

Iowa, asking that religious publications be given the advantage of the act of Congress of July 16, 1894, relative to second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of George E. Wilson, of Royalton, Minn., for relief—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAYTON: Memorial of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, protesting against the passage of Senate bill No. 2261 (H. R. 6508), providing for an international humane and sanitary conference—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEONARD: Remonstrance of citizens of Lycoming County, Pa., against permitting the statue of Marquette to remain in Statuary Hall—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LINTON: Petition of Charles H. Bement, of Laingsburg, Mich.; also of G. H. Slocum, of Caro, Mich., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4566, to amend the postal laws relating to second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Frank H. Rose, of Corunna, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill No. 4566, to amend the postal laws relating to second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of joint resolution No. 11, that neither Congress nor any State shall pass any law respecting the establishment of religion, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions adopted by the National Association of the Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers of the United States, asking that the Interstate Commerce Commission publish certain statistics—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition signed by citizens of Saginaw County, Mich., asking that a bill be passed taxing filled and skimmed cheese—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Petition of the Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the bill establishing a military park at Vicksburg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of W. H. Gibbs and 110 other citizens of Galva, Ill., in favor of the passage of the joint resolution No. 11, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Petition of the Liquor Dealers' Association of Connecticut, against the passage of House bill No. 6668, to amend an act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Petition of George H. Harries, of Pueblo, Colo.; also of J. N. Counter, of Colorado, for the passage of House bill No. 4566, relating to second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Colorado Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Mary Jewett Telford, president, favoring the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of citizens of Longmont and Boulder County, Colo., favoring the passage of joint resolution No. 11, proposing an amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SORG: Petition of Wayne Council, No. 90, Order United American Mechanics, unanimously indorsing the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SNOVER: Petition of Detroit Manufacturers' Club of Detroit, Mich., for financial legislation—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Annie Bell Carswell, counselor, Benjamin Leacock, secretary, and 73 others, of Lady Wentworth Council, No. 18, Daughters of Liberty, Manchester, N. H., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TRELOAR: Petition of Fred Reather Post, No. 420, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Missouri, of Montgomery City, praying for the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELLINGTON: Petition of Mrs. R. T. Viers, of Montgomery County, Md., praying that the war claim filed by William A. Viers, now deceased, be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of D. H. Wyand, executor, asking aid in the settlement of the war claim of Frederick Wyand—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Basil L. Bean, of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of James Orme, deceased, late of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of John Mullieau, of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of James T. West, of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of William R. Beall, of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of B. L. Fox, of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Alexander F. Boswell, of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of Patrick Connolly, deceased, late of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 6, 1896.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.
The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in compliance with the provisions of the act of March 2, 1895, a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, together with a report from Indian Agent D. A. Wisdom, of the Union Indian Agency, Ind. T., showing payments by the Cherokee Nations to such persons as would accept the same and the amounts awarded them by the appraisers appointed under the provisions of the act to appraise the value of improvements of intruders in that nation; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, in compliance with the act of Congress of May 9, 1888, the claim of R. M. Ridgely, postmaster at Springfield, Ill., for credit on his postal account for postage stamps and key-deposit funds stolen from his office April 3, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, of New York, remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill No. 2261, providing for an international humane and sanitary conference; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, praying for the appointment of an impartial national commission of inquiry to investigate and report upon the alcoholic liquor traffic, its relation to crime, pauperism, and the general welfare of the public; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the assembly of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation establishing a military park to commemorate the campaign, siege, and defense of Vicksburg; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, praying for the establishment of a department of commerce and manufactures; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the faculty and students of Tualatin Academy and Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oreg., and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wisconsin, praying for the establishment of an international board of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of Unity Lodge, No. 309, International Association of Machinists, of Cleveland, Ohio, and a petition of Lodge No. 438, International Association of Machinists, of Canton, Ohio, praying for an investigation of the treatment of employees of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Navy-Yard and other navy-yards of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PEPPER presented the petition of Joseph Silver, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem Government obligations in gold and silver coin alike; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of A. N. Lee and 18 other citizens

of Kansas, and the petition of E. E. Warner and 183 other citizens of Randolph County, Ind., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 239, to amend the internal-revenue laws of the United States so as to prohibit the issuance of permits to sell intoxicants in the State of Kansas except to those who hold permits issued by the laws of that State; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McMILLAN presented sundry petitions of citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1886, or some similar measure, requiring the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company to adopt rapid transit on its lines, and remonstrating against the extension of the tracks of that company until its existing lines are modernly equipped and operated; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Christian, Methodist Episcopal, and Congregational churches of Romeo, Mich., and a petition of the Woman's Humane Missionary Union of the Congregational churches of Michigan, praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Northeast Washington (D. C.) Citizens' Association, praying for the enactment of legislation to compel the Washington Gas Light Company to publish a list of names of persons who have deposited money with that company for the purpose of securing the payment of gas bills; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented the memorial of Marcus Mason and sundry other citizens of Beaufort, N. C., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation abolishing compulsory pilotage; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of James E. Shepard, Rev. J. S. Derry, Rev. S. H. Witherspoon, Rev. A. Shepard, Hon. J. H. Young, and 96 other citizens of North Carolina, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 886, to provide a national home for aged and infirm colored people of the United States of America; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLS presented sundry petitions of citizens of Greer County, Okla., praying that they be relieved from the present uncertain condition of their lands, and stating that it would be to the best interest of that county to cede or sell these lands to the State of Texas; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Louisiana, of New Orleans, La., and a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Bangor Board of Trade, of Bangor, Me., praying for the establishment of a department of commerce and manufactures; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented the memorial of Dr. A. Slaman and 89 other citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the adoption of the proposed religious amendments to the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorial of Thomas Austin and 17 other citizens of Davison County, S. Dak., and the memorial of James S. Hunter and 15 other citizens of Mount Vernon, S. Dak., remonstrating against the introduction of military training in the public schools of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BURROWS presented the memorial of William Jackson and 34 other citizens of Detroit, Mich., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Michigan, remonstrating against the placing of the statue of Père Marquette in Statuary Hall; which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented the petition of Rev. Dan F. Bradley, pastor, and the congregation of the Park Congregational Church, of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of 125 citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., remonstrating against the appropriation of money for sectarian purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LODGE presented the petition of Gen. Francis A. Walker, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and 33 other citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of a uniform metric system of weights and measures; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Minnesota, praying for the establishment of a military park to commemorate the campaign, siege, and defense of Vicksburg; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Minnesota, praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TURPIE (for Mr. VOORHEES) presented sundry petitions of citizens of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide 1-cent letter postage per half ounce, and also to amend the postal laws relating to second-class and free mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also (for Mr. VOORHEES) presented a memorial of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill No. 2261, providing for an international humane and sanitary conference; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the memorial of Miss L. E. Reed, editor of the Organizing Publishing Company, of Indianapolis, Ind., and a memorial of sundry citizens of New Albany, Ind., remonstrating against the passage of House bill No. 4566, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ALLEN presented a memorial signed by sundry citizens of Nebraska, Idaho, and Washington, remonstrating against the passage of a Pacific Railroad funding bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sidney, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the State of Nebraska, for educational purposes, the grounds of the old Fort Sidney Military Reservation; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of Rev. Hugh Johnston, pastor of the Metropolitan Methodist Episcopal Church, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting interstate gambling; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Charles A. Burnham, of Derry, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to pay him an amount of money claimed to have been unlawfully withheld from his grandfather, Maj. John Burnham, an officer in the Revolutionary war; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HARRIS presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Nashville, Tenn., praying for a discontinuance of the discussions in Congress on international questions, and also for a wise and careful consideration of our currency and finances; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Tennessee, remonstrating against the placing of the statue of Père Marquette in Statuary Hall; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. MANTLE presented the memorial of T. B. Hammond, W. Winlan, F. E. Curtis, L. M. Boyce, and sundry other citizens of Butte, Mont., remonstrating against the placing of the statue of Père Marquette in Statuary Hall; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. VILAS presented the petition of Rev. S. H. Anderson and Rev. William A. Gerrie, pastors of the Methodist and Congregational churches of Clintonville, Wis.; the petition of David J. Whiting, pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Platteville, Wis., and a petition of the South Central Wisconsin Christian Endeavor Union, praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF HOMESTEAD LAWS.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I present an argument made by Hon. H. R. Pease, before the Senate Committee on Public Lands, April 3, 1896, on Senate bill No. 1571, proposing to amend the homestead laws. I move that the paper be printed as a document, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands to accompany the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1200) providing for an additional circuit judge in the sixth judicial circuit, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5217) making one year's residence in a Territory a prerequisite to obtaining a divorce there, reported it with amendments.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 614) for the relief of James G. Reed, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2022) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of the salmon fisheries of Alaska," reported it with amendments.

