foreign goods; and so far from travelers who do this (and all protectionists who have money do, James G. Blaine "by courtesy" bringing in some thirty-five trunks) having any cause for complaint that they can not bring their foreign-bought personal belongings in without paying a heavy duty, it has always seemed to me that they were nothing less than traitors to the cause of "protection," which they espoused only so long as it trod on other toes than their own. But that is merely a side remark. The article continues:

All this extra cost and annoyance must be submitted to until the domestic product has been brought up to the standard of the competing foreign article. Nor does the burden fall off then. For when the domestic product reaches the foreign standard of quality and price, its protected manufacturers insist upon having the protective tariff continued, to enable them to "invade" foreign markets in the name of American enterprise, this invasion consisting in selling their goods at free-trade prices abroad while maintaining protection prices at home.

So that, instead of the theory of protection working out as its devotees insist it does, viz, for the benefit of the whole people, in their receiving the advantages of that competition which we are told it promotes, the foreigner, the despised and hated foreigner, gets his goods from the American manufacturer at free-trade prices, while the same manufacturer sells the same goods here in the United States to the gullible worshipers of the "protection" idol at protected or "trust" prices. But let Mr. Post speak for himself:

And that is not all. Sheep raisers clamor for protective tariffs on wool to enable them to force their product upon the domestic woolen manufacturers, who force their product upon tailors. And tailors clamor for protective tariffs upon clothing to enable them to recoup the extra price they have to pay for cloth.

Protective tariffs are thus piled up all along the line, from the item of the growers of the raw materials to that of the last touch upon the finished product. For what? Simply to build up an infant industry, and to enable it to invade foreign markets after it has been built up. Is a more wasteful method conceivable? Compare that expensive and harassing process of indirect subsidies with the direct subsidy and note how indescribably superior the latter is.

Under the direct subsidy nobody would be annoyed by custom-house officers while the infant industry was growing to maturity. The disadvantages under which the American producer labored being overcome by subsidies paid out of the public Treasury, his goods would enter the domestic market at lower prices than the foreign goods.

The "Public" forgets that cheapness is a curse and not a blessing. Did not President Harrison say, "A cheap coat makes a cheap man?"

Consequently foreign goods would stay out, except to the extent that the domestic producer was unable fully to meet the home demand, which would be only in the infantile years of his industry. During that period he would be encouraged by having as much of the home market secured to him as he could supply, while home consumers would not be pestered with custom-house regulations in order to procure from abroad what he could not supply, nor burdened with excessive prices for either the foreign or the domestic article. And, although the American people would have to pay the direct subsidy, they would not also have to pay interest upon it every time the subsidized goods changed hands in trade, as they must under a protective tariff.

This is one of the advantages that bounties have over the protective (?) system, as the interest upon the tax and the profits upon it add about 50 per cent to the duty, so that a tariff tax of 60 per cent really becomes a 90 per cent tax by the time the consumer purchases the imported article.

The same advantageous difference would continue after the domestic goods had been brought to the level of the foreign standard and the home market could be fully supplied. They could then be sold at home at a price low enough to keep out the foreign article, and, thanks to the subsidy, would also be sent abroad to undersell foreign goods in their own market.

Other reasons might be urged were space abundant. But enough has been said to show the superiority of the direct-subsidy system. Whether for the purpose of building up an infant industry at home or of enabling it to invade foreign markets after it is built up, indirect subsidies through protective tariffs are vastly inferior to direct subsidies paid out of the public treasury.

But the direct subsidy has also great disadvantages. It is simple. It is easily understood. It is manifestly for the benefit of special interests, and not for the general good. And, withal, it is certain, if overdone—a fate which attends upon all protective methods—to end speedily in an outburst of indignant ridicule.

For myself I sometimes doubt whether protection can be "overdone." The American people are so gullible and throw all reason to the winds the moment some one gets up and declares he has a scheme to "tax the people so as to make them rich!"

These do not sound like disadvantages, and, so far as the public is concerned, they are not. But they are serious disadvantages from the protection point of view. Such a method of encouraging domestic industry might, if once it were adopted, everlastingly discredit the whole protection theory. That is reason enough for the shyness which shrewd protectionists have heretofore exhibited toward direct subsidies for industrial encouragement.

Lately, however, the fat and greedy beneficiaries of protective tariffs, finding no longer any profit for themselves in that method of taxing Peter to enrich Paul, have been turning with favor toward the direct subsidy system. The first step, the sugar bounty, was not encouraging. It was a mistake to begin with a product like sugar. The purely private nature of this bounty was too obvious. For a beginning shipping bounties are better. The people know but little about the modern shipping business, and they are ambitious to boast of a great mercantile navy.

Mr. Post hits it there.

This is but an illustration of how the passions of the people, here as elsewhere, are played on for their own undoing. This fever for "bigness" in a navy is being sedulously cultivated by the magnates of the trusts, as they well know that almost any kind of a steal can be put through if they can but throw the glamour of "patriotism" around it.

Subsidies for ships, therefore, do not seem so much as bounties on sugar like private gifts, even if the chief beneficiaries of the subsidies be great trust magnates of the country.

But if the system of subsidies once takes root in shipping bounties, is anyone so fatuous as to believe that it will end there? Let the protective tariff system answer. Its multitudinous ramifications and the horde of beggars in all kinds of industrial exploitation clamoring for its favors abundantly testify that there is no limit to public gifts for private benefit short of the will and ability of the giver.

A "horde of beggars" forsooth! On what meat has this mere editor of a Chicago weekly newspaper fed that he dares to stigmatize the financial magnates who are perspiring with patriotic fervor in their efforts to convince the American people that the safety, glory, and honor of the nation are at stake if they do not indorse ship subsidies.

If this irreverent editor does not look out he may find that these "captains of industry" will be foreclosing their mortgage on the Republican party and demand that a "Pennypacker" law, a "lèse majesté" law, a press-throttling law be passed by this House, so as to protect the men who contributed so liberally to save the country in 1898, and who merely ask to be paid back a hundred for one through a ship-subsidy bill.

Let shipowners be subsidized out of the public Treasury, and a cry for similar direct subsidies will go up from every industry that can not make the direct subsidies of the protective tariff serve it. If ships, why not exports? European nations, now cited as examples of ship subsidizers, do subsidize some exports with a view to the commercial invasion of other countries.

Shall we shrink from equipping our exporters for that kind of warfare? It has been seen how one tariff breeds another. Why shall not one subsidy breed another? There is no reason for confining subsidies to the encouragement of international trade. If it is good public policy to subsidize ships for foreign commerce, it must be good public policy to subsidize ships and railroads for domestic commerce.

If it is good public policy to subsidize commodities for export, it must be good public policy to subsidize commodities for home consumption. Does anyone doubt, at any rate, that these extensions of subsidies can be urged as plausibly as the ship subsidy on grounds of public policy? If, for example, a protective tariff on wool for the protection of American sheep could be made an issue in national politics, why not a subsidy on wool, now that the protective tariff fails to protect it?

It is entirely true, as Mr. Post says, that there is just as much reason (and as little) for subsidizing goods for domestic consumption as for export, and can be urged just as plausibly. A subsidy to a woolgrower is as justifiable as a "duty" to a wool manufacturer.

Protectionists who believe that protection is a legitimate public policy should make no mistake about the ship-subsidy question. With ship subsidies for a starting point and precedent, there will be no end to the objects vociferously seeking subsidies and no conceivable end to those getting them. But long before the possible end is reached the whole thing will strike the American sense of humor as unspeakably ridiculous, and the subsidy system, with the protective system, of which it is part, will collapse.

Of course the cry for ship subsidies is no more ridiculous than one which was put to such good use a few campaigns back—"the foreigner pays the tax." For myself, I wish I could discern some evidence that the American people turn their "sense of humor" on to these questions of taxation. For while the ridiculous talk about the tariff not being a tax because "it is paid by the foreigner" is no longer put forth, yet those who formerly advanced it are not "laughed out of court" when they advance other protectionist superstitions, some of which yet do service.

Since that is a consummation which free traders devoutly wish for, they might be quizzically asked why they object to this protection-destroying system of subsidies. It might be urged that the ship subsidy should be welcomed by them as an ally. But free traders are not playing in a game. They are not opposing protection for sport. They oppose it because, whatever may be the mode of application, it is in practice destructive to wholesome industry and in principle economically false and morally pernicious.

The subsidy movement is the normal culmination of a long era of protection by tariffs. In that era a few gigantic trusts, promoted and buttressed, if not caused by, protection, have developed. They hold the fate of legitimate industry almost at their mercy, and threaten even the political integrity of the Republic. They have perverted the intellectual standard of schools and colleges. They have polluted the moral atmosphere of churches. They have insinuated their influence into newspaper sanctuaries.

"Insinuated" does not describe the situation. If he had said they have acquired many of the leading newspapers of the country and were directing their policy, he would but have stated the facts.

The article concludes as follows:

They have dictated policies in legislative assemblies, seated their own professional servants upon the judicial bench, corrupted nominating conventions, and by trick and device diverted the course of public opinion itself. And now, glutted with pelf and drunken with power, they cynically propose to rob the public boldly, directly from the public Treasury, as for a generation they have been robbing it stealthily by means of protective tariffs.

That in doing this they will cause the whole protection edifice to crumble is reasonably to be expected. But that much-desired ending of the most absurd and demoralizing superstition of economic history is not a reason for advocating subsidies as the destructive means. This would, indeed, be doing evil that good might come. Much more to the honor of American intelligence and American sensitiveness to right and justice would be for American citizenship to condemn the protective scheme with deliberation than to leave it to the fates.

Rather than to approve the shipping subsidy, though in the reasonable hope that its development would expose the absurd iniquity of protection and loosen the grasp of that superstition, conscientious and intelligent citizens will demand that the shipping subsidy be condemned, because it is one of the forms of that superstition. Free traders would rather kill protection with the club of common sense or the sword of common justice than help to poison with an overdose of subsidies, however reconciled they might be to seeing it so poisoned by its friends.

I have recently come across another article on this subject, which, although treating it from a different standpoint from that of the Public, yet is equally interesting and instructive. This article appeared in "the" Democratic paper of Pennsylvania some months ago, but has only now been called to my attention. Incidentally I would say if the papers which are published in Philadelphia and Pittsburg which call themselves Democratic were as fearless and unfaltering in their devotion to and advocacy of the fundamental Democratic principle "equal rights to all, special privileges to none," as is the Johnstown Democrat; if they applied that principle in its fullness when discussing public questions as that paper does; if they denied the right of any man to a position of power or influence in the party who has not consistently and unequivocally championed that principle, even the protection-soaked State of Pennsylvania would soon become Democratic.

I regret that the limited time allotted me prevents my reading the entire article, and that I must therefore content myself with merely summarizing its contents. The article is headed:

SHIP SUBSIDIES IN NEW GUISE.

After quoting a circular which was being sent out by the Home Market Club, of Boston, asking certain questions of "governors, presidents of railroads, banks, etc.," it says: "The club's own preference is not left in doubt." Subsidies, it says, are "not warranted by the Constitution."

After referring to the fact that "three such bills have failed since 1897," though promised by the great party leaders in return for heavy campaign contributions, and that certain influential leaders "did their best to deliver the goods," it says:

Some of the leading trusts, by a great display of timidity and good sense, advised their Republican Congressmen to go slow in voting for a subsidy bill.

It says:

They feared such a bold appropriation of the people's money would spoil the tariff "graft" which gave the trusts such unparalleled prosperity.

It says:

They virtually said to the shipping people:

"Of course we should like to let you in on a good, fat graft, but we don't want you to spoil our graft, and in the end yours too. We must manage to keep the Republican party in power somehow or all will be lost.

"The people are easy if you approach them in the right way and on the right side; but, like a young cow, they will kick and refuse to be milked when approached from the wrong side. Don't jeopardize both our interests by attempting something rash. We know the people will stand for indirect taxes, because they do not see them, or because they vainly imagine that somebody else may be paying them, or that, in some absurd way, they are benefited by such taxes; but they might rebel and kick our whole graft over if we should show our hand. We shall gladly help you if you can devise some new scheme that will fit on the present indirect tariff-tax system. See what you can do."

There is just one other paragraph in this article which I will call attention to. After alluding to a contract which the International Mercantile Marine Company has made with England, which, it says, "may prevent that patriotic trust from participating so largely in these tariff profits," continues:

Just why this shipping trust should make such an unfavorable contract with the British Government is not apparent, unless we conclude that the trust is open to legal attack, both in Great Britain and this country. In this case it is prudent to get some kind of a legal status and to avoid trouble with British courts. It would be very uncomfortable if this trust was outlawed in both countries and could not land its ships at either end, except under a pirate flag or the flag of some small foreign country.

"OUTLAW" AND "PIRATE," INDEED!

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the distinguished patriots who organized the International Mercantile Marine Company, who so generously let the American investor "in" on this "good thing," but who find themselves still carrying a part of the immense body of water upon which its shares are based, being capitalized at \$200 a ton, when new ships cost but \$120 a ton, on their behalf I protest against the use of such language. "Outlaw" and "pi-

rate," indeed! Is there no sanctity where millionaire promoters are concerned? Would it not be in order for this House to communicate with the attorney-general of Pennsylvania, suggesting that the Pennypacker "press-muzzling" law be invoked to protect these "princes of finance" from such attacks?

If such language as this is permitted to be used about these gentlemen, the next thing we shall hear will be that this audacious paper has used equally reprehensible language concerning the dominating factor of the anthracite coal trust, for it will be remembered that it was the same gentleman who organized and controls the coal trust that offered the shares of the Mercantile Marine Company to a confiding public.

Mr. Chairman, the foundations of American liberty are being undermined when the country permits such language to be used when speaking of the men who so patriotically saved the "honor" of the country.

The extreme position that the advocates of ship subsidies are sometimes driven to in order to maintain their claim for this form of special privilege is evidenced in an oratorical outburst of Senator FRYE, who said:

Trade can not precede the mail! The mail must precede the trade!

Can one conceive of a more absurd misstatement than this?

In order to prove his wild observation the Senator would have to show that the chief delight of the primitive savage is to produce and consume literature. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] three days ago, on my disclaiming any sympathy with paternalism, insisting that I was an individualist, said that he felt sure that the House would be glad to have me some time or other explain what I meant by "individualism." While that is, of course, too large a subject to take up to-day, let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that individualism is the direct antithesis of the principle, or lack of it, upon which this ship-subsidy commission bill is based. This bill is paternalism run mad. It is the worst form of paternalism, because it is paternalism for the exclusive benefit of a few millionaire shipowners and trust exploiters.

PROTECTIONISTS THE ONLY BOUNTY HUNTERS.

Isn't it rather singular that the only people who advocate subsidies are the protectionists? You never hear of a free-trader advocating ship subsidies or other forms of bounty. It is only those whose theory, if carried to its logical conclusion, would prevent all trade, destroy all commerce with foreigners, who contend that the people should be taxed and the proceeds turned over to subsidy beggars and bounty hunters in order to "foster" trade. True, not all protectionists are for subsidies. Perhaps that is due to their having a somewhat more logical mind than the others, and they see that if trade is so bad a thing that we must erect artificial barriers to prevent those who have a desire to trade from doing so, it is illogical to subsidize people to do that very thing.

I confess that the workings of the protectionist mind are incomprehensible to me. First we are told that trade is a bad thing; that we must produce the things for ourselves, thus giving employment to American labor and profits to American capital. To insure this being done we are told that it is necessary to prohibit those who have a desire to trade with foreigners by erecting an artificial wall in the shape of a tariff tax upon goods brought to this country. So far the position of the protectionist is intelligible, if not commendable. But when they proceed to the next position and say we have a surplus which must be disposed of abroad and that we must create a market for this surplus, then the mind gets confused. For I assume that even protectionists will give the inhabitants of other countries credit for possessing equal intelligence with ourselves. If that is so, then if the protective theory is correct for the people of this country it must be equally correct for the people of other countries.

Even if foreigners are not naturally endowed with equal intelligence, they have American protectionist literature to educate them, for there is no export duty on it, and from it they can learn the beauties of that system. This being so, the hated foreigner will naturally say, "If foreign trade is a bad thing, as the American protectionist contends, then we must erect an impassible barrier over which the American manufacturer can not 'push' his goods." Should they carry this policy to its logical conclusion and make the barrier really impassible, then obviously these "surplus" products of ours would be returned to us, and would, I assume, if the the protectionist theory is correct, rot on our hands. I shall not digress to ask how there can be a "surplus" of any product in any country, if there is (as there certainly is in this country) in that country those who are in need of some of that very product and who are willing, aye, begging for the opportunity to exert their labor in the production of almost anything to exchange for that product. To do so would be to stir up another phase of this question of monopoly.