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1082) for the relief of Irwin Tucker, postmaster at Newport News, Va., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom the subject was referred, reported an amendment intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, the amendment authorizing the use or lease of Sibley Island, in the Missouri River, near the city of Bismarck, N. Dak., for public assemblies, etc., and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. VILAS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2635) granting a pension to Caroline Watkins, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GORMAN. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. GIBSON], who is detained from the Senate by illness, I have been requested to report for him, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, the joint resolution (S. R. 89) directing and authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a board of three officers of the Navy to proceed to Navassa Island, in the West Indies, and examine and report upon the cost of establishing a coaling station for the United States Government on said island.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2725) to establish a railroad bridge across the Illinois River at a point within 5 miles from and above the upper limits of Grafton and a point in Calhoun County, in said State, opposite or nearly opposite the said point in said Jersey County, all in the State of Illinois; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 2726) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 2727) to relieve Alfred Burgess from the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 2728) for the relief of George T. Vance and Guy P. Vance, executors of the estate of William L. Vance, deceased, late of Memphis, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2729) granting a pension to Emma Weir Casey; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 2730) for the relief of Kate Winter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 2731) for the relief of Thomas H. Atkinson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2732) for the relief of G. M. Woodruff; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 2733) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lead, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. TURPIE (for Mr. VOORHEES) introduced a bill (S. 2734) granting an increase of pension to Jesse C. Yocum; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (for Mr. VOORHEES) introduced a bill (S. 2735) to give a special rating to certain wounds received by soldiers and sailors of the late war of the rebellion, and other wars not heretofore rated in former pension legislation; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (for Mr. VOORHEES) introduced a bill (S. 2736) granting a pension to James McCarthy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (for Mr. VOORHEES) introduced a bill (S. 2737) granting a pension to Mrs. Henrietta Bixler; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (for Mr. VOORHEES) introduced a bill (S. 2738) granting an increase of pension to William A. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2739) to confirm the title to the Aspen town site in the State of Colorado; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CHILTON introduced a bill (S. 2740) to establish and provide for the government of Greer County, Okla., and for other

purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2741) to reclassify railway postal clerks and prescribe their salaries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 2742) for the relief of Charles Fletcher, alias James H. Mitchell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2743) to determine the lineal rank of medical officers of the Army upon entrance into the service; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 2744) for the relief of Andrew Lindsay, of Rancher, Custer County, Mont.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 120) to declare the intent and meaning of the act of Congress approved January 29, 1887, granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 121) to amend an act granting to the Duluth and Winnipeg Railroad Company a right of way through the Chippewa and White Earth Indian reservations, in the State of Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, providing for the erection of a public building at Deadwood, S. Dak.; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GEORGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GORMAN (for Mr. GIBSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 1st instant approved and signed the following joint resolutions:

A joint resolution (S. R. 111) to authorize Benjamin Harrison to accept certain medals presented to him while President of the United States; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 114) authorizing and directing Bernard R. Green to exercise the duties and powers heretofore conferred upon the late Gen. Thomas L. Casey, in relation to the construction of the Library of Congress.

THE REVENUE BILL AND SILVER COINAGE.

Mr. MANTLE. I give notice that upon next Thursday, at the conclusion of the morning business, I shall call up the resolution submitted by my colleague [Mr. CARTER] February 19, 1896, proposing to recommit House bill 2749 to the Committee on Finance, and with the indulgence of the Senate I shall ask permission to submit a few remarks thereon.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6614, being the Post-Office appropriation bill. The motion was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT].

WAR IN CUBA.

Mr. CALL. I propose to ask the Senator from Iowa if he has any objection to the consideration of the joint resolution in relation to Cuba, which I introduced on the last legislative day? The Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE] is ready to submit some remarks upon it if there is no particular reason for urgency in regard to the appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I shall gladly yield to the Senator from Florida to take up any question that will not lead to debate, but certainly no more important question can now be brought before us than the consideration of the appropriation bills. I much regret to decline to yield, but I must do so, as I presume the joint resolution will lead to more or less debate.

Mr. CALL. I give notice, then, that I shall ask to-morrow morning, after the conclusion of the routine business, to take up for consideration the joint resolution relating to Cuba that I introduced on the last legislative day.

Mr. HALE. What is the condition of the resolution offered

by the Senator from Florida? I supposed it had gone to the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is a joint resolution, and it has gone to the table.

Mr. HALE. Under the rule a resolution going over goes to the Calendar on the second day.

Mr. CALL. I asked that it should be laid upon the table in order that it might be taken up at any time the Senate is willing that it shall be considered. I shall ask to-morrow morning, after the morning business, that it may be taken up at least for some observations to be made by the Senator from Indiana and perhaps by myself.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In response to the parliamentary inquiry of the Senator from Maine, the Chair will state that the resolution introduced by the Senator from Florida is a joint resolution, and it has gone to the table. It can be taken up by motion.

Mr. HALE. I so understand. It can only be taken up by motion.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6614) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897.

Mr. ALLISON. I believe the pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO], and that he is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand that the amendment now in order is the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and reported by me from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ALLISON. I may be mistaken, but I understood the Senator from Florida at the last day's session to offer an amendment to that amendment.

Mr. PASCO. It was in connection with the same subject matter, but I decided, for the time being at all events, not to offer it as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. So I understood.

Mr. PASCO. I will let it stand on its own merits for the present.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I find it necessary to ask the indulgence of the Senate for a few moments more in reference to the amendment which was offered originally by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and which was afterwards reported by the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and referred upon the recommendation of that committee to the Committee on Appropriations, and which, unfortunately, from the point of view I take, was not reported from that committee.

I find that we were all of us in some error on Thursday last as to the phraseology of the amendment, and if I shall not only ask to correct it, but also ask to add to the amendment, and if these constant amendments seem rather of a blundering character, the Senate will understand that when the pending appropriation bill was brought in for consideration it was the first time that the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads or any member of it had seen it. There is perhaps no reason why we should have seen it; and yet if an opportunity had been tendered to the committee or its members to have seen something of the provisions to be inserted, if we could have been advised somewhat as to the character of the amendments recommended by the committee or which were to be rejected, it is possible we might have saved a little of the time of the Senate, although I do not know that we could have hoped to have illumined the intelligence of the Committee on Appropriations.

Upon Thursday we unanimously excluded the use of the word "superintendents" upon the suggestion of the chairman of the committee that there were no such persons as superintendents in the postal service. I find that under the provisions of law there are superintendents who are very much alive and very much needed in the postal service. These superintendents fill a recognized function, and the presence of the word "superintendent" is absolutely essential in the amendment and should not have been stricken from it. I refer the chairman of the committee to section 451 of the postal laws, at the top of page 200:

Superintendents of stations, 10 classes, salary graded in even hundreds of dollars, from \$1,000 to not exceeding \$2,000 per annum, except at New York, N. Y., where the salaries of the superintendents of stations "A" and "D" shall be fixed at \$2,500 each per annum, and superintendents of stations "E" and "F" shall be fixed at \$2,200 each per annum.

These superintendents take the place wherever a second-class post-office is consolidated with the other post-offices under the classification of clerk hire. The clerk in charge of these stations is known as a superintendent of the office, and therefore this word should have been retained in the amendment.

There are in the postal service the post-office, the station, the substation, and the stamp agency. To the public at large it is a post-office, but these distinctions are the distinctions recognized by the Department. The post-office has its boxes, its money orders, its registry division, its stamps, its carriers, and its clerks,

if it is a free-delivery office. The person in charge when it becomes a station is a superintendent, and his salary is fixed at from \$1,000 to \$2,000. The substation under the consolidation plan of the Department ordinarily has no boxes, although it sometimes has. It does not have free delivery—that is, the free delivery in the community, if it is a substation, comes from the main office. It does have the sale of stamps; it has registry; it has money orders. These clerks are compensated under the provisions of section 451 and paid from \$100 to \$1,000. A substation is usually located in a community where there is free delivery, but the free delivery is not from the substation itself—that is, the carriers do not start on their rounds from the substations—but the public is equally served from the substations. Stamp agencies are common in all cities of the country, and the compensation of a stamp agent is \$24 a year. There is no clerk hire in third and fourth class post-offices, and whenever clerk hire is to be awarded, as it often must, it comes under the provisions of law which provide for compensation where there are separating offices; for instance, at the terminus of a railroad there will be mail distributed for a half dozen stage routes, and there there may be clerk hire needed.

Then, under the clause of the appropriation bill which applies money is allowed the third and fourth class offices for separating offices. So the offices are gathered together for the efficiency of the service. For instance, there is the main office in the city of Chicago. There are 26 stations; there are 69 substations; there are 190 stamp agencies. And to secure this result there were 59 post-offices consolidated inside the city of New York and its suburbs and brought under one management, and some of those offices are 15 miles from the city. They have not lost their separate names to the public at large; they are still separate post-offices, but as a matter of fact they come under one compact, simple business management, where there is upon the ground and in the immediate vicinity a supervising head, who inspects the offices regularly and looks after the management of their affairs, and sees that they are conducted upon business principles, and instructs new postmasters in their duties.

Mr. President, do you know that we are now making fourth-class post-offices, and have done so for the last ten years, at the average rate of 2,013 a year? At 50,000 of the fourth-class post-offices of the United States the postmaster has an annual compensation of less than \$50. It is utterly impossible under present appropriations to make any sort of investigation and inspection of all these offices. I am told that there are offices where for fifteen years no inspector has been able to go, because there are too few inspectors. They are called upon to report as to the changing of routes, as to the construction of new buildings, and as to a thousand other things; indeed, when there is a specific case of robbery; but as to the general inspection of this great army of 70,000 postmasters it is utterly impossible that from this main office, where there is no intermediate authority to supervise and to inspect and to govern, there should be any sort of efficient management of those offices.

Meanwhile from the central office at Washington there are 70,000 separate accounts to be kept, increasing, as I have said, at the rate of something like 2,000 a year; and it goes not only to the supply of stamps and stamped envelopes, but if there is twine needed, or wrapping paper, or canceling stamps, or the thousand and one little items that go to make up the small business of a postmaster in a little town, he is compelled to send his requisition here to the Post-Office Department, which has to open a separate account with him, sometimes four or five thousand miles away, with the same particularity and the same precision and the same separateness with which it would be compelled to deal with the postmaster at San Francisco, Cal. All this is to be averted and avoided by putting in central communities an inspection power, a supervisory power, which is to reach out and take in these postmasters.