We then come to the next step in mental protection, viz, that we should send out of the country more goods than are brought

in, because in doing so we enrich ourselves, and of course ship-subsidies are a means to that end. It must be obvious that if we only make the bounty large enough—say sufficient to pay for the building of the ships and all the cost of manning and operating them—we can not only send our "surplus" abroad, but also our entire products. If this is the correct thing to do—and certainly subsidies could then be justified—then we only need to amend the ship-subsidy plan in one particular, and that is to pay a bounty on all products of every kind and nature shipped abroad, but only on condition that the subsidized ships shall return here empty. We could thus very rapidly increase our "balance of trade" enormously.

Because this "favorable" balance-of-trade theory is interwoven with and is the corollary of "fighting" for a market for our surplus goods which gives strength to this cry for ship subsidies, I will append to my remarks, although I will not read it to the House, an article which I contributed to the *Johnstown Democrat* recently on that very subject. While the leader of the minority has honored me by incorporating it in one of his recent speeches, yet, as it is apropos to this subject, I will print it now, including, however, the concluding paragraphs, which he omitted.

THE BALANCE-OF-TRADE FALLACY.

[By Congressman ROBERT BAKER. From the *Daily Democrat*, Johnstown, Pa., Sunday, February 14, 1904.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 13, 1904.

When we consider how widespread is the belief, or rather acceptance of the statement, that not only does protection "enable" the protected manufacturers to pay high wages, but that in some occult way, which even its advocates do not explain, it "compels" their payment by protected manufacturers, it ought not, I assume, to be an occasion for surprise to find how prevalent is the idea that that country whose exports exceed its imports is thereby made prosperous.

Certainly no fallacy is so widely accepted, has so many devotees, is so infrequently challenged. And yet, even the most cursory thought, the most simple examination of the subject should be sufficient to expose its fallaciousness. That it is widespread, that it is generally accepted, is due largely, I think, to the fact that among the rarest of mental gifts seems to be the ability to think in simple terms and simple language, to reason from a fundamental premise. The civilization of to-day is apparently so complex, its ramifications so varied and extensive to so lace and interlace through every artery of commerce, it seems to be to so large an extent involved in the "destiny" of nations and the "world-power" idea, that practically all who give the matter any consideration "throw up the sponge" so soon as they commence to think upon the subject.

The policies of nations, the fates of empires, aye, the very existence of civilization itself, seems to most people to be involved in the contest for commercial supremacy which the great nations of the world are engaged in. So common and so prevalent is the idea of "war" associated with commerce, that it has come to be the usual term of expression that this or that nation must "fight" for commercial supremacy, and the reason advanced by people to-day why nations must fight is not, as in the past, ostensibly for territorial aggrandizement for the extension of the geographical boundaries of nations, but that they must "fight for markets," fight for the right to push the sale of their products among the people of other nations. Of course it is true that this talk of fighting for the "open door," this talk of the necessity of war and warlike methods, these bases from which "attacks" shall be made upon the semicivilized countries of the Orient, is confined to countries like China, but the underlying thought is equally applicable to the more civilized nations.

We are told that it is essential to the continued prosperity of the United States that it shall "open up" a market in Asia for its "superfluous" products. We are told that within a certain limited number of years our trade with the Orient has increased 20 to 50 or maybe 100 per cent, and that it now amounts to two or three hundred million dollars. Yet, almost in the same breath, those who advocate strenuously as a basis for our dealings with other nations who are likewise attempting to force China to purchase their goods, tell us that the internal trade of the United States amounts to eighteen or twenty billion dollars.

Is it not singular that these devotees of war and warlike methods, these people who advocate the necessity of a big navy in order to secure the "open door," who would force our goods upon the heathen Chinese, should not as yet have advocated the creation and establishment of a gigantic State militia in order that the goods produced in New York may be forced upon the people of Ohio and Pennsylvania; that the manufacturers in Illinois require a large standing army in that State to force the sale of their goods upon Wisconsin, Iowa, and Indiana? And yet to those who are not inoculated with this virus for immense armies or big navies it should appear no more fantastic and unreasonable for the people of these and other States to insist that the goods created within their territories shall be forced upon the people of adjoining States than that we should, as a nation, force our goods upon the Chinaman, the Jap, the Russian, or the Hindoo.

As I have said, the prevalence of this idea that markets must be fought for is largely responsible indirectly, if not directly, for the thought that those nations which export the most and import the least are thereby made the most prosperous. And yet if one will but think on this subject in a simple way, will apply the same powers of logical analysis which he gives to his own affairs, will ask himself the question why the doing of something by a large number of people in their collective capacity has a different effect upon them, as a whole, than what would follow the same act of an individual, he must at once see the utter absurdity and falsity of the contention that an excess of exports proves that the nation is thereby becoming rich. Nations are great aggregations of individuals. It is just as true that a hundred thousand individuals can not send out a million dollars' worth of wealth, receiving back \$900,000, and thereby become rich, as if it were the transaction of one individual.

Perhaps the most surprising thing in connection with this delusion is the fact, admitted even by the most ardent advocates of the "profitableness" of excess exports, that Great Britain, admittedly next to the United States the most prosperous nation in the world, has for a long period of years been importing hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of wealth in excess of her exports. For the year ending June 30, 1903, her excess of imports over exports amounted to the enormous sum of \$400,000,000. During the same year the excess exports over imports of the United States amounted to \$400,000,000.

If the contention that that nation is most prosperous which has an excess of exports is sound, then it follows that England by this time must have been almost entirely denuded of all wealth, for her excess of imports has

been going on for decades and must now aggregate many billions of dollars. If this contention is the correct one, then the year ending June 30, 1903, made England relatively thirteen hundred millions of dollars poorer than the United States, four hundred millions of this being the United States excess of exports and nine hundred millions Great Britain's excess of imports.

The explanation usually given this so-called "favorable" balance of trade is that, to quote President McKinley, we get it back in "pure gold." This in face of the fact that our total excess exports of gold and silver during the last hundred years amounts to over a billion dollars. It would be interesting to know how these "balance of trade" theorists account for England having an enormous stock of gold and silver. She has, however, accumulations running into the hundreds of millions of these precious metals, while the United States is one of the largest producers of gold and silver. So that we have the anomaly, if this balance of trade theory is correct, of the nation whose imports (income) habitually exceed her exports (outgo) by several hundred millions annually and produces none of the metals—therefore must import them—accumulating large amounts, while the United States, a large producer of gold and silver, exports several hundred millions in excess of her imports and yet does not accumulate gold and silver to the extent that Great Britain does.

Two elements that go to make up this so-called "favorable" balance are usually ignored, viz, undervaluation of our \$500,000,000 of imports (for the purpose of partly escaping the tariff tax) amounting probably to fifty millions annually, while it is admitted that the number of American tourists visiting Europe is several times as large as the Europeans who visit America. Probably not less than \$35,000,000 represents the excess of exports spent by Americans abroad as compared with imports spent by foreigners in America. In addition some ninety millions of our apparent excess exports is freight charges paid to ships owned abroad, principally British.

There is another element also generally overlooked. That is the tribute paid every year to those who own American soil but who live abroad. How large this tribute is there is no means of knowing, but that it amounts to scores if not hundreds of millions of dollars a year there can be no doubt. William Waldorf Astor alone is reputed to receive such tribute to the amount of \$9,000,000 a year. When we consider the scores of English and European titles which have been married to American heiresses solely because of the large rent rolls that went with these girls, some of whom receive incomes of millions a year, we get a glimpse of the aggregate of the tribute thus paid to foreigners—to increase our "favorable" trade balance.

When Mrs. Schenley, the owner of \$50,000,000 of Pittsburg property, died recently in London, where she had continuously resided for fifty years, drawing tribute from some 25,000 Pittsburg tenants to the tune of millions a year, Andrew Carnegie (himself spending millions in Great Britain) cabled to America that Pittsburg's "queenly benefactress" had passed away and that she was a "true and loyal" Pittsburger to the end.

If one who lays a city or nation under tribute and draws from that country millions of dollars of wealth for which he gives no return, thereby increasing the "balance of trade"—excessive exports—of the country so laid under tribute is a "benefactor," then Mrs. Schenley, William Waldorf Astor, Consuelo Vanderbilt, and the daughters of the Bradley-Martins, the Leiters, the Zimmermans, et al., are indeed benefactors, as the ground rents and interest on stocks they draw to England unquestionably swell American exports and consequently increase its "favorable" trade balance.

Of course we can not expect those occupying the dilapidated shanties on the Schenley estate nor those crowded into Astor double-decker tenements in New York to appreciate how good it is for them and the country that they should contribute the millions that are spent for London mansions and Scotch castles. They have not been educated in the school of "high finance" and are therefore incapable of recognizing the advantage of an outgo in excess of income. Being untutored in the mysteries of the "balance of trade" doctrine, they would probably exclaim:

"Hang your 'balance-of-trade' theory! You leave us what we have heretofore paid as rent, and we'll manage to get along with our undepleted income and won't worry that our balance of trade is 'unfavorable.'"

ROBERT BAKER.

"STACKING" THE CARDS.

In a speech delivered at Concord, N. H., August 23, 1902, the President said:

About all we have a right to expect from the Government is that it will see that the cards are not stacked.

That sentiment I heartily applaud. It may not be the most refined manner of expressing the idea, but that's of no moment. The important thing is that it correctly defines the most essential function of government—to insure to all "equality of opportunity."

The difference, however, between Mr. Roosevelt and myself is that I believe in that principle in its fullness and would apply it in its entirety, while he has done nothing to show that he really believes in it, let alone apply it as a principle of government. On the contrary, the policies for which he stands and which he applies nullify it.

This bill does not merely provide that the cards shall be "stacked" against the common people and in favor of the ship-subsidy beggars, but if its real purpose is carried out it will compel the people to pay for the "chips" which those gamblers use.

The greatest evil of the times, the one which must be uprooted before there can be any marked improvement in our governmental affairs, is the purchase of legislation by corporations, especially by such as seek to obtain special privileges. The money which they contribute to party campaign funds, municipal, State, and national, is producing a cancer which is destroying the very life of the Republic. As I intimated in the beginning, if this bill were the most innocent bill which ever came before this House the circumstances which led up to its introduction should forever condemn it.

ENGLISH BY-ELECTIONS.

A few months ago our Republican friends were pointing to Great Britain as evidence of the growth of the protectionist delusion. One of the Ohio Members, who has since become a member of the other House, even went to the extent of inserting in the *RECORD* some forty pages of speeches of that great reactionary, Joseph Chamberlain, with the undoubted object of making

them available for distribution through the mails free of cost by the Republican Congressional committee. It is true that for some weeks now we have heard no more about the great change of sentiment in England on the tariff question. Even the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber have apparently heard something of the results of recent by-elections in Great Britain, so that they are not now so sure that her fiscal system is to be overthrown and that she is to return to "protection."

In order that my Republican friends may have the facts before them, and as those facts have been kept from them by their leaders, I will insert, as an appendix to my remarks, a table showing the results of recent by-elections in the United Kingdom, which show that Chamberlain's appeal to the ignorance, bigotry, and passions of the people there has been in vain. That this arch traitor to the principle of free trade will adopt some other expedient to resuscitate himself politically, now that he can no longer use his "Little-Englander" and "pro-Boer" slurs to arouse the passions of the people, there can be no doubt; but that will be small comfort to protectionists here, as he can be of no further use to them now that his protection policy has been shown to be unpopular.

I sincerely trust that they have not wasted their campaign funds by ordering several million copies of Chamberlain's speeches, because, if they have done so, then they will have to make another call upon their friends—the beef trust, the steel trust, the oil trust, the sugar trust, and the anthracite-coal trust—for more campaign contributions, with the result that we who live in New York will find the Morgan-Baer combination recouping themselves ten times over by squeezing up the price of our coal, while in common with the inhabitants of the rest of the country we shall find the other necessities of life also "boosted" up.

As the Republican leaders have recently found so much to admire in Mr. Chamberlain, it is entirely appropriate and quite pertinent to ask them what they think of the latest outcome of his war to annihilate the two South African Republics—the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. This war, conducted and instigated by the South African mining millionaires in conjunction with Joseph Chamberlain, was, the British people were told, to extend the "benefits of British civilization" to the people of those countries.

Having destroyed the freedom of the Transvaal, the South African mining multimillionaires—the Biets, Robinsons, Neumanns, Barnattos, Joels, et al.—have now gone a step farther and compelled the Tory Government to introduce slavery there in the form of Chinese labor under contract. Although opposed by the Liberals, Mr. Balfour's Government has been able to force a ratification and approval by the House of Commons of this new form of slavery.

SOMETHING WORTH EMULATING.

If my Republican friends desire to emulate Great Britain (a country, by the way, that a few years ago they could say nothing bad enough about), why don't they emulate her in some of the good things she is doing? As I have said, the cost of ship subsidies, as of all other forms of governmental favors, must be borne by the great mass of the people so long as indirect systems of taxation are used. Recognizing this, the progressive men in Great Britain have for some years now been attempting to put a part of the burdens of government upon those who obtain nearly all its benefits—the landlords.

How much greater progress they have made than has been made here (although the average American boasts of our greater progressiveness) is shown in the vote of the House of Commons on Mr. Trevelyan's bill for the taxation of land values. Two years ago Mr. Trevelyan was only able to muster 156 votes in favor of a similar bill and was defeated by 71 votes. Last year the same bill was beaten by 17 votes. On March 12, this year, the vote was 223 in favor to 156 against, a majority of 67. How significant this action was is shown in the fact that not only did Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman (the Liberal leader) speak for it, but it received the support of every prominent Liberal who was present, and not a Liberal vote was cast against it.

On the other hand, not only did Chamberlain's son, Austen Chamberlain, the chancellor of the exchequer, vote against it, but several other leaders of the Tory and reactionary forces did likewise. In commenting on the matter the London Standard, the Tory organ, intimates that more of the present overwhelming majority in Parliament would have voted against it were it not that a general election is anticipated. Surely its enemies could offer no stronger testimony to the increasing growth among the people of the demand that land values shall bear a large part of the burden of government than the Standard's comment.

LET US TRY FREEDOM.

Mr. Chairman, instead of this bill for a ship-subsidy commission, let the committee which reported this bill bring in here measures providing for "free ships." We have had forty years

of "protection;" let us now try freedom! It may be that like the elephant which has been chained to the floor for years, that the shipping merchants and shipowners may not at once realize that they are free, they may for a short time stay in the same place, being under the delusion that they are yet chained and tethered. But we need not fear, they will soon understand the advantages of freedom, they will quickly utilize them; they will as soon as they are permitted show that American enterprise, American ingenuity, American go-aheadativeness, when backed by the requisite capital, can hold its own against the world. Let us adopt the President's statement that the "cards are not to be stacked." Let us adopt it in good faith, let us set our faces toward the light and declare a "free field and no favor" for all.

Mr. Chairman, what a relief to turn from the sordid commercialism, the hard, cruel, domineering spirit of those who through such instrumentalities as this bill would lay a nation under tribute, would pry open the doors of the National Treasury, so that its sponsors may revel in unearned wealth—wealth wrung by an insidious system of taxation from the necessities of the poor—what a relief and what a change to turn from the contemplation of such cold-blooded, grasping selfishness and insatiable greed and note the noble, humanity-loving spirit which the editor of the Arena has breathed into the pages of a recent number of that magazine. I have but a moment left within which to call attention to one or two striking passages from his article in the October Arena on "Material prosperity and permanent greatness:"

To serious-minded students of history one of the most disquieting signs of our day is the all but universal tendency to elevate material prosperity to a supreme place in the consideration of the people.

History should teach us how pitifully shallow and shortsighted is a statesmanship or a national consciousness that permits commercialism or expediency to override the demands of the eternal ethical verities. Out of the wrecks of the past comes no clearer voice than that which proclaims the doom of all nations that have exalted trade or material prosperity over the empire of moral or intellectual rectitude. The austere religion of Israel, the philosophy and noble art of Greece, the justice or law of Rome, gave to those ancient civilizations their immortality; and the power and greatness of their peoples passed not from them until after they permitted the dominating moral ideals to become subordinate to sensuous and materialistic ideals. Egoism, the passion for wealth, ease, and luxury, and cruel and unjust subjugation of others finally wrought their downfall and death.

HUMAN ACHIEVEMENT AND SORDID GAIN.

Among the many examples of sophistry, as shallow as it is pernicious, which wealth and privilege are industriously disseminating is the claim that the incentive of money or material personal gain is the chief inspirer of genius, invention, and discovery.

Genius is nothing if not restless and active. Her children may be and often are erratic. They are seldom slothful. Run over the list of those who have been chief among the prophets, poets, painters, sculptors, scientists, discoverers, and inventors, and it will be seen that while few were driven by hunger or lured by avarice, many were terribly hampered by poverty and paralyzed by the ever-present fear of the starvation and suffering of those dependent upon them. It will be seen that the greatest benefactors of humanity were either among the poor, who sought not personal wealth, but rather the benefit of humanity, or were in comfortable circumstances, such as would be within the reach of all men and women under just social conditions in which equal opportunities and rights should be guaranteed to all and special privileges granted to none.

The elevation of material considerations above the requirements of the basic moral verities and the underlying principles of pure Democracy is deadly to free government. The broader vision of justice and the proud consciousness that the new freedom which fosters joy and growth would be no longer the prize of the few, but the splendid heritage of the millions, would give a deeper, richer, diviner meaning to life than was possible in any age in which egotism was the dominant note, and where war and competition fostered the savage in the soul of man.

Mr. Chairman, instead of buttressing the narrow, stupid, selfish, bigoted "protection" policy by instituting a policy of bounties, let us declare that the trusts must throw off their infant's garb, their swaddling clothes, behind which they have been hiding themselves while robbing the people, and that they must now do what the American farmer has been doing all along—sell their products in a free-trade market at home as well as abroad. Let us say, as far as we can by our action on this bill, that the American people are tired of this cry of the Goliaths of the trusts that they dare not battle with the pigmy Davids of the commercial world.

If we will but do that we will have taken a great step forward; we shall have inaugurated a policy that will result in the ultimate overthrow of every form of special privilege, a policy which if applied in its fullness will drive every harpie and every corruptionist out of the Halls of Congress, and thus purify American politics. Do this, and this Republic will become what in inception and purpose it was designed to be—a beacon light for liberty, for freedom throughout the world. [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

[From the Westminster Gazette, Saturday, March 19, 1904.]

THE WEEK—THE DEFEAT OF THE GOVERNMENT.

The political situation develops more slowly than some impatient people desire, but still develops continuously in the same direction. The Government grows weaker, undermined by the by-elections in the country and by apathy or confusion in the House of Commons. On Tuesday they were actually defeated on an Irish vote in committee of supply, and though Mr. Balfour naturally makes light of the incident its seriousness is quite well understood by members of the Unionist party. The division was expected. A most ur

gent whip had been sent out to supporters of the party, and yet they did not exert themselves to put in an appearance.

The recriminations which have followed in the correspondence columns of the Times and elsewhere merely bring this fact into greater relief. The Government has still an enormous nominal majority which should leave an ample margin for all accidents and sudden emergencies. That it can not be brought up by a three-line whip is a morbid symptom which speaks for itself. The incident is not solitary, for on other recent occasions ministers have only escaped defeat by 14 or 20. No one seriously expected that Mr. Balfour, after resisting all the provocations to resign which the last nine months have offered, would quit his post because an Irish vote had been reduced by £100. But it is an unwritten law of Parliament that a government can not be more than once beaten on an estimate, however trivial. For a ministry which can not rely on a majority for its money business is properly assumed to be without the power of conducting the daily administration of the country.

EAST DORSET.

The result of the East Dorset election announced on Thursday proved that constituency to be in line with all others that have recently been tested. The majority of 820 by which the seat was wrested from the Tories exceeded the anticipations on the Liberal side and beat all previous records in the constituency. Mr. Lyell, the new member, was an excellent candidate, but he had to fight a wealthy and popular opponent, who resided in the constituency and had even been mayor of its chief borough. This gentleman sought salvation as an opponent of Mr. Chamberlain's policy, but the constituency rightly judged that the only method of opposing a protectionist government was to defeat its candidate, whatever private opinions he might hold upon the fiscal question. East Dorset concludes a series of by-elections which has been without parallel in the memory of most living politicians. In all parts of the country, and in rural and urban constituencies alike, the Government have suffered continuous reverses, and latterly without any break whatever in their misfortunes.

One fact alone is sufficiently impressive. Since the beginning of the year ten seats, formerly held by six Unionists and four Liberals, have been vacated, and as the result of the by-elections these are now held by eight Liberals and two Unionists. No Unionist has been able to secure reelection except in the impregnable strongholds of South Birmingham and the city of London. This is the record for less than three months, and it shows how entirely the Government has lost the confidence of the country. The cartoon published elsewhere, which "F. C. G." has given us for this week, exactly sums up the present situation. Like the cat in the picture, the Government holds on by digging its claws deeper into the tree, which is rudely shaken by these events. Let us add, while speaking of by-elections, that the unopposed return of Mr. L. V. Harcourt, which also has taken place this week, is by no means without significance. If he was permitted a walk-over it was not from any benevolence on the part of his opponents. They did their best to find a candidate, but without success.

That the tide is still running strong against the Tories and against Chamberlain's policies of protection in Great Britain and Chinese slavery in South Africa is shown in the last English by-election, i. e., that of East Dorset, where a Tory who was elected in 1900 by a majority of 96 has been succeeded by a Liberal with a majority of 820.

[From the Daily News (London), Thursday, March 3, 1904.]

THE NORMANTON TRIUMPH—WHAT THE RESULT MEANS—MR. PARROTT INTERVIEWED.

The great victory achieved by Mr. W. Parrott in the Normanton division for Liberalism, labor, and free trade was one of the main topics of conversation in political circles yesterday. We showed in our last issue how complete this triumph was, Mr. Parrott having beaten his protectionist opponent, Mr. Dorman, by a majority of 3,946, a figure which compared with a Liberal majority of 1,419 at the general election.

If the united Liberal and Labor vote at Norwich be excluded, to Mr. Parrott belongs the distinction of having secured the greatest majority yet recorded at an election since Mr. Chamberlain announced his protection policy. How that policy has affected majorities and seats may be gathered from the following list of constituencies contested since May last, when Mr. Chamberlain made his first pronouncement on "tariff reform:"

	Previous majority.	By-election majority.
Barnard Castle.....	a1,491	a2,856
Argyllshire.....	b600	a1,586
St. Andrews Burghs.....	b54	a36
Rochester.....	b479	b521
Leamington.....	b831	b190
Chorley.....	b3,059	b1,428
Dulwich.....	b3,082	b1,437
Lewisham.....	b2,414	b2,012
Ludlow.....	b3,819	b970
Mid Devon.....	a771	a1,476
Norwich.....	b837	a4,264
Gateshead.....	a946	a1,205
Ayr Burghs.....	b590	a44
Mid Herts.....	b2,424	a132
South Birmingham.....	c3,573	c3,076
Normanton.....	a1,419	a3,946

a Liberal. b Conservative. c Union.

In these sixteen constituencies the aggregate votes cast at the last previous elections and at the by-elections show an enormous gain by the Liberal and Free Trade party. The figures are:

	Liberal.	Protectionist.
By-election vote.....	75,941	70,090
Previous election vote.....	52,855	69,990
Net increase.....	23,086	40

At the general election these twelve seats were held, four by Liberals and twelve by Conservatives. They are now held, nine by Liberals and seven by Conservatives. In other words, the Liberals have gained five Tory seats out of twelve, a proportion which works out at 44 per cent. If that ratio could be maintained at a general election in respect of the 389 ministerial seats, the free-trade majority in Parliament would be overwhelming. No wonder Tories shrink from a general election.

TRADE AND THE EMPIRE.

[Mr. Chamberlain's proposals examined in four speeches and a prefatory note by the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith, K. C., M. P., home secretary in Lord Rosebery's ministry.]

PREFATORY NOTE.

I have been requested to republish these speeches in a collected form. I do so the more readily because, whatever judgment may be passed upon their controversial value, they do not, so far as I am aware, contain any statement of fact, whether statistical or historical, which has been successfully impugned.

Those of us who are engaged in the defense of free trade are constantly told that our whole stock in trade consists in the mechanical iteration of catch-words, in blind appeals to authority, in ignorant indifference to actual and potential economic forces, and in obsolete conceptions of the Empire.

My object in the utterances which are here gathered together has been to vindicate our fiscal system, not as an academic dogma, but as a concrete and living policy. As at first, though only a first step in that process of justification, it is necessary to expose without delay the blunders of fact and of logic which have so far accompanied every stage in the new protectionist campaign.

H. H. A.

NOVEMBER, 1903.

[I.—Speech at Cinderford, October 8, 1903.]

A little less than six months ago the then colonial secretary startled the world by the announcement that the British Empire was in danger; that its unity could only be preserved by preferential tariffs, and preferential tariffs involving a tax upon the necessary food of the people of the United Kingdom. These opinions the speaker has during the present week further developed and defended, and with them it will be my duty in a few minutes to come to close quarters.

MR. BALFOUR'S "LEAD."

It seems that there is a wide gulf between a convert in principle and a fellow-worker in the mission field. "I do not think," said Mr. Balfour at Sheffield, "that public opinion in this country is ripe for the taxation of food." It is not as though he, the leader, as he reminded us, of a great party, giving a lead to that party upon a critical occasion—it is not as though he professes to agree with public opinion.

On the contrary, he does not disguise his view that public opinion upon this topic is the slave and the dupe of ingrained political prejudice and perverted historical analogies; but bad as he thinks it, and wrong as he thinks it, he is not going to engage his party to combat and to convert it. No; for himself and his colleagues he has abandoned the open mind, but the open field he leaves to Mr. Chamberlain. He is asked to give a lead, and what is the lead that he gives? In effect, what he says to his followers is this: For the moment we will all combine to talk generalities about retaliation or freedom of negotiation, which may mean anything or which may mean nothing; in that way the unity of our party will be secured; but, none the less, our lamented colleague, Mr. Chamberlain—who, as all the world can see, has parted from me and I from him in a glow of mutual appreciation and regret—our lamented colleague will continue to conduct, ostensibly from outside, his propaganda for the taxation of bread and meat.

In the meantime I, the prime minister, having shed my free-trade colleagues, will contemplate his operations from afar, with undisguised, though for the moment inactive, sympathy, waiting, with my sickle ready for the ripening of the harvest.

Sir Robert Peel, speaking to a world then engirdled by protectionist tariffs, in 1846 said: "I do not care whether foreign countries remove those tariffs or not. It is the duty and the interest of this country to fight tariffs by free imports."

FOOD OR RAW MATERIAL.

It is all very well to use this vague rhetorical language about negotiation and standing up to the foreigner and not taking his insults lying down. I want to know from Mr. Chamberlain upon what is he going to retaliate. Here we come to the very crux, and, indeed, the very heart, of the whole matter. You can not retaliate effectively in this country upon protected countries without imposing a tax upon food or raw material. I give you one or two figures which have been put in very striking form by Mr. Sydney Buxton. He takes Russia and the United States, the two most protected countries in the world. Suppose you want to retaliate upon Russia. Out of our total imports from Russia, amounting to twenty-five millions (\$125,000,000), twenty-three millions, or eleven-twelfths, consist of food stuffs and raw materials, so that we can not retaliate upon Russia without at the same time injuring either our working classes or our manufacturers, or both. What is the case of the United States? Out of one hundred and twenty-seven millions (\$635,000,000) of imports from the United States in 1902, one hundred and eight millions, or five-sixths, were also food stuffs or raw materials.

The moment you begin to translate these vague platform phrases into practice, you find that they can not be carried out as a policy without doing to you here in Great Britain as great, and probably more harm than the persons against whom that policy is used.

The board of trade estimate of the annual earnings of our shipping comes to ninety millions a year.

In 1870, just about the time that Mr. Chamberlain has laken for his comparisons, our tonnage of over-sea shipping was 5,700,000; in 1902 it was 10,000,000 tons. In other words, it has increased very nearly 100 per cent. Now, in 1870 the over-sea shipping tonnage of the United States was 1,500,000; in 1902 this had fallen to 880,000 tons, or a diminution of between 40 and 50 per cent.

If it is true, as Mr. Chamberlain has told us, that we are sending less manufactured goods into the United States, you must not forget that at the same time we are performing for the United States, not gratuitously—great as is our affection for the United States—not gratuitously, but for value received, the service of carrying their goods as well as ours all over the world. While their shipping has declined, owing to the excessive cost of shipbuilding which protection brings about, our shipping under free trade has most continuously and most prosperously increased. Protection is an inclined plane. Once you put your foot on it there is no logical halting place until you get to the bottom.

There is no ground whatever for saying either that British trade, as a whole, is stagnant or decaying, or that the Empire can only be maintained by reverting to fiscal devices which were tried and found wanting in the old days of protection. Free influx of food and of raw materials, from every possible source of supply, into this country is not only as essential, but is more essential to our national strength and prosperity than it was in the days of Cobden and Peel.

THE ALTERNATIVE POLICY.

Do not, however—and this shall be my final word—do not let it be supposed that because we are driven to defend the citadel of free trade, we therefore think that all is for the best and are content with a policy of folded hands. That there are disquieting features in our industrial as in our social conditions no honest observer, certainly no member of the party of progress, will be found to deny. We have seen industries in which we ought to have maintained our supremacy falling behind, and in some cases entirely taken away from us by our competitors. Defective knowledge, inferior processes, lack

of flexibility or versatility, a stubborn industrial conservatism, these are the real enemies of British trade and have done us infinitely more harm than all the tariffs and all the dumping syndicates that were ever created.

Better education, better training, better methods, a larger outlook, these are our primary needs—and it says little for our political sagacity that we should allow our minds to be diverted from them by quarrels as to the quantum of dogmatic theology that is to be administered to little children, or by attempts to revive the buried fallacies of protection. True it is, also, that in spite of the continuous growth of our national prosperity we still have with us the unemployed, the ill-fed, the aged poor; but here again let us look to natural and not to artificial remedies. Instead of raising the price of bread let us try to raise the standard of life. Temperance, better housing, the tenure and taxation of land, these are matters as to which we have allowed our legislation to fall deplorably into arrears. To take up the task in a spirit of faith and of resolute purpose is, I hope and believe, the mission of the Liberal party in a Liberal Parliament.

[II.—Speech at Newcastle-on-Tyne, October 24, 1903.]

We are met, as I understand, not primarily for the ordinary purposes of a political demonstration, though they will not be left out of sight, but we are met to take our share in the defense of principles which we believe to be vital to our national prosperity and our imperial union; principles which have been suddenly attacked—I say suddenly, because a year ago no one would have dreamed of the situation in which we now find ourselves—suddenly attacked, I say by a powerful and formidable statesman, while the government of the day surveys his operations not merely with benevolent neutrality, but with undisguised sympathy, and do not conceal from us their intention, if the assault should turn out to be successful and the stronghold should fall, of joining hands in the hour of triumph with the attacking force and sharing with it in the glory and, I suppose, in the spoils of victory.

There is no doubt that during the last thirty years there has been a considerable diminution in our agricultural population, though let me say parenthetically that the way to bring back the people to the land is not to revive the state of things that prevailed before the repeal of the corn laws, when the agricultural laborer had to work for 7s. a week.

PROTECTIONIST COUNTRIES.

Mr. Chamberlain points to the prosperity of protectionist countries, which he says has increased more rapidly than our own. He admits that the circumstances of the United States are exceptional. He does not go into the case of Germany—I wish he would—I wish he would tell us by applying what test—the comfort of the people, the accumulation of wealth, the rate of wages, the hours of work, the average standard of life—he makes out that the protectionist population of Germany is a more favored one than the free-trade population of this country.

But since he was at Glasgow, in the interval between Glasgow and Newcastle, Mr. Chamberlain has discovered another protectionist paradise. It is Sweden. Now, as regards that, only two days ago I was turning over the consular report for the last year from Gothenburg, and a more doleful piece of reading I have rarely come across for years. And only yesterday—I expect some of you saw it in the papers—there was a letter from a gentleman well qualified to speak, Mr. Bayley, who employs labor both in this country and in Sweden.

It was a most significant story. He said they began in Sweden with a small import duty on maize, with the result that their trade in bacon, which up to that time had been a valuable one, was taken away from them owing to the increased cost of feeding pigs by free-trading Denmark, and in the course of twenty years the average cost of living in Sweden had risen 20 per cent. Emigration had increased in the same time 50 per cent; and, as regards wages, Mr. Bayley tells us that he, employing the same class of labor to do the same class of work, pays 40 per cent less wages in Sweden than in London. I don't think the example of Sweden is one likely to encourage the working classes of this country to change their fiscal system.

The board of trade estimate is that the annual value to this country of the carrying services we render amounts to ninety millions. Those ninety millions ought to be added to your exports if you are to form any fair judgment of what they amount to. This is not the academic view of a recluse or an economist. Take the case of the only mercantile country into whose trade this element of sea carriage enters in anything like the same proportion as ours. Take Norway, which has a large mercantile marine. You find in Norway, if you study the returns, exactly the same phenomena, though on a smaller scale than here.

The imports for each year seem largely to exceed the exports. Why is that? Because Norway is receiving, just as we receive, payment for the service of her mercantile marine. Take, on the other hand, the United States of America. Their mercantile marine has dwindled until it is only a half of what it was thirty years ago. What is the result? Other nations have to do their sea carriage for them, we in particular; and that is one of the great causes why their exports exceed the imports, because they have to pay in the form of exports to us for carrying their goods over the sea. I say you can not leave out of account this £90,000,000. Mr. Chamberlain never refers to it at all.

TRADES INJURED BY TARIFFS.

I do not deny—no free trader denies—that protectionist tariffs are a hindrance to the natural extension and distribution of the world's industry. It is not true that this eighty-six millions of manufactures could be just as well made here. A great many of them are things which under any circumstances foreign manufacturers could make cheaper and better than we could make them ourselves, and one of the great advantages of free trade is that instead of having to make these things ourselves which other people can make better for us we can, in our turn, devote ourselves to making other things which we can make better than they can and exchange the proceeds one against the other.