There are no politics about it. Politics cut not the least figure in it in the world; it is efficiency of management. Of all business in the world which the Government conducts, there is none which should be so free from political taint as the post-office. It is essentially a great, huge business. The man who has to receive our letters and transmit them for delivery ought not to be a man whose employment and detention in office depend upon whom he voted for for President of the United States and as to whom he will vote for next. It ought to be based upon his integrity, his ability, his intelligence, and upon nothing else. Just so long as we base these employments upon political service alone, just so long will there be constant deficits in the Post-Office revenues as against its expenditures, and just so long will the people be prevented from having that low rate of letter postage which is the goal to which we all look forward, which is the reform which every Postmaster-General hopes to see some day attained.

Mr. President, the Senate is composed of men of consummate wisdom, but it seems that the assembled wisdom of the Senate on Thursday last was not sufficient to embrace the subject of the

civil service, and so far as I know no one of us knew what the provision of the civil-service law was. At least, no one was able to enlighten us, and the consequence was that we all talked a great deal more learnedly than we would probably have done if we had known anything about it. We had a great deal of pathos wasted here about the old postmasters at the country stores, who had served for years, reading everybody's postal cards, and, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] suggested, finding somebody going down Oak Lane and getting him to carry a religious newspaper to his neighbor, and he feared these men were to be turned adrift upon a cold and unfeeling world and their place supplied by somebody who knew something.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the provisions of the civil-service law adopted in 1893 provided for the general classification of these clerks. As post-offices were extended, widened out, more offices embraced, then the clerks of the classified service were to be embraced in the office. But as late as November 12, 1895, the Civil Service Commission promulgated a proclamation by the President of the United States which entirely protected the people now employed in office by amending as follows:

And whenever, by order of the Postmaster-General, any post-office shall be consolidated with, and made a part of, another post-office where free delivery is established, all the employees of the office thus consolidated, whose names appear on the roster of said office approved by the Post-Office Department, and including the postmaster thereof, shall, from the date of said order, be employees of said free-delivery office, and the person holding on the date of said order the position of postmaster at the office thus consolidated with said free-delivery office may be assigned to any position therein and given any appropriate designation under the classification act which the Postmaster-General may direct.

Clerks were provided for in 1893. In 1895 it was expressly provided by law that when an office is consolidated the postmaster in charge shall be covered into the civil service as a clerk and shall continue to be employed. So far as the post-offices are concerned in the little stores, they will continue to be kept in the same little places. The local habitation of the post-office is not changed, but instead of its being swapped around whenever there is a change of Administration so that the Democratic grocery store keeper gets it one Administration and the Republican grocery store keeper gets it the next Administration, instead of being run as a sort of political machine, irrespective of the integrity or the ability or the training of the person who has charge of the letters, at some proper place within each village the little post-office is established. The clerk put there is under the immediate supervisory power of some postmaster near by who can keep him inspected and see that he does his duty, and see that he does not keep letters a month until he finds somebody going down Oak Lane to deliver them, and see that the office is managed so that the public gets the benefit of it.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question? A clerk goes from Baltimore to Laurel to take charge of the post-office there, and the old postmaster is dismissed. Who is going to keep the office? The clerk is not supposed to be a resident of the place.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The old postmaster is not dismissed. If the Senator from Connecticut had done me the honor to listen to this proclamation of the President he would see that the postmaster is not dismissed by the fellow who goes down from Baltimore to Laurel.

Mr. HAWLEY. But what is the fellow who goes down going to do when he gets there? Your civil-service clerk is sent down from Baltimore. He can not run the post-office.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand that the old postmaster is retained.

Mr. HAWLEY. But what is the new man going to do when he gets there?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the old postmaster is retained there is no need of a new man.

Mr. HAWLEY. But how do you know that the old postmaster wants to be a clerk?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the old postmaster resigns and gets out of the office then the new man goes there. He goes around to two or three stores in the village and they are all tickled to death to get the post-office, because it brings trade. He looks around and finds that here is the cleanest and best place, with the least suspicion of rumselling about it, a place where little children and ladies would go to get their mail, and he rents that for an office. He makes an arrangement a great deal better for the Government and a great deal better for the persons who get their mail than the old arrangement which gave the office as a reward for party service.

Mr. HAWLEY. Then you would have two postmasters there?

Mr. WOLCOTT. You would not have two postmasters. If the old postmaster should resign he would probably go out West and grow up with the country.

Mr. HAWLEY. And the new man has to go around and beg for a place in which to hold the post-office.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; the Government pays the rent. He has

not to beg for anything. The statistics of the consolidated offices show that they have a great deal better service, and that it costs much less money than by the old system.

Mr. HAWLEY. It shows that to be the case in the big cities.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It shows it in the country towns, too. Now, I will come to what the Senator from Connecticut is objecting to. You would find sometimes in the limits of a city a whole lot of different postmasters. I will call the Senator's attention to some of these Oak Lane places. Here is the post-office at New Haven, Conn. Within the city limits of New Haven there is the post-office known as Westville, and the population served is about 2,000. Westville is distant from the city of New Haven about 3 miles, while just outside the city limits, and in some cases actually nearer the New Haven post-office, are the following independent post-offices:

West Haven, $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles from New Haven post-office; salary of postmaster, \$1,400. Population about 3,000.

East Haven, 5 miles from New Haven post-office; salary of postmaster, \$342.

Montwese, $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles from New Haven post-office; salary of postmaster, \$1,100. Population about 2,000.

Whitneyville, 5 miles from New Haven post-office; salary of postmaster, \$1,000. Population about 2,000.

Highwood, $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles from New Haven post-office; salary of postmaster, \$327.

The total salary and allowances of the six independent offices named above is \$5,530. Stations and substations in lieu of these offices could probably be maintained for less than \$5,000 and far better service given.

Now, I will ask the Senator from Connecticut if he thinks there is a place where these country postmasters ought to be kept. Every one of these places is within 4 or 5 miles of New Haven, and I will show him in a moment where, within the limits of the cities of Connecticut, they have post-office after post-office.

Mr. HAWLEY. I thought the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I did.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will say, then, while the Senator is looking at his papers, that I distinctly said last Thursday, when this matter was up, that this consolidation would work excellently well. For example, taking Boston, there is no reason why Brookline, Roxbury, Cambridge, etc., all within easy reach, should not be under one system. So with places in the immediate vicinity of Baltimore. Everybody knows that it is necessary in the city of New York to have some substations, etc. What I am objecting to is the spreading of the system all over the land, so as to take in the country post-offices in the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will show the Senator the reason for it in a minute—as soon as I look over the papers I have here. I understood the Senator to say that he favored civil service generally; that he was the father of the law; but that he did not believe in it in this case.

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not believe in carrying it to an extreme.

Mr. ALLISON. May I ask the Senator a question for information?

Mr. WOLCOTT. With pleasure.

Mr. ALLISON. Do I understand the Senator from Colorado to maintain that the Postmaster-General can not, under existing law, consolidate the post-offices in the country surrounding New Haven with the office in the city of New Haven?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Postmaster-General can do so, but under the present law he can not do it efficiently.

Mr. ALLISON. Then I will ask another question. Having abolished the minor offices and made them a part of the New Haven post-office, is there not ample authority to provide the necessary clerk hire for the substations without additional law?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; and it is to that I will address myself in a moment.

Mr. ALLISON. I shall be glad to hear the Senator on that point.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the Senator will bear with me until I show the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] how these towns are built up in New England, which seem as if they needed consolidation, I will come to the question he suggests.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The organization of cities in New England seems peculiar to that section of country in this, that within the limits of many cities we find several other cities or towns with separate post-offices. For instance, the city of Gloucester, Mass., has five post-offices within its limits, in addition to the main office at Gloucester. Annisquam, with a population of 900, which is distant from the main office at Gloucester $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles; Bay View, with a population of 1,000, is 5 miles distant; Lanesville, with a population of 1,900, is 6 miles distant; West Gloucester, with a population of 400, is $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles distant; and Magnolia, with a population of 1,500, is $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles distant. These five offices are to be abolished and stations established at Annisquam, Bay View, and Lanesville,

and substations established at Magnolia and West Gloucester, and four additional carriers added, three for Bay View and one for Annisquam.

Medford, Mass., has three within its limits besides the main office—West Medford, with a population of 2,811, which is 1½ miles distant from the main office; Wellington, with a population of 453, which is 1½ miles distant, and Tuft's College, five-sixths of a mile distant. These are to be abolished and substations established, with two additional carriers to deliver mails to the patrons.

Manchester, N. H., has three additional post-offices within the city limits—Massabesic, with a population of 300, which is 4½ miles distant from main office; Goffs Falls, with a population of 150, which is 4 miles distant, and Amoskeag, with a population of 2,000,

which is 1½ miles distant. These are to be abolished, and five substations to be established, as follows: At West Manchester, East Manchester, Amoskeag, Goffs Falls, and Massabesic, with one additional carrier for the main office.

Fitchburg, Mass., has two additional post-offices within its limits—West Fitchburg, with a population of 3,000, and South Fitchburg, with a population of 1,000, which are both made stations to Fitchburg.

This is true of most, if not all, of the New England States, and it is true also of many towns in Connecticut. I seem to have mislaid for a moment the memoranda referring to the Connecticut towns. The following statement shows some of the independent offices within city limits:

Office.	Post-office within corporate limits.	Distance.	Population served.	Salary.	Gross receipts.	Clerk hire.	Rent, fuel, and light.
		<i>Miles.</i>					
Auburn, Me.	North Auburn	6½	300	\$172	\$170		
	East Auburn	3	300	149	154		
	West Auburn	1½	400	188	139		
	Auburn Plains	5½	20	188	146		
	Danville	6½	300	208	252		
	South Danville	11½	100	75	86		
Newton, Mass.	Lewiston Junction	5	100	92	141		
	Newtonville	1		2,400	13,522	\$1,600	\$650
	West Newton	2		2,100	9,065	1,400	500
	Auburndale	3½		2,400	5,581		280
	Newton Lower Falls	5		443	1,527		
	Newton Upper Falls	5	15,000	1,400	3,014		223
	Waban	4½		320	815		
	Newton Highlands	4½		1,900	7,575		275
	Newton Center	3½		2,200	10,013	900	500
	Chestnut Hill	3½		1,002	3,270		
Northampton, Mass.	Bay State	1½	500	257	254		
	Florence	2½	2,500	1,600	4,533		275
	Leeds	5	1,000	433	676		
	Londville	6½	150	85	99		
	Mount Tom	4	200	300	439		
	Smiths Ferry	5½	75	68	69		
Duluth, Minn.	West Farms	4	50	46	55		
	Lakeview	5	1,000	244	248		
	West Duluth	6½	6,000	1,700	5,702	400	410
	Smithville	7½	200	86	216		
	New Duluth	12½	800	490	770		
	Fond du Lac	13	300	109	122		
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Bath Beach	7.5	2,400	1,100	2,289		148
	Bay Ridge	5	2,800	1,000	1,826		
	Bensonhurst	7.75	1,050	522	724		
	Blythebourne	5.5	1,000	918	1,461		
	Fort Hamilton	6.75	3,900	1,008	1,713		
	Van Pelt Manor	7	750	365	469		
	West Brooklyn	4.75	600	884	1,585		
	Coney Island	10	5,100	1,031	2,529		275
	Gravesend	8	1,200	481	700		
	Gravesend Beach	8.25	500	282	959		
	Sheepshead Bay	6.5	1,700	815	1,502		
	Lawnwood	4.25	700	80	88		
	Flatlands	5.75	1,300	245	327		
Rome, N. Y.	Canarsie	11	2,300	408	603		
	Coonrod	4		36	35		
	Greenway	5		80	102		
	Lorena	6		23	40		
	Plains	11		31	35		
	Ridge Mills	2		94	98		
Seattle, Wash.	Stanwix	2		36	35		
	Interbay	4	300	130	143		
	Ross	5	300	89	97		
	Fremont	4	1,500	684	826		
	Greenlake*	7	100				
	Latona	6	500	230	250		
San Diego, Cal.	Ravenna	6.5	100	66	71		
	North San Diego	3	275	175	177		
	Pacific Beach	8	175	193	195		
	La Jolla*	10	100				
	Point Loma	5	150	57	51		
	Sorento	15	150	81	96		

* New office.

Mr. President, the theory of this attempt of the Post-Office Department is to gather all these offices, as far as possible, under one management, and under the provisions of the civil-service law, as I have stated, every old postmaster is retained; but we must face the fact that as to the new postmasters, as to those who are to come after, they are to be clerks, pure and simple. We may amend, if we like, the civil-service law, whereby these clerks shall be appointed from the counties or from the towns in which vacancies occur if there are proper persons there who offer to be employed; otherwise they are to come from the State the residents in which furnish the material for their employment.

But, Mr. President, the carriage of letters is not a sentimental business. It is built up just like any other business. You put stamps on sale and give the people ample post-office accommodations, and they will buy stamps and write letters. The experience of the Department is that wherever the people are given special facilities for the exchange of ideas and of getting their periodicals the business comes, and the people write as they are encouraged to write.

What earthly difference does it make in these little towns in the country whether or not a man who lives there is postmaster, or whether or not some efficient clerk, whose business is solely that of looking after his duties as a post-office clerk, and is not that of a merchant seeking trade, who does not want to gather in the poor people who come after letters in order to sell them molasses or rum, but who wants to give them the benefit of delivering their letters promptly and receiving those written by them, and nothing else? In the great business of the Post-Office Department, which represents an expenditure of so many million dollars and the loss of so many million dollars, what is there incongruous with the system of our institutions if these people can be better employed, because they are intelligent and they give their whole time to the business of the post-office; and we say: "Mr. Postmaster-General, employ as many in that way as you want; you can not look personally after 70,000 people when they want a bundle of twine or a package of wrapping paper; take these people and put them under competent heads who can supervise them and manage all these small details." That is the theory.

Now, I am very proud to say that the Post-Office Department under this Administration is sought to be properly conducted, so far as I know, and it has been, so far as I have observed, since I have been in public life. I am not by any means friendly with this Administration or with the administration of the Post-Office Department; I have nothing to do with them, but I do know that the affairs of that office are ably and intelligently conducted, and that the object of this movement is to remove it from politics, and not make it more political. Those who want the loaves and fishes need not be afraid, for if they worked night and day they could not take in a thousand offices between now and the time when there will be a change of Administration. We are establishing 2,000 post-offices a year and more. There is nothing political in this provision. It simply means better and more efficient service.

I tell you I think this love and appreciation of civil service is an acquired taste, and I think when you once get it it never leaves you. [Laughter.] I think, further, that any man who can stay here in public life during four years of an unfriendly Administration in his own party and who finds whenever he goes to seek appointments to office, even when "Yes" is said to him, it is said in the most offensive fashion; and when he is in public life with an Administration opposed to him he sees appointed in the State, whose interest and welfare he has at heart, unworthy men who are not fit to hold office, men whom their own fellow-citizens would never elect to an office or put into a place of public confidence, discharging these important duties, unintelligent and unprincipled as many of them are, and even people who are receiving the reward for political dirty work done in some other States than the States in which they are appointed—I say he can not fail to appreciate from a selfish point of view some of the beauties of civil-service reform.

I should be very glad, for my part, if this business could be taken from us and from patronage and given where the public could get their letters more promptly, where they could have greater facilities for obtaining post-office accommodations, and where the business could be conducted more like a business and less like a political job.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has asked me about the authority of the Postmaster-General to make these changes. Without the amendment, as the matter stands now, the Postmaster-General may establish or close any post-office he desires. He has the general power given to him to establish post-offices and the power to close and do away with offices; but the appropriations which are given by the committee are for clerk hire for post-offices. Unless some provision of law is adopted, when he closes a post-office the Postmaster-General puts it under clerk hire employment. He has to take the money for the clerk out of the appropriation for clerk hire, and the money for the salary of the postmaster lapses. He has not the power to-day, and therefore we must have some amendment to the law which will permit him to use the money no longer needed as salary for the postmaster, where the office has been consolidated. If the amendment is made in the form I seek to make it, then he will have the necessary power to consolidate offices and to make all proper arrangements for carrying on the business. With that in view there is an amendment suggested by the chairman of the committee which permits us to put back the word "superintendent," so that it may stand as it was originally and cover the people who have been postmasters in second-class offices, and who become clerks under the title of "superintendents," which is their title at free delivery offices.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator they are not given that title by law. That is the title, as I understand, by the regulations of the Department, not by law.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think not.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator show me where they are called "superintendents" by law and where they are provided for by law?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am looking at section 451 of the Postal Laws and Regulations. I take it that that is a section of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. ALLISON. That is not a section of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have not the statutes before me.

Mr. ALLISON. I think that is only a section of the Postal Regulations. The reason I stated it was not necessary to insert "superintendents" was that I did not know of such a designation in the statutes. Of course, if there are superintendents of these offices, so designated by statute, that is a proper phraseology, but if they are not so designated, then we inject into the law an office which is not known to the law. I know there are superintendents of those stations; there are superintendents of mail delivery at local offices in cities where there are a number of railroad stations; but they are mere designations under the Postal Regulations; and the officials are paid either from the mail-messenger service or from the clerk-hire service. The only reason why I suggested that the

word "superintendent" should be stricken out was because it is a word not known to the law in this connection. If the Senator can point me to a law that recognizes the superintendent locally in charge of mails I should be very glad to agree to restore the provision, but otherwise I should object to it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, it does seem to me, with all deference to the Senator from Iowa who is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that it is rather hypercritical, because that word "superintendent" is not in the Revised Statutes, but is in the regulations of the Department under which we are doing business, and under which the Senator's committee has year after year reported bills giving money to the Department, for the Senator to say that it is now injecting a new word into the law. Certainly the superintendent is included in the rules of the Department, and if the word "superintendent" is stricken out the Department will not have the ability to apply the appropriations to the persons who fill the position of superintendent of the mails.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not wish to disturb the Senator's line of argument, but there are three designations of these officials in the appropriation bills as to the conduct of the Post-Office Department. One is the designation of postmasters, another is the designation of clerks in post-offices, and another is the mail-messenger service. Those are the three designations under which all the employees of the postal service are paid in the management of the post-offices.

The Senator said a moment ago—and I mention that in connection with what I am about to say—that the reason for this change was that if these post-offices are consolidated less money will be needed for the salaries of postmasters and more money will be needed for the salaries of clerks. The Committee on Appropriations made full provision for that. We have reduced or rather failed to appropriate to the extent of \$750,000 for the salaries of postmasters below what the present estimate of those salaries is, but we have increased the appropriation for clerk hire \$150,000, so as to cover the clerk hire of those consolidated offices, if they are consolidated, thus leaving absolutely free play to the Postmaster-General to do what we think he can now do under existing law.