THE 10 PER CENT TAX.

They talk about putting a 10 per cent duty on these things. What would be the result? I can tell you in a sentence. If the 10 per cent duty excludes the foreign goods, you will get no revenue from your tax. That, I think, is plain. If it does not exclude foreign goods, the consumer will pay more in the shape of price than he did before, and to that extent the effective demand for other goods will be diminished.

Mr. Chamberlain has watered down his Glasgow proposal that the colonies should prevent the setting up of new industries which could come into competition with our own—a proposal scouted throughout the whole length and breadth of the British Empire as soon as it was uttered—to one that they should not be "encouraged to manufacture goods for which they have no natural aptitude." Well, that is the doctrine of free trade. If you had free trade, not preferential tariffs between the colonies and ourselves, that is exactly what would happen.

If the taxation does not fall on the consumer, why does he exempt maize, and why does he exempt bacon? Now we are fortunate enough to know the reason, because Mr. Chamberlain has told us why he has dealt with these commodities in an exceptional way. Maize, he says, is the food of some of the poorest of our people; bacon is a staple food of the majority of the population.

But if the consumer does not pay, if the foreigner pays, why should not the foreigner pay on what is the food of the poorest? That is my first question. I am going to put him another, which I hope he will also answer at the same time. Why, if these do not fall on the consumer, does he take credit for the gain which will accrue to the consumer when he removes the tax on sugar and on tea? If the consumer does not pay, what advantage is it to him?

EVILS CRYING ALOUD FOR REDRESS.

While we oppose with all our force these ill-considered proposals, fallacious as we believe them in argument, disastrous in practice, let no one suppose that the only alternative is to wrap ourselves in the inertia of a complacent optimism. We Liberals do not deny, we assert, not for the first nor for the hundredth time, that both in the industrial and social spheres there are evils which cry aloud for redress. We want first and foremost a reconstruction of our educational system from the bottom to the top upon a just and even and democratic foundation, and adapted in all its stages to the requirements of our trade, our country, our age. We want, further, a serious attempt to grapple with the problems of the tenure and taxation of land, both in the country and in the towns.

[III.—Speech at Paisley, October 31, 1903.]

We have been challenged to a controversy, in which it is no exaggeration to say not only the material prosperity of these islands but the harmonious working of the British Empire is at stake. That controversy is being carried on under conditions which are absolutely unprecedented in political history. A distinguished statesman has been let loose for the purpose from the restraints and responsibilities of office. A purged Cabinet, which does not contain in its new form any recognizable Free Trader, looks on in favoring silence, or, as has been the case, I think, of not less than three of its members during the present week, with the language of open encouragement.

The policy of the halfway house, which is the ostensible official programme of the Government, is universally acknowledged to be merely a formula for the temporary appeasement of divergent and irreconcilable groups. Now, what does Sir Robert Giffen say? He points out that in order to show correctly the net export of the produce of British labor and capital in goods we must deduct from the gross total of our exported merchandise the value of the imported raw materials contained in them. That, I think, is perfectly clear.

Having made that preliminary assumption, he applies the method to two years. He first takes the year 1877—twenty-five years ago—and he then takes the year 1902; and how do the figures work out—the figures of our export merchandise after that deduction has been made? In 1877 the net produce that British labor and capital exported—so ascertained—was valued at £140,000,000. In 1902—twenty-five years later—that net produce was valued at £224,000,000. In other words, during those twenty-five years of this stagnant export trade of ours there has been a net annual growth of £84,000,000.

WHAT IS RAW MATERIAL?

I put this further question: "Will Mr. Chamberlain or any of his friends tell us what they mean by raw material?" I know one definition, and one only, for this purpose. It is a commodity which comes here in order that British capital and British labor may be exercised upon it.

Wire.—What is the fact about wire? Our exports of wire are increasing and the German export trade in that commodity, although it is a very large one, is, I am told on excellent authority, declining year by year, and declining for a very significant reason, owing to the heavy import duty which the German tariff lays on the raw material out of which the wire is made.

WHAT IS DUMPING?

Now, this leads me to say a word, if you will allow me to do so, upon the question—I approach it with a good deal of trepidation—the nerve-shaking topic of dumping, and here I feel I must mind my "p's" and "q's." Mr. Chamberlain is so incensed with the levity which I have shown in this matter of dumping that he uses language about me which I venture to say indicates a loss of temper, and, what sometimes accompanies loss of temper, a loss of manners also. Gentlemen, what is dumping? I agree with Mr. Chamberlain when he says that dumping only takes place, or takes place seriously, when the country that resorts to it is in a state of depression.

A manufacturer, or more often a syndicate of manufacturers, is enabled, by a protective tariff, to keep up the price of the thing they make at an artificially high level in their own home market, export the surplus supply of the same commodity at a much lower price to foreign countries, and undersell the native producer. That is dumping. Well, now, let us note what are its characteristics. In the first place dumping, as Mr. Chamberlain says, does not take place except when the country from which the thing comes is in a state of depression. In the next place, it is a process which, as all experience shows, cannot possibly last long.

It is, indeed, in the long run a suicidal policy. I will tell you why; for two reasons. First, it tends to provoke a strong reaction at home among the domestic consumers, who find that they have been made to pay—as the combined result of a protective tariff and the action of syndicates—more for the same thing than other people in foreign countries pay for it. It leads to resentment, indignation, agitation, and in the long run it is sure to lead to the undermining of protection.

In the second place, dumping cuts its own throat in another way by supplying the manufacturer abroad with the dumped material at an artificially low price, and makes it possible for him to produce the finished article at a lower cost and to drive the dumping nation—who have produced it at a greater cost—out of the market. It has happened over and over again. It is happening in Germany at the present moment. If you wish to know more about it, I would recommend you to read the board of trade blue book. I confess I am absolutely impenitent about dumping.

"Oh," says Mr. Chamberlain, "what can a lawyer know about these things? You should leave them to men of business who really understand them." I am quite content to leave them to men of business who understand and apply the rules of simple arithmetic. But since the appeal is to men of business, I will read you, if you will allow me, a short passage from a speech, made as lately as August last, by a business man, whose name I will give you when I have come to the end of his remarks. This is what this man of business says:

"On behalf of my own company and on behalf of any manufacturer who is fit to be in the business, I altogether repudiate the suggestion that we need protective tariffs or would benefit by them. My company has always done a good business in the better qualities of wire nails, both for home and export, and that business we are increasing year by year. It is a fact that we have not yet been able to compete in the commoner lines, but I no more attribute this inability to unfair competition on the part of the foreigners than I attribute their inability to compete with us in some of our lines to unfair competition on our part.

"Similar cases have come under my notice before, and I invariably found the explanation of the foreigner's success to lie in some natural advantage, or, and this is more often the case, in wiser methods of business. I have no doubt that before long the able men serving my company will have discovered the secret of cheap wire nails, and we shall then add that to the many

others we have captured from foreign competitors. Meanwhile, if the knot is to be cut by making England pay more for its wire nails, you take away from inventors the incentive to invention and reward dullards for their dullness."

That is the opinion of a man of business, and the name of the man of business is Mr. Arthur Chamberlain. If Mr. Chamberlain's picture is a true picture—I do not say it is—that foreigners under a protective tariff are driven to try to get hold of our markets by dumping down, in days of depression, at less than cost price, the produce of sweated labor—if that is a true picture—does it not suggest to you that perhaps on the whole protection may not be a panacea for the diseases of the industrial world?

Who is the foreign competitor whom Mr. Chamberlain describes as less "scrupulous" than we in these matters, who conducts his operations without any of the legal protections and safeguards upon which we most rightly insist? Is it possible Mr. Chamberlain is ignorant that in Germany, our chief competitor in this matter, and in almost every continental country, there is a system of factory acts, copies from our own? Only, I am sorry to say, in some respects substantially in advance of them. And in Germany, in addition to the factory acts, they have, of course, as I thought we all knew, a system of compulsory insurance for accident and for sickness.

If the existence of laws of this kind were a real handicap to industry, which I am going to show you it is not, it is one from which almost all countries suffer like ourselves. It is true that the German workman works longer hours, gets less money wages, and is able to buy less with his money than the British workman.

For every 20s.—I am speaking of the skilled trades now—for every 20s. that is received by the workman in the United Kingdom the corresponding German workman gets 12s. 6d. Since 1886, a period of over fifteen years, money wages in these trades have had a considerably greater rise here than they have had there, and while the money wages have been rising, what about the cost of living? The cost of living has fallen here under free trade in these fifteen years by 3 per cent, and it has risen in Germany by something like 12 per cent.

Mr. Chamberlain has not put his finger upon the real spot. There is a difference, a notable difference, between the conditions of the German workman and the British workman, but the difference is not between a country where factory legislation exists and one where it does not; it is the difference between a country which lives under protection and a country which lives under free trade.

[IV.—Speech at Worcester November 9, 1903.]

I have been told, I do not know whether it is true, that this city, and, indeed, this county, are treated by political map makers as within the range of a certain sphere of influence whose headquarters are supposed to lie in the city of Birmingham. That sphere, whatever may be its precise territorial limits, is at present the seat of a good deal of magnetic disturbance, and I can not but think that you here in Worcester, if any such connection did ever exist, which I do not know, could hardly choose a fitter time to terminate it than a time at which Birmingham, whose greatest political glory in the past is to have been associated with the name of John Bright, is being invited to turn its back upon his creed, and to become the rallying center—may I not say the dumping ground—of the crudest and rawest fallacies of protection.

Some of us have said of late that protection is an inclined plane. You begin with a small duty and then before you know where you are you find you are landed in a very heavy duty. Well, just as protection tends to be an inclined plane in practice, so it seems to me the development of the protectionist argument in the present controversy tends to be and has proved to be an inclined plane in logic.

One among the many boons which free trade confers is that it tends, by keeping open the sources of supply, not merely to enlarge the area of employment, but to steady the whole course of industry. It counteracts, it is, in fact, the only effective counter agent which has ever yet been discovered, to those violent oscillations and fluctuations from which countries that surround themselves by a protective fence are constantly suffering.

There is no fact in my opinion which is better attested in the history of the world than that in the years which preceded the repeal of the corn laws, despite the transient spurts occasionally given to industry by exceptionally abundant harvests, the material condition of the great bulk of the British people was deplorably and unutterably bad. Since free trade has become part of our established fiscal system there has been nothing comparable to it, either in kind or in degree. It is always well to reinforce oneself when one enunciates general propositions of that kind by authority.

Therefore I will read a very short sentence from a speech, also made in Birmingham, on November 7, 1885. Mr. Chamberlain, speaking of fair trade—and fair trade is nothing but his own scheme anticipated by more prescient thinkers—used these words: "I warn you that at the bottom of this fair trade there is the question, and if you discuss it you will find it impossible to avoid it, of a return to those bad times of protection, of the corn laws, which were responsible for the destitution and the starvation wages from which your forefathers suffered so greatly."

Mr. Chamberlain will tell you that he has changed his opinions since 1885. So he has, but because Mr. Chamberlain has changed his opinions, the foundations of the universe have not been shifted, nor have the facts of history altered. I quite expect to be told before we are many months older, if the controversy proceeds at its present pace, that the multiplication table is an obsolete shibboleth and that to hold that in this world it is universally or approximately true that two and two make four is to entertain the superstitions of a troglodyte.

THE APPEAL TO MR. MONTGREDIEN.

The facts of history do not alter, and Mr. Chamberlain appeals to the authority of an excellent book, Mr. Montgredien's History of the Free-Trade Movement in England [10]. Very well, let us go to Mr. Montgredien. I am going to read you a short passage from this work, to which Mr. Chamberlain appeals, which describes the condition of things that prevailed here in England and Scotland, not only in 1841, but in the years from 1841 to 1844, which immediately preceded the repeal of the corn laws.

It says: "Some of the details are quite appalling and testify to an intensity and universality of destitution, starvation, and misery to which no period of temporary distress since the adoption of free trade in England can show the slightest approach. In Leeds there were over 20,000 persons whose average earnings were under 1s. a week. In Nottingham 10,500 persons, nearly one-fifth of the population, were in receipt of parochial relief."

"In most of the leading trades of Birmingham the men were earning not one-half, and, in some cases, one-third, of their usual wages, while some of the masters were so near ruin that they had on Saturday night to pawn their goods to pay their men's wages. In Manchester 12,000 females, after having pawned every article of furniture and of dress with which they could possibly dispense, were supported by voluntary charitable contributions. One-third of the population of Coventry was out of work."

I need not go on. These are samples taken from all the leading industrial centers of the Kingdom. That state of things prevailed in 1841.

UNIVERSAL FREE TRADE.

When you are told that this country adopted free trade upon the assurance, the promise, that other nations would follow suit, and only upon that assurance, I ask you to remember the language of Sir Robert Peel himself, not speaking as a propagandist on a platform, but with the authority of the first minister of the Crown in the House of Commons on January 27, 1846:

"I fairly avow that in making these great reductions on the produce of foreign countries I have no guaranty that other countries will follow our example. Wearied by our long-endured efforts, we have resolved to consult our own immediate interests."

"It is a fact that other countries have not followed our example. Nay, they have in some cases raised the duties upon the admission of our goods."

Then he ends with these significant, just, and true words: "Hostile tariffs, so far from being an argument against the removal of restrictive duties, furnish a strong argument in its favor."

A CONCLUDING PARADOX.

One other concluding paradox. You are told by Mr. Chamberlain that protection enables foreign countries to undersell us here with the produce of cheap and sweated labor, and therefore we are to tax the imports that come in from foreign countries to make the balance even. In the same breath we are told that the foreign workmen's condition, if not actually better than that of our own, is steadily improving at a more rapid rate, and therefore, apparently, we ought to adopt protection in order that we may share his happy fate.

SUMMARY.

I am not going to add to the number I have given of self-contradictory propositions; I am surprised at my own moderation. But let me, in order that there may be no doubt about this—let me recapitulate what I have been saying. Here are five distinct and cardinal propositions, each of which contains its own confutation:

(1) British trade is stagnant, and yet 1902 and 1903 threaten to be our record years.

(2) A tax on food does not fall on the consumer, and yet we dare not tax bacon and maize because they are the food of the poorest of the community.

(3) We must not tax raw material, and yet if we do not some of our most important colonial interests, like those of South Africa, will obtain no preference.

(4) We are to put a 10 per cent duty on imported manufactures, which is at the same time to bring us a revenue, on the assumption that foreign goods come in and pay the duty, and to secure additional employment for British labor, on the assumption that the same foreign goods do not come in at all.

(5) Last, and not least significant, protection enables foreign countries to undersell us here by sweated labor; let us therefore, in order to improve the condition of our own workmen, adopt the same system of protection which makes that sweated labor possible.

WHAT DOES IT COME TO?

You are asked to take this, the first step on a slippery journey, on the strength, as I have shown you, of a series of unproved and unprovable assertions, in reliance upon a pledge to which no human being can be held, that you will not be invited to go beyond the first stage upon the road, and worse than that, in my judgment, in the illusory hope that by imperiling the very foundation of British prosperity you will be strengthening the fabric of the Empire.

I venture to say that everything is against it. Experience, the experience of our own fathers who tried it, there is nothing new about this scheme, and gave it up, experience is against it. Argument abundant, overwhelming, unanswerable, at any rate unanswered, is against it. Authority is against it.

The authority of every living man who has been responsible for the stewardship of our national finances, with, indeed, one exception, our new chancellor of the exchequer, who, apparently, is not yet aware that he owes to his illustrious predecessor, Sir William Harcourt, that great discal instrument of the death duties which, more than any other reform since the establishment of free trade, may enable us to discharge the vast burden of unnecessary expenditure which has been piled by himself and his colleagues upon the shoulders of the people.

A celebrated measure was once called by its cynical author "a leap in the dark." This is more than a leap in the dark; it is a piece of political plunging. Let us demand that without delay it shall be submitted to the judgment of the people, and when their good sense and sound political instinct has got it out of the way, then, and not till then, we shall be able to take up again the interrupted task of reform, and to provide against the real dangers which menace the prosperity of our trade and the consolidation of our Empire.

During the delivery of the above speech the time of the gentleman from New York expired.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and leave is granted.

Mr. BENTON. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we have been informed that it is the policy of the Republican party to make no appropriations for the rivers and harbors and waterways of the country at the present session of Congress. We are told that a deficit of \$42,000,000 is confronting the Republican Administration during the present fiscal year; that no bills appropriating money, except for the absolute needs of the Government, will be passed, and that only the usual and necessary supply bills will be framed and enacted into law.