I will say now to the Senator from Colorado, if it is his purpose, under the guise of an amendment in the nature of a proviso, to reorganize the postal service of the United States and consolidate counties into a single post-office, it will be better for the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads of this body to deal with the subject in a separate bill and not upon an appropriation bill, so that such safeguards may be thrown around it as will protect the revenue as well as protect those who are patrons of those post-offices. That is my objection to putting it in in this way as a new relation and as a new condition respecting all the post-offices in the United States. I did not so understand it on Thursday last, and I do not so understand it now, except from the argument made by the Senator from Colorado. If that be the purpose, I submit that the amendment should be more carefully framed than it is as it stands now.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, of course this apparent doubt does not really exist in the mind of the Senator from Iowa. He knows perfectly well that the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads is not, as a matter of fact, in the guise of anything else in the world, attempting to do anything except exactly what the language of the amendment shows it is intended to do, the purpose of which has been stated with entire frankness by everybody who has spoken upon the subject; and nothing I have stated this morning changes in the slightest degree either the apparent or the real meaning at least of this member of the committee or of any other member who has seen fit to address the Senate on the subject. The fact is, that it is not under the guise of anything. This is a simple, honest attempt to bring about a knowledge of the question as to whether or not it is not wise that the lesser post-offices of the country should be consolidated as nearly as possible, and as frequently as possible, and as often as practicable, with the greater commercial centers connected with the small offices by improved methods of transportation, whereby the public will be better, more efficiently, and more cheaply served. That is the only guise under which we are here masquerading.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will allow me, I meant what I said in no offensive sense. But the Senator in his argument stated that, under existing conditions, if a postmaster 5,000 miles away wanted to secure a bundle of twine or the necessary wrapping paper to conduct the business of a small office, he must send to Washington for it and have it sent to him; and therefore, if this consolidation could be made, it would concentrate the distribution of the supplies necessary to the conduct of the post-offices more nearly to those offices. If that be true, it would require a change in our entire arrangement and adjustment, not only of the post-office regulations, but also in the appropriations; because now it is true that if a postmaster in San Francisco or in the neighborhood of San Francisco, or in Oregon or Alaska, needs a

bundle of twine or wrapping paper, he would have to make a requisition and send to the Post-Office Department here for it. That requisition would, under the contract, be filled up, a supply of the articles sent to the postmaster himself, and an account kept of it. That was what I said, that if it was the intention to so enlarge the amendment as to gather in all the suggestions made by the Senator from Colorado, I thought it was too important an amendment to be placed upon an appropriation bill. That is all I meant to say.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, nothing has been said on that subject that was not said with a great deal more emphasis on Thursday last. It was, in effect, that those of us at least who believed in the policy of this amendment looked forward with the most pleasurable anticipation to the time when all these small offices would be consolidated with the offices nearer to them in such a way that the public would be better and more cheaply served, and the Department saved from the necessity of opening trivial accounts with postmasters thousands of miles away, where they can not be properly served and can not be properly inspected.

On Thursday last, I am inclined to think—although I had not been to see the Postmaster-General—I did a great injustice respecting the post-office at Ellicott City. I am advised that there was no sort of politics affecting that change, and that, instead of being 14 miles distant, it is $9\frac{1}{2}$ miles distant from Baltimore, and that all the leading offices around Baltimore have been consolidated with it. It is true that dissociated and unconnected offices in the country have not been so consolidated, but where they were in the direct line of the business of the Department the post-offices were sought to be gathered together.

Mr. GORMAN. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. GORMAN. The Senator, of course, is now only making a statement which comes to him secondhand.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Certainly; and I am subject to correction.

Mr. GORMAN. The Senator does not speak of his own personal knowledge. I desire to say to him that his statement is not correct and that he has been misinformed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In what respect, will the Senator state, am I misinformed?

Mr. GORMAN. I will tell the Senator. The Senator's statement was a little inaccurate on Thursday last, when he said that the post-offices between Baltimore and Ellicott City on a direct line had been jumped over and Ellicott City included in the classified service. The fact is, that there was first an extension from the Baltimore City post-office, embracing the villages near at hand, Towson, Catonsville, and Stephenson. Not satisfied with making the service apply to villages within 2 miles or $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles of the city limits of Baltimore, a circle of 10 miles was drawn around the city of Baltimore, including agricultural communities, and embracing within the Baltimore City service nearly all the post-offices within that 10-mile circle, while the only direct communication between Baltimore and Ellicott City is by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, which runs out to the Relay House and then up the Patapsco River, and when they came to the Relay House they jumped next to Ilchester, within the 10-mile limit, which they exempted. Then they came to Ellicott City and embraced that; and then above Ellicott City, still within the 10-mile limit, they left out the little office there. There can not be any question of personal knowledge about it, for it is in my own county. I know all about it, and the Senator from Colorado is simply misinformed.

When it comes to the reasons for making this proposed change, I hope I shall be able to show the Senator from Colorado that at least those of us who represent Maryland know a little more about the affairs of that State than my distinguished friend the chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will say that I do not assume to understand the political affairs of Maryland.

Mr. GORMAN. No.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And I certainly do not undertake to keep track of the quarrels of the Senator from Maryland with members of his own party.

Mr. GORMAN. I have no quarrels.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am simply endeavoring to do my duty here and endeavoring to meet the most astounding amendment that the most solemn body of people, known as the Committee on Appropriations, has ever put on an appropriation bill, to the effect that no post-offices could be discontinued where they were at county seats; and then the Senator from Maryland accepted the exception in favor of Cambridge. There had never been but three county seats where the offices had been consolidated, two of them in Maryland and one in Massachusetts, which were excepted from the provisions of the law, and the Committee on Appropriations is very much afraid that under the guise of doing something we want to do something else respecting this amendment, and has finally brought in an amendment which provides that the office at a county seat shall not be consolidated.

The information that I received as to Ellicott City from the Post-Office Department is as follows:

Although there are a few small offices on the steam-railroad line between Ellicott City and Baltimore not taken into this consolidation, their receipts are very small, ranging from \$40 up to about \$200, and the postmaster's salary ranging from about \$30 up to \$150; and the moment they are consolidated they must be taken care of by the clerk-hire appropriation, and at the same time, there being no electric lines to these places, their service would not be increased, as was the case with Ellicott City, and temporarily were left out of the consolidation. This applies for the same reason to other small post-offices within this radius of 10 miles.

Excepting it apparently in good faith. Of course I can not speak from my own knowledge; I can not walk through that county and look at those post-offices and examine the books, but I must take the statement of the Department, which is the statement I have, and upon that statement I relied in perfect good faith until the Senator from Maryland corrected me. If there are errors in the statement, I have no doubt the Senator will point them out. But whether or not there are political differences of opinion between a Department of this Government and any one of these Senators, if the public service is to be furthered and helped and increased by the consolidation of these offices, then I say that private differences should give way for the public service.

For one I shall be very glad to reach a vote upon this amendment. To me personally it is a matter of entire indifference whether the amendment passes or not. I can see that the amendment will probably fail. It does not meet the approval of the Committee on Appropriations; it was reported by the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads; it has not the approval nor the important seal of the confidence of the Committee on Appropriations; but, Mr. President, the agitation of the question ought to bring before the people the knowledge that the affairs of the post-office should be conducted as a business, wisely and economically, and that they are not so conducted because the legislative department of this Government desires that they shall be controlled as a political machine, which will, in its time and in its own good season, work its own cure. The time will come when the people of this country will invest the smaller post-offices of this Government in proper hands and will not require one officer at the seat of Government to personally conduct the affairs of 70,000 offices, 50,000 of which bring in less than \$50 a year, and which are increasing at the rate of over 2,000 a year.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] seems to place the discussion of this question on an unusually low plane for him. He seemed in his closing remarks to intimate, if he did not state, that this is a mere personal or political question. If it be a political question, I congratulate the Post-Office Department that a distinguished Senator on the other side of the Chamber is its defender. There has been a suspicion on the part of a great many Democrats that many acts of the Administration in Maryland could best be defended by some Republican; and I am delighted that the Senator from Colorado comes forth as the champion of a Department which is departing from the usage and also from the law, as I think, and which is now advocating the consolidation of all the post-offices in the Union under a hundred or a fewer heads, and to take from the people the right to select their own servants, the little fifty-dollar post-offices in their localities. I understand the Senator to say that is precisely what he is inaugurating, a system which will consolidate under some great city head and embrace within the civil service all these little country post-offices.

Against that, Mr. President, I protest. I protest against it not because of any political differences, not because the appointment of a postmaster for political purposes amounts to anything. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I have served in the Senate under Republican Administrations and Democratic Administrations, and the mere appointment of a postmaster has never been of any especial interest to me.

What I desire, if I can get it from Congress, is a provision in the pending bill that the post-office at the county seat in which I reside, and at every county seat, shall be maintained as an independent office. The Ellicott City post-office is as old as that of Baltimore City. It is a community as intelligent, it is a community as wealthy per capita as any county in the Union. The people there have a pride in having their office, and I insist that it shall be restored to them, knowing full well from recent events that any recommendation I might make for a postmaster would be rejected. It is therefore the office and not the officer that I contend for.