After a period of reckless wastefulness of the public money and of extravagance; after large appropriations for a large standing army to maintain a policy of imperialism, and acquisition of foreign territory to be held as colonies, contrary to the spirit and genius of our free institutions; after the most lavish expenditures for battle ships, armored cruisers, and a large navy, and after a wasteful expenditure of the public money for many other purposes a spasm of economy has seized the Republican party upon the eve of a Presidential election. Millions have been and will be expended upon our Army and Navy and upon the Philippines, but

not one dollar at this session of Congress is to be appropriated for the benefit of the people at home, for public buildings, or for rivers and harbors to open and improve the great highways of commerce, the waterways of our country. It is announced that not even a survey preliminary to the improvement of a single river, harbor, or waterway is to be authorized. All must wait until next session and until after the campaign, so that the Republican party can show the people how economical it has been.

This is purely political strategy, Mr. Chairman, against which I protest. There are many necessary and important works in my district and State which should be continued and inaugurated, but under this Republican policy I am powerless and my party is powerless. The rivers and harbors and great waterways of my district must await a political campaign to get that recognition to which they are entitled. Beaufort Harbor and its adjacent waters, the Neuse and Trent rivers and their tributaries, the New River, the Northeast and Black rivers, in my district and State, must be neglected by a great Government because political expediency demands there shall be no money appropriated by the Republican party at this session of Congress other than for governmental necessities.

I have discharged my duty, however, and have insisted upon just and liberal provisions for every river, harbor, and waterway in my district. No portion of it and no interest in it shall be neglected while I have the honor to represent its people. For the harbor of Beaufort I have asked an appropriation of \$250,000, which is no more than this harbor should have for the purpose of making it navigable by seagoing vessels of the largest tonnage and capacity, increasing the depth of water on the bar from 14 or 15 feet to 20 or 25 feet. I have insisted that Carrot Island Slough and the other waters adjacent to Beaufort and Morehead City should be improved in accordance with the recommendations of the engineers and the necessities of the case. I have asked that provision be made for carrying out existing projects, including the projects for the Neuse and Trent rivers, New River, the Black and Northeast Cape Fear rivers. It is especially important that depth of water in the last-named river should be increased in order to give needed facilities to the citizens of Duplin County.

But I arose, Mr. Chairman, to call special attention to and discuss the great project of improvement of our inland waters on the Atlantic coast. This project, upon which a report of the Board of Engineers of Rivers and Harbors has recently been submitted to Congress, is known as the "Waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina." This is a matter of vital importance, affecting not only my own district, especially the harbor of Beaufort, but all North Carolina commerce. Indeed, it affects our national commerce, and is a project which is national and not local in its scope, interest, and importance. It is a project in behalf of which my colleague, Hon. JOHN H. SMALL, has wrought so long and effectively, and in which I am heartily cooperating with him.

In the river and harbor act approved June 13, 1902, the following provision was incorporated:

SEC. 14. That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to cause preliminary examinations or surveys to be made at the localities named in this section as hereinafter provided. In all cases, unless a survey or estimate is herein expressly directed, a preliminary examination shall first be made, which shall embrace information concerning the commercial importance, present and prospective, of the river or harbor mentioned, and a report as to the advisability of its improvement. Whenever such preliminary examination has been made, in case such improvement is not deemed advisable, no survey thereof or estimate therefor shall be made without the direction of Congress; but in case the report shall be to the effect that such river or harbor is worthy of improvement, the Secretary of War is hereby directed, at his discretion, to cause surveys to be made and the cost of improving such river or harbor to be estimated and to be reported to Congress: *Provided*, That in all cases preliminary examinations, as well as surveys, provided for in this act shall be examined and reviewed by the board provided for in section 3 of this act, to wit:

NORTH CAROLINA.

Waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina, with a view to the construction of a channel not less than 16 feet in depth, upon the most advantageous route between the points named: *Provided*, That the examination and survey shall be made by a board of engineer officers detailed by the Secretary of War, and any report made shall include the probable cost of any private waterway that it may be to the interest of the United States to acquire in connection with the proposed improvement: *Provided further*, That the total expense of the examination and of any survey which may be made shall not exceed the sum of \$5,000.

Under authority of this act of Congress the special board of engineers, of which Col. Charles J. Allen was president, in their reports, dated September 22, 1902, and August 31, 1903, estimated that the cost of the project was not out of proportion to present and prospective commerce. But the regular Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in their report of February 9, 1904, expresses the opinion that it is not advisable to undertake the construction of the waterway with a channel of 16 feet in depth; but the belief is advanced that a channel of less depth would be of great advantage to commerce and the military interests involved, and the recommendation is made that a new inquiry be made by Congress with a view to ascertaining the cost of a channel 10 and

12 feet deep and of suitable width. Gen. A. Mackenzie, Chief of Engineers, in his report to Secretary of War Taft, transmitting all these reports to Congress and reviewing them all, says:

Owing to the nature of the country, and on account of various works of improvement heretofore carried on by the General Government and private parties, there were numerous alternative locations subject to consideration by the Board in selecting the "most advantageous route between the points named," as required by the law.

As a result of its investigations the routes selected by the Board in the different divisions of the waterway are as follows: Via Cooper Creek, Rose Bay, Adams Creek, and Beaufort Inlet, covering a total distance of 194.1 miles between Norfolk, Va., and Beaufort Inlet. The amount (\$5,000) allotted by the act for this examination and survey was not sufficient to permit of a definite location of the exact lines of the proposed channel way. The Board specifically states that the selected route has been defined in general terms only, and that before the definite location of the different parts of the route can be made further detailed surveys will be necessary.

The estimated cost of a 16-foot channel by the route indicated is fixed by the Board at \$10,000,000 in round numbers, with \$150,000 annually for maintenance of the completed waterway. This estimate of first cost includes excavation, retaining walls, right of way, bridges, and one tidal lock, but does not include the purchase price of any canal rights, for the reason that the route selected does not follow the line of any existing private canal.

In concluding its report of August 31, 1903, the Board expresses the opinion that the selected route is a perfectly practicable one, and that a waterway can be constructed along it for the amount of the estimate named—\$10,000,000—provided the appropriations are of sufficient size and are made with sufficient regularity to allow the work to be carried on constantly and systematically. After carefully considering all available data as to its present and prospective commerce, the Board gives the further opinion that the estimated cost of the project under discussion is not out of proportion to the extent of such commerce, added to the importance of the completed waterway as a factor in the scheme for coast defense on the Atlantic seaboard.

These reports have been referred for consideration by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, as provided in sections 3 and 14 of the act of June 13, 1902, and attention is invited to this Board's report of February 9, 1904, herewith. After reviewing at length the reports of the special board, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors expresses the opinion that it is not now advisable to undertake the construction of a waterway from Norfolk to Beaufort Inlet with a channel not less than 16 feet in depth, the Board believes that a channel of less than 16 feet depth would be of great advantage to the commercial traffic and military interests involved, and recommends that a new inquiry be initiated by Congress with a view to ascertaining the best route, and the cost of channels 10 and 12 feet deep, respectively, and of suitable width, between Norfolk, Va., and Beaufort, N. C., with a view to determining the advisability of undertaking the creation of a channel of either of the depths mentioned.

I concur in the view of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors that it is not advisable for the United States to expend \$10,000,000 in constructing a channel 16 feet deep from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

A. MACKENZIE,
Brigadier-General, Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army.

Hon. WM. H. TAFT,
Secretary of War.

Mr. Chairman, this is at least a partial victory for this great project. I regret the Board of Engineers should have reported against a channel 16 feet deep, but they admit the value of the project to commerce, and with all due respect to General Mackenzie and the Board of Engineers of Rivers and Harbors, they are wrong, in my opinion, as to the disapproval of the proposed depth or any change in the project. Measured in dollars and cents, the \$10,000,000 expenditure, which the project of 16 feet depth would require, is a mere bagatelle compared with the advantages of the waterway to the commerce of the country. One battle ship equipped costs, according to the best estimates, about \$8,500,000. This great waterway would cost only a little more than one fully equipped battle ship. For the cost of one battle ship Congress could give a safe and cheap inland route from Baltimore to the South, reducing freight rates, increasing transportation by barges, and avoiding the dangers of Cape Hatteras, that "ocean 'Blue Beard' standing with outstretched arms and welcoming to the chambers of death the white-winged brides of the sea." Upon Cape Hatteras many a gallant ship, richly freighted, has been doomed to destruction.

The project is now being discussed to appropriate a very large sum for the purpose of erecting a light-house at this cape upon the outer Diamond Shoals, so well known as the most dangerous spot upon the Atlantic coast. The special board of engineers says:

In regard to the dangers of Cape Hatteras, the records of the Life-Saving Service show that within the last twenty-five years not less than \$3,000,000 worth of property and sixty-seven lives have been lost on the shoals in the vicinity of Cape Hatteras alone. The records of the losses in the vicinity of Cape Lookout are not immediately available, but the losses are no doubt sufficient to add materially to the aggregate of the two capes, and argue strongly the necessity of a safer route under existing conditions.

An inland water route would lend itself admirably to the method of barge transportation and the lowering of freight rates, and would have a very great influence in developing a traffic that at present does not exist. It would offer a safe route for barges from Baltimore to the mouth of St. Johns River, Florida, and possibly to Cuba and other West India Islands. It would enable coal, machinery, and manufactured articles to be shipped south, and lumber, cotton, phosphate, and southern products to be shipped north by the most economical method known. According to Captain Lucas's estimate, based upon an extended investigation of this subject, and contained in his report of November 22, 1900, the commerce of this route would amount to as much as \$115,000,000 per annum.

The possession of such an inland route would be important from a military point of view, and there are not a few who do not hesitate to say that the importance of this feature alone is sufficient to warrant the expenditure of whatever sum may be necessary to secure its construction.

After due consideration, the Board is of the opinion that the proposed inland waterway can be secured for a sum not exceeding \$7,000,000; that it is entirely feasible, and that the improvement is worthy.

Notwithstanding this report, the regular Board of Engineers overrules the special board of engineers and declares that \$10,000,000 would be required, and this is too much money to be expended by the Government at this time for this great project, and recommends a new survey for a depth of 10 and 12 feet.

ROUTE RECOMMENDED.

The special board of engineers says in regard to the route:

The existence of two large sounds in the path of this waterway divide it naturally into divisions, which will be separately discussed.

First. The part from Norfolk Harbor to Albemarle Sound.

Second. From Albemarle Sound to Pamlico Sound.

Third. From Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Inlet.

Fourth. Beaufort Inlet.

The routes selected by the board in the different divisions of the waterway and their lengths and cost are as follows:

Division.	Route selected.	Length.	Excavation.		Estimated cost.
			Cubic yards.	Length.	
		Miles.		Miles.	
First	Cooper Creek	62.0	31,600,000	54.2	\$4,922,000
Second	Rose Bay	80.5	24,500,000	55.3	3,719,000
Third	Adams Creek	50.0	9,800,000	19.7	1,387,000
Fourth	Beaufort Inlet	1.6	300,000	.8	45,000
Total		194.1	66,000,000	130.0	10,023,000

The selected route passes from Norfolk up the south branch of the Elizabeth River to near the mouth of Mill Creek; thence in a direct line by a land cut to the Pasquotank River at the mouth of Cooper Creek; thence down this river to and across Albemarle Sound and up the straight portion of the Alligator River; thence in a land cut through the marshes of the upper Alligator River, across the neck of land and into Rose Bay; thence into the Pamlico River, down this river, around Brant Island light-house, and up the Neuse River to opposite the mouth of Adams Creek; thence up Adams Creek and by a land cut to the head of Core Creek; thence down Core Creek, Newport River, and across Beaufort bar to the ocean. The length of this route, allowing for a direct line across the deep water of Albemarle Sound, is about 190 miles. This distance can be considerably shortened, and the route will be a better protected one if a cut should be made across Brant Island shoal not far from Brant Island. The Board has not sufficient data upon which to base an estimate for the work, but it will not be great.

This route has the advantages of the greatest possible amount of protection from storms throughout its length, of having safe harbors at each end of every land cut, of passing close to Elizabeth City, Morehead City, and Beaufort, and of being conveniently located with reference to the cities on the Pamlico and Neuse rivers.

In thus expressing its choice of the route the Board desires to specifically state that the selected route has been defined in general terms only, and that before the definite location of the different parts of the route can be made further detailed surveys will be necessary.

The Board is of the opinion that the selected route is a perfectly practicable one and that a waterway can be constructed along it for \$10,000,000, provided that the appropriations are of sufficient size and are made with sufficient regularity to allow the work to be carried on constantly and systematically. The annual cost of maintenance of the completed waterway is estimated by the Board at about \$150,000.

COMMERCIAL IMPORTANCE.

The termini of the waterway, as defined by the act, are at Norfolk, Va., and Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina; but as Norfolk is at present connected by a deep channel with Chesapeake Bay and the Atlantic Ocean, and Beaufort Inlet opens on the same ocean south of Capes Hatteras and Lookout, the object of the waterway is evidently to furnish an inland connection between the Atlantic Ocean at Chesapeake Bay and the same ocean south of both capes.

These two capes, and especially the former, have long been the terror of navigators. Before the introduction of steam the passage around Cape Hatteras was hazardous in the extreme; and though at the present time this cape is not as great an obstacle as formerly, yet it is still a serious menace to navigation. The records of the Life-Saving Service show that within the last quarter of a century not less than \$3,000,000 worth of property and sixty-seven lives have been lost in the vicinity of Hatteras alone, and if the records of all the losses between Cape Henry and Beaufort were available the total would be much greater. Indeed, in a recent publication it was stated "that 17 per cent of the vessels trading along the coast are wrecked at this point."

Not only is Cape Hatteras a source of danger, but by reason of the conflicting winds and currents to be met with at that point sailing vessels are frequently delayed in rounding the cape, even when the weather is not stormy enough to be a source of danger. Indeed, these delays have been so frequent that the establishment has several times been seriously contemplated of a line of seagoing tugs to wait near Hatteras to tow away any sailing vessels that might be delayed there.

All these dangers, both of loss and delay, have had their effects upon the rates charged for freight and insurance between the South and North Atlantic ports, and could these dangers be avoided there would of course be a considerable saving in these items.

It has been clearly demonstrated in recent years that the cheapest method of transporting bulky freight is in large barges towed by suitable tugs. Transportation by this method is now carried on to a large extent on the Great Lakes, and it has been successfully introduced between points on the Atlantic coast north of the Chesapeake. In all cases the introduction of this method of carrying freight has resulted in the reduction of freight rates by from 30 to 60 per cent.

Owing to the difficulties and dangers due to Capes Hatteras and Lookout all attempts to introduce the barge system on our South Atlantic coast have up to the present been unsuccessful, and the traffic around the capes is now carried on almost exclusively in steamers or in large sailing vessels. As south of Beaufort there is no very menacing cape and as possible harbors are quite numerous, there is every reason to believe that the opening of a waterway avoiding these capes would be shortly followed by the extension of the barge

method of transportation to our South Atlantic ports, with a resulting decrease in freight and insurance charges.

While it is easy to see that the opening of the waterway would result in a considerable saving in freight charges, it is not so easy to arrive at any reliable conclusion as to the extent of the commerce which would be affected and the amount of freight that would be saved.

Being informed that the Board was investigating this matter, the commercial bodies of the various cities on or near the South Atlantic coast undertook to assist, and the letters and statistics received from these commercial bodies are appended to this report.

These cities may be classed as those north of the waterway, those south of it, and those situated along its course. A brief analysis of the papers received from these cities will now be given.

The cities of Wilmington and Norfolk are both situated north of the waterway, and in the papers received from them it is estimated that the saving in freight charges on the commerce to and from them will amount to about \$2,250,000 annually.

The ports of Wilmington, Georgetown, Charleston, Savannah, Brunswick, Fernandina, and Jacksonville are all situated south of the southern terminus of the waterway, and from the statistics received from these ports it would appear that their total coastwise trade is now about 4,500,000 tons annually, valued at \$225,000,000, practically all of which is with ports north of the Chesapeake. Of this total trade they estimate that about three-fourths will be affected by the new waterway, and that the annual saving in freight charges will be about \$2,500,000.

While accepting as sufficiently accurate this statement of the present coastwise trade, the Board nevertheless believes that the effect of the opening of the new waterway upon it has been somewhat exaggerated. That a considerable amount of this commerce would shortly seek a cheaper method of transportation is undoubtedly true, but the Board is more inclined to put the ratio at one-fourth than at three-fourths. This commerce is now largely carried in steamers that give it quick and regular transit, and it would be some time before it would be likely to change to a less regular though possibly slightly cheaper method of transportation. Accepting this figure of one-fourth as more nearly correct, we have, as the total present commerce that would be affected by the waterway, about 1,100,000 tons, valued at about \$55,000,000. The annual saving in freight on this would probably not be less than \$900,000.

The commerce above considered would all, as far as the new waterway is concerned, be "through" freight, but there will also doubtless be a large amount of local freight passing to and from points situated along the line of the canal.

Statements from the existing canals show that in the past few years the total commerce of these canals has amounted annually to about 400,000 tons, valued at \$4,100,000, and carried in about 7,000 vessels. As the present conditions of navigation through these canals are such as to restrict the traffic to vessels of small size, and as there is a considerable toll charged, these figures give no basis upon which to estimate the amount of local freight in the new waterway.

Of the cities affected by this local traffic, statistics have been received from Elizabeth City, Washington, and Beaufort. The total commerce of these points is about 1,500,000 tons annually, and they estimate the probable saving in freight charges due to the new waterway at about \$750,000.

All the figures given above as to the commercial importance of the new waterway are based upon the traffic at present carried by water, but there are other items which should be considered. There is a large amount of commerce originating at or near the seacoast and now carried to other seaports by rail that would undoubtedly seek water transportation should such transportation be made comparatively cheap and safe. Cheap transportation is one of the most important factors in the development of a country, and the opening up of a cheap and safe route along the middle part of our Atlantic coast would certainly have a very large effect in stimulating trade between the different sections, increasing that already existing, and bringing into being much commerce that at present does not exist.

Especially would this be true of the country to be traversed by the waterway. This region is at present poorly supplied with rail transportation, while its water trade is hampered by the lack of a practicable ocean outlet, the small size of the existing canals, and the toll charges thereon. With these difficulties removed there would undoubtedly be a great and rapid development of this region and its trade.

To what extent and at what rate this increase and development would take place are matters of speculation, but, judging from the effects of the opening of the canal between Lakes Superior and Huron, there is reason to believe that the development would be sufficiently rapid.

MILITARY IMPORTANCE.

From a military and strategic point of view the construction of this waterway would be of great importance. In connection with other canals already existing, it would permit our torpedo boats and small gunboats to pass by an interior and protected route from one part of our coast to another, and to thus concentrate at any desired point.

Besides these abstracts from the reports of the engineers I will incorporate in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, and ask to have read, the following letters from the Wilmington (N. C.) Chamber of Commerce and from citizens of Beaufort:

[Letter from the Wilmington (N. C.) Chamber of Commerce.]

APRIL 16, 1903.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the chamber of commerce held this day (7th April) the plan to open an inland waterway from Chesapeake Bay to the Atlantic Ocean at Beaufort Inlet, in North Carolina, was brought before the meeting by Mr. William W. Worth, chairman of our committee on harbor, shipping, and commerce, and very freely discussed, and received the unanimous indorsement of the chamber. It was concluded by all that such an inland waterway would in a great many ways benefit this port. It would open to us an enormous territory, fully 200 miles of sounds, besides the wide territory to be reached therefrom by using the rivers flowing therein, constituting hundreds of miles, which we can not now reach. It would from the very nature of things result in the establishing of barging, the cheapest known method of transportation, barging from this port outside to Beaufort Inlet being perfectly practicable and safe at any season of the year.

This city and immediate vicinity consumes annually 60,000 to 75,000 tons of bituminous coal. Barging from Chesapeake Bay would enable us to land this coal 60 cents per ton cheaper than now obtainable, causing a saving thereby of \$45,000 annually, which result would largely increase its use. We ship by water annually 75,000,000 feet of lumber, poles, ties, and piling. The present rate to Baltimore is \$4.25 per thousand. By barging this lumber and timber could be landed in Baltimore and other Chesapeake Bay markets \$1.75 per thousand cheaper, thereby causing a saving of \$131,000 annually in handling of wood products alone. We handle annually of canned goods, lime, cement, and heavy groceries in value about \$6,000,000. These goods would naturally seek the route offering the cheapest rate of transportation and would be the principal cargo coming this way, and on which we could reasonably expect a saving of about \$100,000.

By this waterway we would avoid the dangers of Capes Lookout and Hatteras, thereby lessening the rate of insurance, and reduce to a minimum time in water transportation, as vessels would not be forced to wait favorable weather to get around Hatteras. We are confident the opening of this waterway would result in the establishing of new enterprises and industries in our immediate vicinity and the enlarging of some we now have. As the making or unmaking of the centers of trade is now dependent largely upon the rates of freight, it was the unanimous opinion that the opening of this waterway could but result in benefiting our immediate commerce in every way, which now exceeds in volume \$50,000,000 annually. The aggregate of saving on inward and outward freight which would directly accrue to us by reason of the construction of this canal and waterway would be \$276,000 annually and of immense benefit indirectly.

Our total domestic tonnage for 1902 was 295,897 tons.

Yours, very truly,

WM. E. WORTH,
J. A. TAYLOR,
JNO. A. ARRINGDALE,
Special Committee Wilmington Chamber of Commerce.

Col. CHARLES J. ALLEN, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army,
President of Board of Engineers having under consideration the project of an inland waterway between Norfolk, Va., and Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina.

[Letter of citizens of Beaufort, N. C.]

JUNE 29, 1903.

DEAR SIR: At a mass meeting of the citizens of the town of Beaufort held in the town hall on the 8d day of June the undersigned were appointed a committee to secure data and statistics of the business, commerce, industries, and different enterprises of the town of Beaufort, and the county of Carteret, N. C., to be forwarded to you, in reference to the project of the inland waterway from Chesapeake Bay to Beaufort, N. C.

Beaufort is a thriving town on the eastern coast of North Carolina, the county seat of Carteret County. According to the last census it has a population of 2,185; it is the third oldest town in North Carolina; was incorporated in the year 1722 as a port of entry by the English Government; it has a fine natural harbor, and notwithstanding the fact that it has never been deepened by the Government, yet vessels drawing 14 and 15 feet of water can come in with safety. Vessels have entered this harbor in the past drawing as much as 25 feet of water; in fact, Beaufort Harbor was the rendezvous of the United States fleet in 1864, in charge of General Butler, when the attack was made on Fort Fisher, and also the later one in charge of General Terry. This latter fleet contained near 300 vessels. By a reference to a recent report of the United States engineers in regard to the Beaufort Harbor it can be seen that with an outlay of from \$60,000 to \$100,000 the harbor can be deepened so that vessels drawing 25 feet of water can come into our port.

The town of Beaufort is only about a half-hour's run from the sea, and the harbor is landlocked on all sides and makes a good refuge for vessels from storms in any and all directions.

The county of Carteret is a very fertile county. The principal industries are fish, oysters, clams, and other sea products; farming, trucking, timber interests, etc.

The Gulf Stream is within 19 miles of our coast, and owing to its nearness truck and early vegetables can be raised at least two weeks earlier than they can be raised within 80 miles in the interior. Our soil is capable of raising cotton, corn, hay, rice, potatoes, vegetables, and numerous other products.

There was listed for taxation in June, 1902, in the county 157,903 acres of land; 1,856 town lots. The aggregate value of the real and personal property was, in round numbers, \$1,000,000. The report from the custom-house for the port of Beaufort shows 225 registered vessels, with a gross tonnage of 2,675 tons. There are at least eight times as many smaller craft, which are engaged in commerce in the county, not registered in the custom-house, they being under custom-house tonnage. The amount of the gross sales of the merchants in Carteret County for the year ending December 30, 1902, aggregates, in round numbers, about \$1,000,000; the amount of gross sales for the town of Beaufort aggregates \$200,000; the number of vessels engaged in the oyster business in the county, dredgers, 54, smaller craft, 1,000. The number of licenses issued for oystermen for the year 1902 was 766.

The different commodities handled in the county for the year ending December 31, 1902, were as follows:

Cotton.....bales.....	2,500	Oysters.....bushels.....	1,000,000
Cotton seed.....bushels.....	7,500	Turpentine, crude, barrels.....	1,000
Tobacco leaf.....pounds.....	25,000	Clams.....bushels.....	75,000
Rice, rough.....bushels.....	2,000	Wood.....cords.....	200,000
Grain.....do.....	100,000	Timber.....feet.....	25,000,000
Hay.....tons.....	100	Lumber.....do.....	20,000,000
Potatoes.....bushels.....	200,000	Shingles.....number.....	1,000,000
Vegetables.....pounds.....	1,000,000	Fertilizers.....tons.....	10,000
Cattle.....head.....	2,000	Merchandise, general, do.....	500,000
Horses.....do.....	3,000	Machinery.....pounds.....	100,000
Hogs.....do.....	5,000	Passengers.....number.....	20,000
Poultry.....do.....	50,000	Coal.....tons.....	1,000
Eggs.....dozen.....	500,000	Peanuts.....bushels.....	10,000
Fish.....pounds.....	60,000,000	Fish oil.....barrels.....	10,000

In gathering the above statistics the committee have in some instances been unable to get definite figures and have had to estimate the same. The estimates are very low.

With the inland waterway we feel confident that this business would increase treble.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

J. H. POTTER,
C. P. DEY,
W. S. CHADWICK,
W. F. DILL,
C. D. JONES,
J. S. CAFFEY,
CHAS. L. ABERNETHY,
Committee.

Col. CHARLES J. ALLEN, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army,
President of the Board of Engineers having under consideration the project of an inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, as stated the other day upon the floor by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], this is an era of canal building. The era of railroad building must sooner or later come to an end. The water-controlling period of the world is upon us. The whole drift of the times is toward the construction of water routes of transportation, supplementing railroad routes, and made necessary by the growth of population of the country. In the

history of the centuries the time has arrived in which we propose to build the great isthmian canal at Panama connecting the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, shortening the distance between New York and San Francisco 10,080 miles. From New York to San Francisco by way of Cape Horn it is 14,840; by way of the Panama Canal it will be only 4,760, a saving of over 10,000 miles, and over fifty days' time by freight steamers between those two points, with a corresponding economy of sailing time to other points of the two coasts.

Soon, by means of this great canal, the lumber, cotton, cotton manufactures, coal, and iron of the South will be shipped to the Pacific coast and to the far Orient. Bearing a relationship to the construction of the Panama Canal, and in line with the general drift of the times, is the improvement and extension of the inland waterways of the United States. Inland waterways tend to cheapen the cost of freight, to develop industry; they cheapen the rate of transportation not only for the products of the farmers, but of manufacturers as well. In the world at large the Suez Canal is now open to commerce; the great Baltic Ship Canal is now in operation. Germany has within a very recent period expended more than \$90,000,000 in the construction of a canal, and France has entered upon an extensive system of similar improvements.

On this continent Canada has a splendid system of waterways. In the United States the city of Chicago has started to build a great canal to the sea for its shipping and that of the Great Lakes; and without the aid of the State or National Government has already expended for that purpose \$35,000,000, and has already constructed a great canal through which almost any vessel that can go through the Suez Canal can pass, making a great waterway from the Great Lakes, through the Illinois and Mississippi rivers, to the Gulf of Mexico. The State of New York has just determined to expend over \$100,000,000 in enlarging the Erie Canal. The citizens of Philadelphia are clamoring for a 35-foot channel to the sea. The citizens of Delaware are asking Congress to deepen and widen the old Delaware and Chesapeake Canal, making a ship canal for our ships of war and our merchant marine and constituting a link in that wonderful water passageway which exists almost all the way from Sandy Hook to Florida.

With this well-recognized drift of events, I believe and I hope the day is near at hand when this great project of an inland waterway along the North Carolina coast, a project which has been agitated for so many years, and which was first suggested nearly one hundred years ago by Albert Gallatin, will soon meet the approval of Congress. I find in a valuable pamphlet on "Internal Improvements in North Carolina" an article which outlines the scheme of Albert Gallatin for a great coastwise canal in the early part of the nineteenth century. The article states the estimated cost of this work was placed at \$3,000,000.

According to Gallatin's idea a seagoing vessel would enter the first canal at Boston Harbor, pass through the Rhode Island Bay, Long Island Sound, the harbor of New York, and reach Brunswick on the Raritan. It would then follow the second canal to Trenton, where it would meet the Delaware. It would follow this river to Christiana or New Castle; then through the third canal to Elk River and the Chesapeake. Down the Chesapeake Bay and up Elizabeth River it would enter Albemarle Sound through the fourth canal. Then by Pamlico, Core, and Bogue sounds it would reach Beaufort, N. C. From Beaufort vessels of smaller draft could be made to reach the Cape Fear Inlet by cutting two small necks of land. Below this point inland navigation could be continued between the outlying chain of islands and the coast of South Carolina and Georgia.

This bold plan of Gallatin attracted much attention and met with widespread approbation, but the war with Great Britain interrupted its execution. To North Carolina Gallatin's plan was very acceptable. The Secretary, before he made his great report, had surveyed a part of the route. In 1818 additional surveying was done. If the plan of connecting Norfolk and Beaufort were carried out, North Carolina confidently expected to see all the coasting trade of the United States pass that way in order to avoid the dangerous navigation around Cape Hatteras.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this great project, advocated thus early by the distinguished Gallatin, will sooner or later become a reality, making the seaports of North Carolina, especially the great harbor of Beaufort, all that the God of nature intended they should be, and benefiting the commerce of the whole country. Would it not be better for our national interests to spend a little less money for battle ships and cruisers to sail the seas and expend a little more money for the defense of our coasts, improving our navigation, the increase of our commerce and coastwise trade, and the benefit of the people who live at home?

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I am not a believer in made-to-order issues for a Presidential campaign. Such issues, embodied in a platform, constitute a platform intended to get in

on, but not to stand on. A platform to catch votes, to fool the people, but not embodying any vital principles. I have been somewhat amused during the present session of Congress at the efforts of certain Democratic leaders to get a made-to-order platform, differing materially from the platforms of the past, relegating to the rear or evading old issues in order that the Democratic party might be rejuvenated with something resembling actuality, so that there might be some possible chance of inducing the voters of the country to forget its past and again intrust it with the control of the Government. Those efforts seem to have thus far been futile, and it now seems that the coming political battle must be fought out along old lines and on well-established questions of principle.

There is one issue, and one only, on which the two great political parties of this country are divided to-day, precisely as they have been divided in the past. That is the issue of protection to American industries and American labor. There is no other issue—for this campaign there can be no other issue—upon which every Republican stands on one side and every Democrat upon the other side. This issue is as important now, as vital, as ever before in the history of this country. Protection is as necessary to preserve and maintain universal prosperity of all industries, of all classes, as it was originally to secure and bring about such prosperity. Strike it down in any degree and just to that extent you will strike down the interests and the prosperity of our manufactures, our agricultural interests, and the interests of every man who toils with hand or brain. The "academic idea of free trade" is as dangerous as it would be to intrust all the great affairs of this Government to the management of "academic" minds. It is not matter of dispute that since the passage of the Dingley tariff bill we have enjoyed in this country a period of unexampled prosperity in which all classes have participated.

Yet there are those who claim, in opposition to all the teachings of history, that freer trade with foreign nations would benefit the people of this country by giving them cheaper goods. So far as competitive products are concerned, I deny that any class of our people would be benefited by free trade or by a material reduction of present tariff rates. Certainly not the laboring man, for every dollar's worth of additional products imported from other lands would just that extent lessen the demand for labor here, for we should be purchasing from abroad what could be made at home, which ought to be made at home, and which otherwise would be made at home by American labor. The business interests of the country would not be benefited by sending out of the country the money that should be used to pay for material and labor produced at home, for in the one case we should have only the goods and some other country would have the money, while in the other case we should have both the goods and the money, which would inevitably go back into the channels of our own trade to produce and pay for still other goods and furnish employment, comfort, and independence to the laboring men of our own country.

Lower duties would inevitably increase importations and just as inevitably would close some of our factories and throw out of employment some of our citizens. Such has always been the effect; such always will be the effect. In these days there is much of humbug and claptrap in connection with the doctrine of reciprocity, which is the handmaiden of protection or of free trade, as the case may be. Reciprocity in noncompetitive products is the doctrine of Blaine and McKinley, and is in truth the handmaiden of protection. Reciprocity in competitive products is just the opposite and is only another name for free trade. In other words, there can be no such thing as reciprocity unless we get our fair share of the benefits, and as we can derive no benefit by admitting free-of-duty articles that come in competition with like articles produced by our own citizens, such an act would not be one of reciprocity, but of simple free trade; nothing more and nothing less. There would be no reciprocity in admitting, for instance, Canadian cereals, eggs, butter, and other farm products free of duty in competition with the products of our own farmers, for of such articles we can more than supply the home market, and admitting great quantities of the same articles from Canada would inevitably reduce the price our farmers would receive at home, and would also compel them to seek a market abroad for just so much more of the home crop and therefore operate to reduce the export price as well.

No; our farmers will never consent to let in the natural products of Canada duty free to compete with them in their own home market, and woe to the political party which advocates such reciprocity as that. Canada can offer us nothing to adequately compensate for admitting its products free. If they should admit our manufactured goods, such as farm implements, for instance, free of duty, their own growing industries of the same kind would be driven out of business, their own laborers thrown out of employment, and in the end it would be but a bad bargain for both countries. Flood Minnesota with Canadian wheat, so that the great

flour mills would be independent of home producers, and every farmer of that State and of other surrounding States would suffer. Flood Canada with our manufactured products free of duty and her own factories, would go out of business, her own laboring men be driven out of employment.