Mr. President, this attempt to place in the classified service all the fourth-class post-offices is civil-service attempt run mad. We passed an act authorizing the President by his proclamation at any time to place in the civil service the offices of the Government. It was intended for the great offices in Washington and the large custom-houses and post-offices in the cities. No man dreamt that it would be extended to the country post-offices at \$50 each. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] says it will

give better service; that it will give a service which will do no injustice to a locality; that under the order of the President and the Postmaster-General the local man who is in office will be retained. So he will be retained, but the moment a vacancy occurs by death or resignation then you go to the civil-service list under the order and take one of the first three who stand the highest upon the roster, no matter from what part of the State he may come, and send him to your village and to mine to distribute the letters and to look after our affairs.

It is not political, says the Senator from Colorado. The friends of the proposition protest that it is not political. They protest that it will give us better service. I see before me the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], who in sentiment is a thorough and complete civil-service reformer, as I have always understood him. He believes in applying it to the great Departments of the Government. He at one time held a high position in the Post-Office Department, and he did place the men in official positions in that Department here, and possibly the railway mail clerks, under civil service.

Mr. VILAS. There was no extension of the classified service to any of the offices of the Department during the time I was in the service. There were ample reasons, peculiar and special to the time, which were sufficient to require it to be delayed.

Mr. GORMAN. Then it followed by order of the successor in that office of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, I think.

But what was the operation of it? Under that Administration about one-half of all the railway mail clerks were changed and new men were installed. The Postmaster-General reported great efficiency in the service from the injection of new blood and new men. Then, under Postmaster-General Dickinson, came an order from the President of the United States placing them all under the civil service. No sooner had the Administration changed and Mr. Wanamaker become the Postmaster-General than that order was suspended, that the political friends of the distinguished Senator from Colorado might be installed. When they were, civil service was applied, and they stand to-day within the classified service. The Senator from Colorado says there is no politics in this movement. I could read to him from a statement of the civil-service reformers of Maryland that the very office in Baltimore, so far as it could be made, was a partisan machine and is a partisan machine. They did there the most extraordinary thing. On the 2d day of November a year ago, when the service there was all placed under the civil service, appointments were permitted to be made because the postmaster had verbally notified several gentlemen that they would be removed later on, but who were not removed until after the order went into effect. So far as my experience with the matter goes, the men who are shouting for civil service first aim to get their friends in office and then by an order they hope to keep them in for all time.

Mr. President, what is proposed here? The Postmaster-General says frankly that he proposes to extend this system, as the Senator has well said, until it covers all the offices in the country. The reorganization of the Post-Office Department so as to place it under a closer and more compact business arrangement has been the work of every Postmaster-General as the service has grown. It was Postmaster-General Wanamaker who conceived or rather enforced the idea that the whole country should be divided into a hundred districts and a principal officer stationed within each district to supervise the business of the small offices, consolidate the reports, and send them to the Post-Office Department. That was his scheme. It was so extreme, however, it involved so much, that Congress, both Republican and Democratic, has not authorized that it be carried out. The people are jealous of their right to go to the headquarters of their Government. Now comes the Postmaster-General, installed in office because of the success of the Democratic party at the last Presidential election, who makes a rule, adopts a line of action that was never contemplated by any of his predecessors and which no Congress, in my judgment, would ever have tolerated, absolutely by an order to wipe out any number of those small offices and consolidate them under one great head.

Chicago and Baltimore and New York and Boston and Brooklyn were contemplated. They were enlarged. In Baltimore first only the villages which had communication with the city by electric cars were involved, and then came the agricultural community which I have described. When it comes to the great city of Brooklyn, listen, Mr. President, to what the Postmaster-General says, that it would be well to consolidate under the Brooklyn post-office all the offices on Long Island, a stretch of land 90 miles in length. The plain intimation from his report and from the letter of the Postmaster-General to the chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, which is on the desk of every Senator, is that his intention is to proceed as the business will permit and bring within the embrace of each of those cities all of the post-offices in their vicinity. I take it, it would embrace the whole State of Maryland in the one post-office at Baltimore.

It does seem to me, sir, that there is a deliberate, a well-organized attempt, a thorough determination on the part of some gentlemen both in and outside of the Democratic party to take from the people of this country the opportunity to determine who shall be their public servants—to eliminate, to take away, as the Senator says, from Congressmen and Senators the bother of looking after the people's interests. In my view of it, no man has the right to be upon this floor or in the other House who thinks that his time is so valuable or his taste so æsthetic that he can not listen to the appeals of the people in his neighborhood who wish to have their little affairs attended to.

It is complained of the agitation about the small post-office, at the corner grocery, with the people excited and struggling for the office. This right is the very corner stone of our form of government. It is the agitation which keeps the waters from becoming stagnant. The people should assemble; and if controversies occur, have they not occurred by the thousand heretofore? Who is the worse off? Who suffers by it if the Postmaster-General or his numerous assistants are compelled to listen to their appeals? They had better be engaged in listening to the appeals of the people from those small places than to be delivering lectures upon the tariff, the currency, or any other question. When he accepts this employment he is the servant of the people. When he accepts it and attempts to consolidate his power, as is being attempted in this case, at the same time proclaiming that he is doing it in order that we may have a better civil service, one freed from politics, we had better go back to the old idea of the people in the country, and remember that when a man is constantly proclaiming his virtue and his honesty and distrusting everybody he can not meet with favor.

But the Senator says we are to have more frequent service, better service, more economical service. I do not understand how it is possible to have five or six more deliveries of mail in villages all over the country and more frequent collections of mail without multiplying the offices and increasing the pay in the aggregate. It will decrease some of the Presidential offices, which may be abolished, but it will increase by hundreds the carriers and the small clerks and will increase the army, already grown to 200,000, in the postal service. But it will do another thing that the Senator from Colorado does not take into account. It will give greater compensation to the railroads—the electric railroads and the steam railroads—and there is where the extravagance comes in the appropriations for the postal service. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin demonstrated a year ago that the extravagance which exists in this Department came from that item, and those of us who have been giving attention to the amount of appropriations have looked forward to the time—and have hoped that it would be at the present session—when, with a revenue not sufficient to support the Government, the Post-Office Department, as one of the great Departments of the Government, would present a bill through the Post-Office Committee cutting down those extravagant charges and saving the people money without reducing the service. Instead of that we come to the proposition presented by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, to take from the people, under the guise of reform, their right to select their own postmasters in their neighborhoods.

The Senator from Colorado was not quite frank, and it was unlike him. He read the order of the President of the United States embracing within the classified service the postmasters who are already in. That is true. But it lasts only so long as the present incumbent lasts. When he passes away from any cause—by removal, death, or resignation—then you go to the eligible list of the civil service, and it is nine chances out of ten that no man would be selected as a clerk in my village who is a resident there.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Senator from Maryland—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. GORMAN. Certainly.
Mr. WOLCOTT. The Senator from Maryland will recall that I distinctly stated that it applies only to the present incumbent; that when he passes away or leaves another clerk will take his place.

Mr. GORMAN. I overlooked the Senator's statement. I understand the correction.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Senator will find it when he looks over my remarks.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask the Senator whether he advocates distinctly a proposition that would end in bringing a man from a distance, from another neighborhood or another county, to act as postmaster in his own town or county?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would with the same cheerfulness that I take my letter which is brought by railway post in a car from a man who may live in Kalamazoo or Calcutta. I do not care where he lives so long as he brings my letter on a railroad train. What do I care as to the place of his birth or his residence? It does not make the slightest difference in the world to me where the man lives.

Mr. GORMAN. Then I can—

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say that the presiding genius of the Post-Office Department in Colorado comes from West Virginia. It is not satisfactory, but so long as we get our letters we do not care.

Mr. GORMAN. The Postmaster-General?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I refer to the inspectors of our post-offices in Colorado.

Mr. GORMAN. That is the general departmental service here. Now, the Senator would apply this system to the little postmaster at the corner store in my own neighborhood and his, and merely because some man from the city of Denver or the city of Baltimore has passed the examination he would like to have him located in his neighborhood. Is it not monstrous that we are to have men imported from other localities to hold local offices? Are we to see it inaugurated here under the name of civil service? Does the Senator from Colorado or any other Senator know of a postmaster in one of the great cities who does not deal in politics to some extent? He ought to do it. He ought to take an interest in the affairs of his country, no matter what his politics is. Then human nature follows; it has followed, or it exists, and to a certain extent he uses the force he has to carry out his own views. He may proclaim his virtues every morning, but he nevertheless uses the power and the information which he has from this great corps of men to promote his own views or the views of the master who appoints him.

Sir, the safety of our institutions, the safety of the Government, depend on having this power distributed, permitting the people to determine in their own way who shall be their servants in these important little places in their localities. I trust, Mr. President, that Congress will not give its sanction to this beginning of the consolidation of the great power of this Postmaster-General or any other Postmaster-General. I hope to see the time when we shall have a Postmaster-General, no matter what his politics may be, who will reform the Department, who will cut down its expenditures without diminishing the efficiency of the service, and when we have that it will be done on the lines I have indicated by cutting down extraordinary compensation for the carriage of mails and high salaries, and promoting the interests of the small post-offices which are in touch with the people.

Mr. PASCO. Mr. President, during my service here I have not been connected with any of the great committees which have supervision of the affairs of the Post-Office Department. My attention was arrested last week when this discussion commenced, and I noticed that for the first time an effort was being made to establish by law a system providing for stations and substations and post-office districts. It is quite probable that very many advantages may come from such a system, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] stated to us in his remarks this morning, but it is new legislation, and in this apparently innocent amendment we have really a very great change in the statutory law of the country. The amendment provides—

That whenever, by order of the Postmaster-General, any post-office is consolidated with any office so as to become a station or substation of the same, the salary of the superintendent or clerk in charge of such station or substation may then be paid out of the appropriation, etc.

I speak of the amendment as first introduced. I am satisfied that if the amendment shall be adopted the word "station" or "substation" will appear in the legislation of the country for the first time in connection with the Post-Office Department. I have examined the statutes with reference to postal affairs from the beginning of the Government, and nowhere do I find any authority whatever for the establishment of a station or substation of the Post-Office Department. We were informed by Senators who took part in the discussion on Thursday that this condition of affairs has existed ever since the formation of the Government; that it was established when Benjamin Franklin was made Postmaster-General. But I have been unable to find any authority whatever for that statement.

The first time that anything of the sort is found in the legislation of Congress is in 1862, when there was a provision made for the establishment of branch post-offices; and I understand that upon that foundation all this subsequent action has been based. This law appears in the twelfth volume of the Statutes at Large, and is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster-General be authorized and directed, when in his judgment the public interest or convenience may require it, to establish one or more branch post-offices, to facilitate the operation of the post-office in any city or place which, in the opinion of the Postmaster-General, may require such additional accommodations for the convenience of the inhabitants; and it shall be the duty of the Postmaster-General to prescribe the rules and regulations for the branch post-office which may be established by virtue of this act.

Then it goes on to provide that there shall be additional postage on letters deposited and delivered through those branch offices. It will be seen that this legislation provided that the branch offices should be for the convenience of the inhabitants and that they

should be operated in the city or place where the original post-office was established. It was not contemplated that there should be any exercise of authority beyond the limits of the city or the town where the principal office is located.

This remained the law until 1872, ten years later, when a general law was passed consolidating the laws which related to the Post-Office Department. It is a law approved June 8, 1872, entitled "An act to revise, consolidate, and amend the statutes relating to the Post-Office Department." Section 98 of that statute provides—

That the Postmaster-General, when the public convenience requires it, may establish within any post-office delivery one or more branch offices, for the receipt and delivery of mail matter and the sale of stamps and envelopes; and he shall prescribe the rules and regulations for the government thereof. But no letter shall be sent for delivery to any branch office contrary to the request of the party to whom it is addressed.

The main difference between this law and the one passed in 1862 is that the branch offices were to be established within the post-office delivery, and, in my judgment, the plain meaning of that was that it should be within the limits of the city or town where the principal office was located, and that it should not be extended beyond.

Mr. GORMAN. Will the Senator from Florida read that clause again? I did not fully hear it.

Mr. PASCO. It provides:

That the Postmaster-General, when the public convenience requires it, may establish within any post-office delivery one or more branch offices for the receipt and delivery of mail matter and the sale of stamps and envelopes, and he shall prescribe the rules and regulations for the government thereof.

There was no provision that a station should be provided for the city of Cambridge or the city of Worcester or the city of Lowell, in Massachusetts. They were not within the delivery of the Boston post-office. They were separate and independent offices, and it could not have been within the contemplation of those who passed this law that there should be any general authority to wipe out, to discontinue, and abolish all the post-offices in a particular district of country and establish in their places a lot of stations and substations.

There is no hint at any such power in this statute, and there certainly is none in the statute which preceded it. There is no other statute that I can find which relates to this subject-matter, and in neither of these statutes is there any mention of or authority for the establishment of stations and substations. The establishment of such stations and substations was not the work of Congress, but, in my judgment, purely the result of departmental construction. It was not Congressional law, but departmental law.

Mr. ALLEN. I wish to ask the Senator from Florida a question. When did I understand him to state that the establishment of substations was first authorized?

Mr. PASCO. I say it was never authorized by Congress.

Mr. ALLEN. It never was authorized?

Mr. PASCO. It never was authorized. I say that the branch post-offices were first authorized in 1862, and that when this subsequent statute gathering together all the legislation with reference to the Post-Office Department was passed in 1872 the statute passed in 1862 was incorporated with a little change in the new law, and the statement that this system and condition of things date back to the days of Benjamin Franklin is a mistake, and so far as I can find has no substantial foundation.

Mr. ALLEN. When was the Postmaster-General first authorized to convert a regularly established post-office into a substation of some other post-office?

Mr. PASCO. I have not been connected with the work of the Post-Office Department through any of the committees of this body in such a way as to enable me to give the Senator the information.

Mr. VILAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida who made the statement that the power to establish substations dates from the time of Benjamin Franklin and where the statement is found?

Mr. PASCO. I find it on page 3485 of the RECORD.

Mr. ALLEN. It was made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS].

Mr. PASCO. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] said:

The law as it stands now gives the Postmaster-General power to establish or discontinue a post-office at pleasure. It gives him power to establish substations within any post-office district, and it is within his power to define what the post-office district shall be.

Thereupon the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] said:

Then I understand the Senator to assert this—

The Senator from Wisconsin went on:

But I wish to add that it is not to be presumed that a law which has existed like that since the beginning of the Government, since the establishment of the Post-Office Department under Benjamin Franklin, is to be abused as is indicated by that question.

After an interruption by the Senator from Nebraska, which interruption was as follows:

Mr. ALLEN. But I do not understand that since the time of Benjamin Franklin the law has existed to establish subpost-offices. I understand that

the power to establish or abolish a post-office exists, but what I want to know of the Senator—

The Senator from Wisconsin said:

It has existed since the system was begun.

Mr. VILAS. I wanted to understand the Senator's reference. I will make that statement plain in a few moments.

Mr. PASCO. If there is any other authority than that which I have read, any statute in this country authorizing the establishments of stations or substations, I should like to see such authority or statute now, or to have it produced during the progress of this discussion. As I said before, in my opinion it is the result of departmental construction, and it is not Congressional law. I can not state, in answer to the question of the Senator from Nebraska, when this system was commenced, but I find that at the present time it is going on at a rapid rate. The report offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], and from which he read this morning, shows that during last year the number of post-offices discontinued has been 94, and in their place a lot of stations and substations have been established in different places, in Illinois, Maryland, New York, Massachusetts, and other States. This statement is found on pages 5 and 6 of Report No. 592, made by the Senator from Colorado in reporting the amendment.

Mr. VILAS. I should like also to ask the Senator from Florida what he understands the delivery of a post-office to be under the law to which he has made reference?

Mr. PASCO. I think that history teaches us, certainly it is within the experience and knowledge of every Senator who has lived thirty or forty years, as the Senator from Wisconsin and myself have, that the delivery of an office was always understood to be the country within reach of and immediately around the office, occupied by the people who did business with the office and who went there to receive their letters and went there to mail their letters; and it never was contemplated that the delivery of a post-office extended 30, 40, 50, or 100 miles off from the place where the post-office was established. There is nothing in any of the statutes defining what delivery is, but in connection with the prior statute which I read, which says that these stations and substations were to be established within the city where the post-office was located or established, I think the proper and fair construction is that branch post-offices, to use the statutory designation, were to be established within the limits of the cities and towns where the office was established.

Now, Mr. President, on looking a little further into the matter (I have not had much time to examine it since Thursday, when the question came up before the Senate), I find that a project is on foot to establish districts which may, when the system is carried out to the full extent, extend all over the country. Already there is a proposition to consolidate all the country in the eastern part of Massachusetts into a single district, and the postmasters at those different offices are to be mere superintendents of stations and clerks. I suppose the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of this scheme, and giving it for the first time some legislative recognition. I was very glad the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] excluded from the operations of this intended arrangement the city of Cambridge, the seat of the grand old university of Harvard.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Florida will pardon me, by the exception Cambridge is kept within the metropolitan district. The object of my amendment was to prevent its being taken out and reestablished as a separate post-office, because the service is so much better.

Mr. PASCO. The Senator then wishes Cambridge to be simply a substation?

Mr. LODGE. Cambridge is now and has been for years a part of the metropolitan district of Boston.

Mr. PASCO. Then, Mr. President, this matter has gone on a great deal further than I knew anything about. I supposed that the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts was to spare Cambridge from being put down simply as a substation of the Boston post-office.

Mr. LODGE. The proposed change in the law, which was put in by the Committee on Appropriations in order to oblige the Senator from Maryland, a member of the committee, included Cambridge; that is, because it is a county seat, it took it out of the present metropolitan district. As the change was made many years ago and resulted in better service, and nobody I knew of wanted it changed back again, I asked to have Cambridge remain as it is at present.

Mr. PASCO. How many years ago did that change take place?

Mr. LODGE. I do not recall how many, but a good many years ago. It has been so for a long time.

Mr. PASCO. It then took place long since the Senator and I were at college?

Mr. LODGE. Yes, since I was in college, I am sorry to say.

Mr. PASCO. Now, Mr. President, I am not in favor of wiping out the old-fashioned post-office. I do not believe there will be any advantage to the civil service of the country in establishing these districts and subdistricts instead of post-offices. They may cover a large territory, perhaps entire Congressional districts. They may extend over two or three States. Some of the smaller States may be swept into a district of another State. I am not in favor of abolishing the lines of towns and counties and States. I believe in retaining the post-offices in the same form and covering the same territory that they have had ever since the foundation of the Government until this new scheme, which has crept into existence through the action of a Department, has made a change. I do not believe that we are going to escape political interference simply by changing post-offices into postal districts. I am in favor of a reasonable civil-service reform, but I do not believe that this will advance it.