Protection is fair trade as opposed to free trade; that is, we should admit free of duty or at a low rate of duty by reciprocal arrangement with other countries such articles as they grow or produce and the like of which we can not grow or produce, on consideration of such countries admitting our products upon equally favorable terms. But every competing product of soil or factory should pay a duty equal at least to the difference in wages and cost of production between the country from which it comes and our own country. Thus we protect our own producers, give employment to our own people; and necessarily, as we are, and for all time must be, the greatest producing nation on earth, the country of the greatest resources, we shall inevitably keep the balance of trade in our favor, and thereby insure for all time the prosperity of our people. When we sell more than we buy, when the balance of trade is constantly in our favor, we are sure to be materially prosperous. With all our wonderful resources, the balance of trade has generally been against us in times of free trade or low tariffs, and always in our favor in times when the doctrine of protection has prevailed. We have sold more to other countries since the passage of the Dingley protective law, and at the same time we have bought more, notwithstanding the tariff, because we have been better able to buy. But our exports have increased to a much greater extent than our imports, because under the stimulus of protection our products have greatly increased, new industries have been established, and our people have been constantly employed.

Let us do a little comparing here between the condition of affairs in this country and in Great Britain, the one under the policy of protection and the other under the policy of free trade. The export trade of Great Britain has fallen off in thirty years about \$110,000,000 per year, and her imports have in the same time increased about \$800,000,000 per year, being a net loss of a little less than a round billion dollars per year. What wonder is it that her statesmen are seriously considering a radical change of policy from free trade to protection! Take the same thirty years in this country, and the figures, without other argument, ought to be enough to convert to the cause of protection every Democrat in the United States. Our imports in the calendar year 1903 exceeded those of 1873 by \$400,000,000, an increase in the thirty years of 67 per cent, while at the same time in the calendar year 1903 our exports exceeded those of 1873 by \$917,000,000, an increase in thirty years of 161 per cent.

Neither imports nor exports decreased by reason of the repeal of the Wilson bill and the enactment of the Dingley bill, but under the protective system both increased enormously. Our imports in the calendar year 1903 exceeded those of 1893 by \$219,000,000, and the exports of 1903 exceeded those of 1893 by \$608,000,000. For the calendar year 1903 our imports, including those from Hawaii and Porto Rico, were \$1,035,119,829, and our exports were \$1,508,314,032, leaving a net balance of trade in our favor of \$473,194,103. And in the last seven years, under the protective system, the net balance of trade in our favor has been more than three and one-half billions of dollars.

It will be seen by the figures that under the protective system we buy more and we sell more than under free trade or a purely revenue tariff. It works both ways. By building up our industries we produce more and thus have more to sell to other countries, while by keeping our people constantly employed in remunerative pursuits they have more money with which to buy, and thus our foreign trade increases materially and our home trade enormously. Let me quote a British authority as to the effect of a protective tariff. Mr. Chamberlain, talking to the tin-plate workers at Cardiff, Wales, said:

You have the iron, you have the coal, you have the workmen, you have the people who have for generations been devoted to this particular trade. It is recognized everywhere that this particular trade is favorably situated, and yet this trade which ought to have been yours under any theory of true free trade or free exchange received a few years ago a mighty and staggering blow. The greater part of this trade was done with the United States of America. The McKinley tariff of 1891 put on it a prohibitive duty. This did not operate on your trade immediately, but, as always happens in such cases, behind the tariff a great industry grew up in America—a great industry which, at the present time, produces 400,000 tons of tin plate every year and gives employment to 50,000 workmen. * * * What was the position at the time Mr. McKinley put on the duty? At that time the whole manufacture of tin plates in America was 500 tons. Now, in a few years it has increased to 400,000 tons. A trade of 400,000 tons you can not disturb. The vested interest is too powerful; the advantage to the country is too evident; the trade you have lost you have lost and you will never get it back.

Is not that an object lesson the effect of which no free trader or tariff reformer can get around or explain otherwise than as an irrefutable argument in favor of the doctrine of protection? I might go on to show you from the figures that the consumer did not, either, in that case pay the tax, because, as a matter of fact,

the product was immensely cheapened to the consumer. A great industry built up, 50,000 men given employment, and all the money kept at home instead of being sent out of the country to pay for the same product! In innumerable cases the same result has followed protective legislation. In the last year, just one single year, it is stated by the Chattanooga Tradesman, 5,236 new industries were started in the Southern States alone. How many millions of dollars were invested in them I do not know; how many American citizens were given employment I can not tell; but this I do know, and every intelligent being knows the same thing, that the protective laws upon our statute books made this wonderful feat of development and prosperity possible.

Think you the South can be again humbugged with the fallacious idea that its people would be benefited by reducing duties and amending tariff schedules so that these new industries would have to compete in the open markets of the world, and of this country in particular, with the same kind of products produced in other lands where wages are only a third or a half what they are here? Can the laboring men of the land be induced to ever vote again for a policy that will close these factories and throw them out of employment? The days of free soup houses, of Coxey's armies, of millions of men out of employment and looking for work, are altogether too recent to be wholly forgotten.

Mr. Chairman, the logic of events has made the one and only issue of the coming campaign. It is the paramount issue, if you please, and the issue that will continue President Roosevelt and a Republican Congress at the helm. It is the issue that will insure the continuance of our wonderful prosperity in every avenue of trade and commerce north, south, east, and west, in every nook and corner of this broad land; the issue upon which every Republican holds the affirmative and every Democrat the negative, unless, indeed, the Democratic party is ready to admit that the Republican party has been right upon this issue during all its past history, while they have been wrong, and as to both these propositions, in the light of experience, there can be and there is no shadow of doubt.

We have all heard the argument—we shall doubtless continue to hear it in the next campaign—that the tariff fosters trusts and great monopolies. No one can deny that such trusts and monopolies exist in free-trade countries as well as in this country; no one can deny that they exist in nonprotected as well as in protected industries. But the mere fact—and I admit it is a fact—that they derive benefit from a protected tariff is used as an alleged argument against the entire policy of protection. Would you take away the benefits of protection from all industries, from all the people, because some great corporations are benefited? I would not. The rain falls on the just and on the unjust, yet I have never heard any one argue against the plan of an all-wise Providence in that respect. The wicked as well as the good, the rich as well as the poor, high and low alike enjoy all the blessings and the benefits of sunshine and shower, yet who would deny the actuality of the blessings or the benefits or propose to alter or change the Divine plan in order that the undeserving might be shut out from the enjoyment of such blessings and such benefits?

The protective system benefits all and is for all our people. I would not crush out a small industry to injure a larger industry. I would not think it a blessing or a benefit to deprive a thousand or a hundred thousand or a million of our people of their employment, of their chance to earn a livelihood, even if by so doing the greatest and richest corporation on earth could be driven out of business. If it were to never rain again, if the sun were to never shine again, the righteous would suffer quite as much as the sinners. Strike down your protective tariff system and not the trusts alone would be crippled, but the prosperity of all would be destroyed. We can manage our great corporations; we can control them; we will manage and control them, but not at the expense of all business, of all industries; not by closing all factories and all avenues of production; not by throwing all our laboring people out of employment, but by wise and enlightened supervision and control.

I believe that even with our present tariff laws we are getting quite as much of foreign manufactured goods shipped into this country as we need. If it would shut more of them out I would be willing to increase rather than reduce the tariff rates. The last fiscal year, 1903, our imports increased over the year previous by more than \$100,000,000. The imports of manufactured articles for the year were more than \$412,000,000. That is quite a large enough amount of manufactured goods from abroad to be admitted into this country in a single year to compete with our own manufacturers, especially when we consider that if the same goods had been made here by our own people fully \$300,000,000 of that amount would have gone into the pockets of the laboring men of this country. Does it seem reasonable in the face of these figures that any laboring man would vote to take down the tariff bars and admit unlimited quantities of such foreign manufactured goods?

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe in the sacredness of any tariff schedules. Sometimes, no doubt, they need revising, to make more perfect the protective system. But as to the system as a whole the Republican party "stands pat." That will be its platform. That will be the issue, and on that issue, with hundreds of thousands of votes from those who have heretofore voted the Democratic ticket, but who as sensible and patriotic Americans can not do otherwise than vote with the Republican party on this great issue, we shall sweep the country.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EMERICH].

Mr. EMERICH. Mr. Chairman, there has during the current month been a vast amount of discussion in this House upon the subject of the Post-Office Department. Many able addresses have been made by Members; much information has been elicited concerning its workings and methods. The iniquities that fester and canker the conduct of the Department have been thoroughly thrashed out; its abuses have been made manifest. The rottenness existing among many of its higher officials has been trumpeted forth to the country. Charge and countercharges have been insistently made, and a veritable tempest of wrath seems to have devoured this House and the country at large whenever the malodorous subject of the administration of the Post-Office Department has been broached.

And yet, with this Department the storm center of the Administration, with the courts justly punishing parasitic officials who have used their exalted positions for the purpose of plundering the nation and guiltily enriching themselves, and with the spectacle before us of frantic attempts upon the part of all concerned to shift the blame from themselves to the shoulders of others, with absolute recklessness of the guilt or innocence of those accused so long as their own miserable, pitiful persons are protected, little has been said of the rank and file of the employees of the Department.

And this, too, is strange, because I doubt if the Government in any branch of its service contains a body of men more faithful to its employer, more single minded in its devotion to duty, and of greater public utility than this same class of uncomplaining, un-murmuring, hard-working, and thoroughly efficient postal clerks, carriers, and messengers.

While I realize that any statement that I may make in their behalf must be necessarily inadequate, lame, and halting, since no one without the actual experience in the arduousness of their work and the assiduity of their efforts can effectually portray them, still, I shall call the attention of this House to some of the important features, which, while of so common and everyday occurrence as to almost fail to excite comment, are yet of such a character as to demand prompt and careful attention. I wish also to call to the attention of the House some remedial legislation that I have proposed, which, in my judgment, will tend to mitigate the arduous and rigors of the very unenviable condition of these postal employees.

Briefly, then, I have offered two bills during the present session, House bills Nos. 13993 and 14096, which have been referred respectively to the Committee on Reform of the Civil Service and to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The first of these bills is one entitled "A bill to provide for the employees of the United States engaged in the postal service, who are incapacitated by injuries sustained in the performance of their duties or who become superannuated after twenty successive years of service, and for other purposes."

In it I have provided that clerks, carriers, messengers, and the men engaged in the difficult, arduous, and wearing duties of the Railway Mail Service be recompensed when they have sustained physical injuries which prevent them from further performing their duties.

In this connection it may not be amiss to dilate for a few minutes upon the character of men engaged in the Railway Mail Service, and the importance, danger, and physical strain of their work and of their own courage, fortitude, bravery—aye, unvaunted and unappreciated heroism.

The railway postal clerk leads the life of a nomad. His waking and sleeping hours are spent in the uncomfortable and nerve-racking environment of the United States mail coach, and his waking far exceed in number his sleeping hours. His duties demand his entire attention. The minuteness of detail that he must attend is tremendous. He must be a man of good education, quick, alert, and indefatigable. He must stand a frighful strain, which inevitably undermines his constitution. His responsibilities are enormous. His labor highly essential. He is in constant danger of his life. Yet in the face of all these obstacles, which might well appall a man of Spartan training and fortitude, he goes about the performance of his duties in a manner which must force admiration from the most grudging miser of praise, by sheer force of simple self-devotion and apparent unconsciousness of self-sacrifice.

How often have you gentlemen read in the public prints of railway disasters, frightful wrecks, bold robberies, almost unbelievable catastrophes, and at the end of the account noticed two or three lines to the effect that the railway mail clerk stuck to his car, defended his mail, gave up his life, or suffered dreadful physical tortures in the course of the effort required of him by the circumstances in safeguarding and defending the trust reposed in him. You have read numberless accounts of his quickness of wit, his address and adroitness, his bravery, and his utter unselfishness when these qualities were necessary to insure the inviolability of his trust. It is, as I stated above, so common as to scarcely excite remark, and yet this is heroism—true heroism in the ordinary walks of life, and it is not exceeded in sublimity by the most admired and hysterically bepraised action on the field of battle.

Are these men adequately rewarded? Does their emolument or opportunity for substantial advancement compare favorably with those of other public servants in less exacting, less arduous, less necessary, but more prominent and showy positions?

Does a great government which, quite properly, cares for and tenderly cherishes the lives of its defenders in time of war evidence a corresponding solicitude for these tried, brave, and faithful servants who so signally assist in promoting the arts of peace?

In their old age, when exhausted nature precludes them from continuing in so exacting a branch of the service, and when, by force of long habit, they are practically unfitted for other fields of effort, does a benign employing government say to them: "You have labored faithfully; you have given much and received little; you deserve well of your country, and it shall be your country's care and pride to deserve well of you?"

Alas, for the fact that it is not so. It is a trite saying that republics are ungrateful, and it must be admitted that our treatment of these deserving men adds tremendous force to the adage.

Mr. Chairman, let us rectify this deplorable condition. Let us mete out at least a modicum of justice to these silent, suffering, persevering heroes.

In my bill I have provided that when these men are so disabled as to be unfitted for the further discharge of their duties they shall receive a pension equal to one-half of the salary that they earn at the time of their disability. Is not that a sufficiently modest proposal? Is it too much to guarantee a bare existence for life to a man who has sacrificed the best that that life possesses for the promotion of the comfort and the well-being of his country and his fellow-men?

I have made this feature apply also to clerks, carriers, and messengers in the postal service, and they are equally entitled to it.

It is true that the chance of injury in their cases is considerably smaller, but, especially in the cases of carriers and messengers, cruel and continuous exposure and other factors in our complicated modern social and business systems render them always liable to injury and to becoming incapacitated for further active duty, and the reasons that I have previously cited apply here with equal force and cogency.

In this bill I have also provided that superannuation pensions be granted to clerks, carriers, and messengers in the postal service and to employees in the Railway Mail Service, and this provision I regard as the essential feature of the bill.

While there is always the chance of injury in any of these services, and in some cases the probability is greater than the probability of immunity, still the element of chance governs, and there always exists the prospect of a lifetime of service without mishap, but old age is inexorable and a certainty, and from the palsy and ruthless hand of time there is no escape.

Our postal clerks, carriers, and messengers are scantily paid, hard worked, capable, deserving, and perform functions of enormous utility. The carriers and messengers work long hours, perform hard physical labor, have great responsibilities, are indefatigable, tireless, and devoted. They are constantly subject to severe hardships, they are exposed to all the rigors of climate without the means of ameliorating conditions which other men more fortunate in their choice of avocation possess, and in this service they age quickly and their usefulness perceptibly diminishes with their advancing years until the period is reached when they are discarded like a cast-off garment which has served its purpose. Indeed, of the two, the garment receives the more consideration, from the fact that its owner frequently regrets it from force of association and for the service it has performed, while little if any sympathy is bestowed upon the worn-out public servant, who has only given his entire life to the service of his country.

My bill provides that when one of these employees reaches the age of 60 he may retire upon a pension of one-half the amount of salary he earns at the time of retirement, provided he has been in the Government employ continuously for a period of twenty years, and that if he has been employed for a less period than that

and for a period of five years or more his retiring pension shall be such proportion of one-half his salary as the number of years of his service shall be of twenty.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal is not one that partakes of the nature of a request for alms for any set of men, but it is a matter of simple justice.

The country would not be giving them anything for nothing, but would merely be letting them have what they deserve and what they have earned. Surely a lifetime of earnest effort for inadequate remuneration deserves and earns a guaranty of competence in enforced retirement.

The country owes these men not merely a debt of gratitude but a more substantial, more tangible debt of dollars and cents, earned through much travail and hard labor, and at a cost of absolute life sacrifice, and it is incumbent upon you gentlemen in this House to provide for the payment of that debt in your positions as the nation's business managers, just as you would provide for the payment of the honest obligations of any commercial enterprise the management of which was intrusted to you.

The great business houses, the great industrial enterprises, all the great employers of labor are rapidly realizing that they are under both a moral and actual obligation to their faithful employees when these are compelled by stress of advancing age to relinquish their labors, and these same concerns are providing for the payment of that obligation.

Is a great government that ruthlessly takes the best that is in its servants to be held exempt from a similar obligation, or shall we make the humbling and disgraceful confession that this same great nation, so generous in the fostering of material advancement, so prodigal in its benefactions to industrial enterprises, so persistent in exemplifying the truth of the adage, "To him who hath shall be given," is too neglectful or too niggardly to properly provide for its deserving and patient servants?

For shame! Let us not stand before the world a nation that self-confessedly appropriates the lifeblood of its human pillars and then refuses to recompense them for their sacrifice.

Mr. Chairman, I have also, as I stated before, introduced a bill that is now innocuously slumbering in the cavernous recesses of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads with many other worthy bills, which the timidity, to call it by no worse name, of our legislators will not permit to see the beneficent light of day, and that bill proposes an increase of pay for postal clerks, carriers, and messengers.

Mr. Chairman, that bill is a just measure, and all that I have previously said about the neglect of the postal employees gathers renewed force when their shamefully inadequate pay is taken into consideration.

I have no power of expression that can voice my indignation at the penurious policy which the Government has employed in dealing with this question. We stand convicted before the world of rank and flagrant injustice. Our neglect and our self-complacency in the face of that neglect are nothing short of being absolutely criminal.

We discuss calmly and smugly the well-being of Filipinos, the righteousness of our conduct toward the Cubans, the beneficial or harmful nature of our policies respecting the Porto Ricans, and our duties toward hundreds of alien races and peoples, and this is all proper enough. We condemn the Sultan of Turkey's treatment of his subjects. Quite correct. But for Heaven's sake, before we remark on the mote in our brother's eye, let us cast the beam from out our own. Let us be just to our servants and true to ourselves, "and it must follow, as the night the day, that we shall not then be false to any other man." [Loud applause.]

My bill provides for but a small increase. I would I thought I could procure a greater.

Mr. Chairman, if we can not prevail upon ourselves to do entire justice, let us at least assure to these men a tithe of what is their due.

One feature of my bill, to which I wish to call especial attention, is that of an automatic increase of \$100 in yearly salary for each five years' service.

Mr. Chairman, no reputable business house fails to recognize long, faithful service, and it is as little as we can do to grant the miserably small additional pittance of \$100 after we have been faithfully served for five years. [Applause.]

When I reflect what a comparatively small sum it would require to effect the changes concerning which I have spoken, when I reflect what haggling, what puerile objections are advanced to the carrying out of these proposals, when I reflect, in addition, what prodigality is indulged in for less meritorious reasons, I am consumed with indignation and can hardly trust myself to give coherent expression to my views.

Mr. Chairman, this is no attempt to procure partisan advantage; it is no effort to place any man or men or party in a disagreeable position or bad light. I merely ask that some measure of justice be accorded hard-working, modest, deserving men, and I ask in

the name of American manhood, American ideals, American principles of right that earnestness and single-heartedness be recognized and rewarded, and that justice, the eternal foundation of an enduring nation, record its triumph and vindicate our claim to perpetual fame and an exalted position in the plane of moral rectitude. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 14416, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had instructed him to report that the committee had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8889. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania, by the Eastern Railroad Company."

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. 1570. An act granting an increase of pension to Jasper Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 76. An act granting a pension to Mary H. Cornell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4773. An act granting a pension to Juliette Nunez—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4381. An act granting a pension to Mary P. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3986. An act granting a pension to Cynthia Speaks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3956. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick Fleming—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3777. An act granting a pension to Sarah S. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 3490. An act granting an increase of pension to Bucklin H. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3352. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Nash—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 3198. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2727. An act granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Stafford—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 2582. An act granting an increase of pension to Harry M. Sherman—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 2458. An act granting a pension to John H. Oney—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 2361. An act granting an increase of pension to Clara E. Daniels—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 2124. An act granting an increase of pension to David W. Johns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5110. An act granting a pension to Cornelia K. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5077. An act granting an increase of pension to Agnes Harmon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5032. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Edick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4936. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4935. An act granting a pension to John Waarsteson—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4915. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4827. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. Burkholder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4815. An act granting an increase of pension to Angeline P. Root—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4777. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4776. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse Maurer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4759. An act granting a pension to John M. Manlove—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4731. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4727. An act granting an increase of pension to William M. Tanner—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4708. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Bailey—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4695. An act granting an increase of pension to Horatio P. Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4678. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Paris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4670. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Devine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4635. An act granting an increase of pension to David Miser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4621. An act granting an increase of pension to George Draper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4602. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram Imus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4531. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia C. Vanzant—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4529. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse N. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4528. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda M. Hand—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4514. An act granting an increase of pension to John P. Whitehouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4511. An act granting an increase of pension to James L. Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4507. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis G. Hoffmire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4496. An act granting an increase of pension to Harvey Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4487. An act granting an increase of pension to Aaron M. Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4480. An act granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4428. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin W. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4364. An act granting an increase of pension to Joshua McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4363. An act granting an increase of pension to Eli Venzie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4308. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Pillow—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4275. An act granting a pension to Nancy Noxon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4249. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Gilroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4242. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4192. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Whaley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4139. An act granting an increase of pension to John D. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4001. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin A. Provoost—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3988. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3778. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Cotey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3561. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Draper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3493. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Van Campen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3485. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Bedford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3385. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3327. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3308. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse C. Lott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3305. An act granting an increase of pension to James K. Deyo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3246. An act granting a pension to John McDermid—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 3227. An act granting an increase of pension to James F. Mears—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3034. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen F. Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3018. An act granting an increase of pension to George M. Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2975. An act granting a pension to Claude C. Swafford—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 2657. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2645. An act granting an increase of pension to La Roy B. Church—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2636. An act granting an increase of pension to Alvin D. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2569. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2508. An act granting an increase of pension to Morris H. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2380. An act granting a pension to Jane Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2372. An act granting an increase of pension to David M. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2252. An act granting an increase of pension to David Inches—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2248. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Sommers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2194. An act granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Buch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2030. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias L. Fidler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 725. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda L. Mardin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 460. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Nicholson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 25. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Frybarger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2046. An act granting an increase of pension to William G. Scott—to the Committee on Pensions.

MINORITY VIEWS ON THE BILL S. 2263.

Mr. LUCKING obtained unanimous consent to file views of the minority on the bill (S. 2263) to require the employment of vessels of the United States for public purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

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 assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John H. Bray against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Douglass Taylor, administrator of estate of Stephen Harris, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, 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. VOLSTEAD, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10411) granting right of way for trailway to W. W. Bass, of Coconino County, Ariz., for travel across the Grand Canyon of Arizona, and ferry privileges, and so forth, across the Colorado River therein, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1957); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LITTLE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13350) conferring jurisdiction upon United States commissioners over offenses committed in a portion of the permanent Hot Springs Mountain Reservation, Ark., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1958); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRIFFITH, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9298) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad and other improvements over and on that part of the Hot Springs Reservation known as West Mountain, Hot Springs, Ark., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1959); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCKING, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2263) to require the employment of vessels of the United States for public purposes, submitted the views of the minority of said committee (Report No. 1893, part 2); which said views were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12553) granting an increase of pension to Amaziah Havey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1911); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8014) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Audos, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1912); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8823) granting a pension to Bird L. Francis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1913); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8790) granting a pension to C. Annette Buckel, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1914); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8394) granting a pension to Reuben W. Bartram, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1915); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6868) granting an increase of pension to George R. Hanson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1916); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8921) granting an increase of pension to John McCollister, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1917); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8993) granting an increase of pension to Melvina Bottles, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1918); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6713) granting an increase of pension to John E. White, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1919); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5314) granting an increase of pension to John Woods, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1920); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3653) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Sollenberger, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1921); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6090) granting an increase of pension to F. C. Wickham, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1922); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6048) granting a pension to William Johnson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1923); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6000) to pension John B. Salzman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1924); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2450) granting a pension to Lucinda Heith, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1925); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2606) to increase the pension of Catherine Bowsher, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1926); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 605) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Frick, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1927); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9575) granting an increase of pension to John Donahoe, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1928); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6739) granting an increase of pension to Waldo A. Foster, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1929); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10790) granting an increase of pension to John F. Rockey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1930); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11776) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Mooney, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1931); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10169) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Flanagan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1932); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9797) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Langridge, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1933); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11576) granting an increase of pension to James E. Stalker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1934); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14181) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Burnet, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1935); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11193) granting an increase of pension to Abbie W. Griffin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1936); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9969) granting an increase of pension to James Frederick, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1937); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10126) granting an increase of pension to Job Throckmorton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1938); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11315) granting an increase of pension to Christian Mott, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1939); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12398) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Johnson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1940); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11748) granting an increase of pension to Edward E. Curran, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1941); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11487) granting an increase of pension to John Wybrant, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1942); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13310) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Smith, jr., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1943); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pen-

sions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13643) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Welsh, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1944); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13657) granting an increase of pension to Francis F. Rogers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1945); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13879) granting an increase of pension to Abraham S. Van Fleet, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1946); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14000) granting an increase of pension to Bradford A. Gehr, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1947); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14016) granting an increase of pension to William J. Whealton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1948); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14102) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Foster, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1949); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14145) granting an increase of pension to Abel S. Brooks, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1950); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14184) granting an increase of pension to James Ginnane, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1951); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3985) granting an increase of pension to Isabel F. Easum, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1952); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9959) for the relief of Mary E. O. Dashiell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1953); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14366) for the relief of G. A. Anderson—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8473) to supplement an act of Congress approved February 27, 1899, entitled "An act for the relief of the Fourth Arkansas Mounted Infantry"—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8954) granting a pension to Cecilia H. Long—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4248) for the relief of F. G. Fuller and J. A. Mitchell, executors of the will of John O'Dell, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 14469) to exempt applicants for pensions or increase of pensions from medical examination in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 14470) to incorporate the National German-American Alliance—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 14471) to authorize Indian allottees to sell and convey their allotted lands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 14472) to further promote the

efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Militia.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 14473) supplementary to an act to regulate the sale of milk in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 2, 1895—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 14474) establishing a United States court at Checotah, Ind. T., and conforming other districts therewith—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14475) establishing a regular term of the United States district court in Lewisburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMAR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 14476) fixing a period of limitation on judgments—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUDD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 137) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to examine and report upon a route for the construction of a free and open waterway to connect the waters of the Chesapeake and Delaware bays—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 54) to require the Secretary of War to cause a survey to be made of Great Peedee River, in South Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 14477) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Deverix—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14478) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Daniel Walsh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14479) granting an increase of pension to Alden Washburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14480) granting a pension to Eli B. Carlton—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 14481) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Estes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 14482) granting an increase of pension to Edwin F. Barrett—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 14483) granting a pension to Nellie Galencia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 14484) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 14485) granting a pension to Charlotte M. Wylie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14486) granting a pension to Alexander Kinnison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14487) granting a pension to Charles Dillon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 14488) granting an increase of pension to Hugh H. Canaday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14489) granting an increase of pension to John M. Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 14490) granting a pension to Degraphenreed P. McKinley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 14491) granting an increase of pension to Eli Prebble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 14492) for the relief of Barclay H. Warburton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14493) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14494) for the relief of Fannie Y. Kilgore, surviving wife of Judge C. B. Kilgore—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 14495) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 14496) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Fouce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 14497) granting an increase of pension to Theophilus P. McPheeters—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 the SPEAKER: Petition of J. L. Gamble, commander of B. Frank Maxson Post, No. 428, Grand Army of the Republic, and others, of Alfred, N. Y., urging the speedy passage of certain pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Ctas Zklanders, David Knickerbocker Boyd, and H. Kent Day, of Philadelphia, in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution of a convention of Republicans of Virginia, indorsing the Jamestown Exposition and its purpose—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, resolution of the Patent Law Association of Chicago, against the passage of bills H. R. 11585 and S. 4062—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Resolutions of the Patent Law Association of Chicago, against the passage of bill H. R. 11585, in relation to patents—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Citizens' Committee of San Miguel, Cal., against the selection of the J. H. Henry ranch, in California, for a military training camp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petition of S. V. Brewer Post, No. 323, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Nebraska, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to give status to Nebraska Territorial militia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Resolution of the members of the Tuscarawas County bar, of the northern district of Ohio, in favor of having Tuscarawas County remain in the northern district of Ohio—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of E. H. Pope, of Belle Plaine, Iowa, relative to giving the Metlakahtlans of the Annette Islands a clear title to their island—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Lodge No. 149, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron-ship Builders, of Marshalltown, Iowa, in favor of bill H. R. 7056—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of a union mass meeting held in the Presbyterian Church at Tipton, Iowa, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution of the Patent Law Association of Chicago, against the passage of bill H. R. 11585—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of residents of Wilkinsburg, Pa., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 2993, to increase the pension of Lewis Townsend—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolution of the Patent Law Association of Chicago, against the passage of bills H. R. 11585 and S. 4062—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the Patent Law Association of Chicago, against passage of bills H. R. 11585 and S. 4062—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FLOOD: Petitions of Rev. Luke R. Markwood and 32 others, of Rockbridge, Va.; John P. Hughes and 30 others, of Slaughter Precinct, Va., and the Mill Creek Church and 20 others, of Arch Mills, Va., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Resolution of the Chicago Board of Trade, in favor of arbitration treaties between the United States and Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Union, No. 7187, American Federation of Labor, of Streator, Ill., in favor of an eight-hour law and the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Resolution of Ponce Section of the Chamber of Commerce of Porto Rico, in favor of bill H. R. 7056, providing for a commission to consider and report legislation for the development of the merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of Charles T. Morgan and 59 others, of Haverhill, Mass., and D. L. Bartlett and 39 others, of Amesbury, Mass., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGG: Resolution of the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, relative to interstate commerce and in favor of the Cooper-Quarles bills—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Resolution of Welch Post, No. 422, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Ohio, in favor of bill H. R. 5760—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Little Miami Division, No. 34, of the

Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, in favor of bill H. R. 2869—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Resolution of Lodge No. 103, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron-ship Builders, of Salt Lake City, Utah, in favor of bill H. R. 7056—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey (by request): Two petitions of the joint committee of the American Anti-Trust League, of Washington, D. C., relative to antitrust legislation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELIHER: Petition of Division No. 14, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Norfolk County, Mass., in favor of the bill providing for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Kearsarge Association of Naval Veterans, of Boston, Mass., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Real Estate Exchange and Auction Board, Boston, Mass., in favor of bill H. R. 7056—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Chadwick Boston Lead Company, in favor of bill H. R. 9050—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Manning Brothers, of Boston, Mass., in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LACEY: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to John M. Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Commercial Exchange of Des Moines, Iowa, relative to the reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Richland, Iowa, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of the officers and directors of the State Historical Society of North Dakota, in favor of bill H. R. 9876—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Papers to accompany House bill to increase the pension of Charles H. Dunihueby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: Resolutions of public meetings held in Duquesne Theater, Pittsburg, and Carnegie Music Hall, Allegheny, on March 5 and 6, 1904, in favor of bill to create the Colonization Bureau and to provide for advances to actual settlers on the public domain—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Commodore Barry Assembly, No. 3, American Catholic Union, of Philadelphia, in favor of the bill providing for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of David Knickerbocker Boyd, of Philadelphia, in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution of a convention of the Republicans of Virginia, in favor of the Jamestown Exposition—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, resolution of the Patent Law Association of Chicago, in favor of bills H. R. 11585 and S. 4062—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of residents of Watsonville, Cal., against the passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the board of supervisors of the county of San Joaquin, Cal., in favor of a bill declaring Bensons Ferry to be the head of navigation of the Mokelumne River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of Board of Trade of San Francisco, against the passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PAYNE: Resolution of Lodge No. 188, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron-ship Builders, of Geneva, N. Y., in favor of bill H. R. 7056—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PORTER: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, in favor of bill S. 2641—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, in favor of bill S. 4505—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects; the City Parks Association, of Philadelphia; and Edgar V. Seeler, president of Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, relative to erecting public buildings on the Mall, Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RHEA: Petition of J. R. Young and others, of Logan, Ky., in favor of bill H. R. 3574—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of N. H. Simmons and 44 others, and Robert Barbour and 40 others, of Glasgow, Ky., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, nine petitions of citizens of Todd and Logan counties, Ky., relative to amending the revenue laws—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic post at Gardner, Kans., in favor of the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 5037, granting an increase of pension to R. H. Stillwell—to the Committee of Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 14378, to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce," etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNOOK: Petition of the Farmers' Mutual Protective Association of Carryall Township, Paulding County, Ohio, in favor of a good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to John Horstmann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Petition of the A. Merriam Company, of South Acton, Mass., in favor of bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Annie E. Fillebrown and 38 others, of Ayer, Mass., in favor of a forest reserve in the White Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petition of the Troy Chair Company, of Troy, Ind., in favor of bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, March 28, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on the request of Mr. BURROWS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. MCKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed with amendments the bill (S. 4672) to authorize the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Connecticut River, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 3256) directing the issue of a check in lieu of a lost check drawn by Thomas J. Hobbs, disbursing clerk, in favor of Crane & Co., of Dalton, Mass.; and

A bill (H. R. 13480) to authorize the Southern Indiana Railway Company to construct a railroad bridge across the Wabash River in Vigo County, Ind.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 9) to open for settlement 505,000 acres of land in the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian reservations, in Oklahoma Territory;

A bill (H. R. 9135) for the relief of F. R. Lanson;

A bill (H. R. 9985) providing for the donation of lots A, B, K, and L, in block 39, in Fort Dalles military addition to The Dalles, Oreg., as shown on the plat of the city of The Dalles, Oreg., to the Oregon Historical Society;

A bill (H. R. 10208) for the relief of the Allegheny College, at Meadville, Pa.;

A bill (H. R. 10866) to amend section 63, chapter 23, of volume 28, of the United States Statutes at Large;

A bill (H. R. 12685) for the reappraisal and sale of the undisposed lands within the Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation, in the State of Washington;

A bill (H. R. 13740) for the relief of the Western Alaska Construction Company's Railroad;

A bill (H. R. 14110) to authorize the donation of a certain unused and obsolete gun now at Chickamauga Park, Ga., to Phil Kearny Post of the Grand Army of the Republic, at Nelsonville, Ohio; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) for appointment of members of Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.