When we divide up a State into two or three postal districts we make vast organizations, and we make, in one sense, vast machines; and as long as the condition of things exists in this country that exists to-day, whenever we have these vast machines there will be some way or other of managing them in a political sense; they will be political factors, no matter what you call them. You may have all the civil-service rules that exist and a great many more, but you will not by that means take these organizations out of the operation of political influence. They who are united in the management of these post-office districts, whether as clerks or as superintendents, or in other positions, will in some way work together and bring their action together, and they will have their influence upon the politics of their districts and of the country.

I hastily prepared an amendment on Thursday for the purpose of preventing the extension of this change and of bringing back the postal service of the country in this respect to what it was for a hundred years after the Government was organized. I hesitated whether to offer it as an amendment to the pending amendment or as a separate amendment. I believe I will test the views of the Senate on this question, and it is a very interesting and important one. I regret very much that it is brought in here in the fag end of a debate on an appropriation bill. I think if this great change in the postal system of the country is to be made, if it is to be recognized by law, it should be done in a separate and independent statute; and we should know well what we are doing when we make a change of so great importance and consequence as this is. I offered the amendment, but without stating definitely whether it was to be an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado or not. I shall now offer it as an amendment to that amendment. It is found on page 3490 of the RECORD. I will read it:

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall authorize the establishment of any substation or branch office beyond the limits of any city or town in which the principal office is established.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me to propose an amendment right here to that amendment?

Mr. PASCO. I will listen to any suggestion the Senator from New York may wish to make.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I suggest that, inasmuch as the Senator from Florida says he does not know whether he is going to offer this as an amendment to the pending amendment or as a separate amendment—

Mr. PASCO. Oh, no.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Perhaps the Senator from New York would like to ascertain where the tail of his kite is to land.

Mr. PASCO. The Senator from Colorado misstates me. He was not listening to what I said.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I did listen, and I will ask to have read what the Senator said.

Mr. PASCO. I stated that on Thursday I was uncertain whether to offer it as an original amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understood the Senator to say he was not certain whether he would offer it as an amendment or not.

Mr. PASCO. That shows the Senator was not listening.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I now understand the Senator to say that. I hope he will correct me. I am in perfect good faith about it. Does not the Senator now say so? Senators about me so understood him.

Mr. PASCO. If the Senator is through I will state what I wish to say. He keeps on interrupting me. I will wait until he has finished.

I said on Thursday, when this matter was up, I was uncertain whether I should offer it as a separate amendment or as an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, but that, in order to test the sense of the Senate upon this legislation, which I went on to say I regarded as important and that I did not think it ought to be brought in at the fag-end of the discussion upon an appropriation bill, but that, being a very important matter, and in order to test the views of the Senate, I should offer it now as an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, and at that stage I was interrupted by the Senator

from New York, to whom I very cheerfully yielded to propose a modification of the amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I desire to explain to the Senator from Florida that I regret extremely if I misquoted him. I did not intend to do so. I certainly did not mean to ruffle his feelings.

Mr. PASCO. I do not suppose that the Senator from Colorado desired to misquote me and his statement is satisfactory, but my wish is to test the question by offering my amendment as an amendment to his, and this is now my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HILL. I will wait until the Senator is through.

Mr. PASCO. I should like to hear the suggestion of the Senator from New York.

Mr. HILL. After the word "authorize," in line 1, I suggest to insert the words "or permit"; after the word "establishment" to insert the word "hereafter"; and in line 2, after the word "beyond," to insert the words "5 miles outside of." Will the Senator from Florida pardon me a moment?

Mr. PASCO. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. When the amendment of the Senator from Colorado was first suggested, I believed that it had reference to the consolidation of post-offices very near large towns and cities. In that view I was disposed to support it. For instance, Boston was cited as one of the places where the amendment could well apply. I can see no reason why, in certain cities where the boundaries are very limited in their character, where towns have grown up in the immediate vicinity that really constitute a part of the city in fact, but not according to law, it would not be proper to have substations, and in that view I can see no objection to the amendment.

Mr. President, from the debate already had it seems to me the scheme embraces something far beyond this, and that it is an entering wedge for something new. I simply suggest to the Senate that if some grand new scheme is to be inaugurated that is to overturn the system which has been in existence for years it had better be done in some other place than on an appropriation bill. I am disposed to vote against any amendment of this character whatever to an appropriation bill, but we find before us an amendment relating to the subject, and if the bill is to be amended at all in this respect it should be amended correctly.

I am not going to discuss the great question of civil-service reform which has been so well discussed here this morning. If we are to have a change in the post-offices of the country upon that basis let the Post-Office Committee or some other committee bring in a bill to that effect and we will discuss it on its merits. If the whole of Long Island, which embraces three county seats, a vast territory 100 miles and over in length, is to be embraced in one post-office substantially and all the rest are to be substations—if that is the scheme I want to know it. I will discuss it when the question comes up; but I must object to this provision being inserted in this way if it means that. I am with the Senator from Colorado on the general proposition of including the small post-offices within the incorporated limits or just within the outskirts, and such places are numerous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, the title of which will be read.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. R. 102) directing the Secretary of the Interior to open for public entry all that certain part of the public domain in the State of Utah known as the Uncompahgre Indian Reservation.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be informally laid aside in order that we may continue the consideration of the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the Senator from New York will proceed.

Mr. HILL. Let us proceed one step at a time. I do not believe that there is really any objection here to the scheme of consolidating post-offices within the very reasonable distance of a great city. If that is what is contemplated, and it requires additional legislation to do it, then we are in favor of it. My amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Florida simply fixes the limit. There must be some arbitrary limit. Five miles is a sufficient limit. I am not familiar enough with the territory around Boston to know how far Cambridge is from the limits of the city. I presume it is not over 5 miles, but I am not familiar with it; it may be more.

Mr. President, there must be some limit. Five miles will give a chance to consolidate all the little post-offices on the outskirts of cities, and I am with the amendment to that extent. I am disposed to object to it beyond that, at this time, on an appropriation bill. Whether this scheme is a wise one or not (and we have heard many arguments from the Senator from Colorado that it would

be a wise one), let it be brought in as a separate bill that we may direct the Postmaster-General just what he shall do or shall not do. Let us know just what is to be done. I object to legislating in the dark and to have such measures for reform carried out by departmental officers and the first thing we know about it is when we are confronted with the scheme. I should like to consult with the people of Long Island, embracing three counties, before any department of the Government shall abolish all the offices within that Territory of a hundred miles in extent. I want to see what is proposed; I want to see how it affects the whole State, and how it affects the country. If we are to proceed to legislate upon the true lines of civil-service reform let the whole scheme be presented, so that we may act intelligently.

I do not propose to discuss the great question involved here any further than I have done. I am willing to go to the extent of limiting the consolidation to within 5 miles of the cities. That would be far enough, in my judgment. Of course the limitation as to the county seat can also remain in—it is there now; that they shall not take away the post-office from a county seat. Therefore, if there is such an instance where a county seat is within 5 miles I do not think it should be consolidated. The two provisions can stand together. The change shall not be made at the county seat and it shall not be done unless within 5 miles of the limits of the city.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President—

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

Mr. PASCO. I would rather settle the question as to the amendment before I give up the floor. I suggest to the Senator from New York that his amendment is rather doubtful with reference to the limit. Has he examined it carefully? I understand the purpose and object of it. The words come in after "beyond."

Mr. HILL. Yes; "beyond 5 miles outside of the limits of the city or town."

Mr. PASCO. Would it not be better to say "5 miles beyond the limits"?

Mr. HILL. Yes; that makes it a little better.

Mr. PASCO. I merely want it to express the meaning.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Florida permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. PASCO. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. A limit which might be proper in the case of a large city would be entirely too great in the case of a small city. I have in my mind certain small towns which are clustered comparatively near together, and it would be a very great hardship to consolidate all the post-offices in the limits of a town that might be no larger than some of the neighboring towns.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Florida allow me a minute?

Mr. PASCO. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I have an amendment to propose which I think will cover and meet the views both of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from New York. Will the Senator from Florida give me the floor?

Mr. PASCO. Will the Senator from Minnesota have his amendment read?

Mr. NELSON. I will read it, and I should like to make a few remarks.

Mr. PASCO. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I offer an amendment, to come in at the end of the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that was adopted at the end of line 6. His amendment excepted from the proviso the post-office at Cambridge, I think. At the end of that clause, I move to insert the following additional proviso:

And provided further. That no post-office situate in the midst of a farming community and not directly connected by streets and street-car service of any kind with the post-office with which it is proposed to consolidate the same shall be consolidated with any other post-office or abolished or discontinued.

Mr. President, in support of this amendment I ask leave to say a few words. I was astonished the other day when I heard the claim made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] as to the powers of the Post-Office Department to consolidate, and I was still more astonished when I heard the statement of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] as to the fact that the post-office at Ellicott City had been consolidated with Baltimore. I know something about Ellicott City. I carried a musket in the streets of that city in 1861 and I know that it is as disconnected from the city of Baltimore as is the city of Alexandria from Washington. You might as well consolidate the city of Alexandria, across the river here in Virginia, with the city of Washington as to consolidate the city of Ellicott Mills or Ellicott City with the post-office at Baltimore. It is entirely disconnected. On a branch line going by rail from Baltimore it must be upward of 14 or 15 miles from the city of Baltimore, and it has no other than an ordinary rail

connection on a branch line; it is not on the line between Washington and Baltimore.

More than that, Ellicott City is the county seat of one of the prosperous counties in Maryland, and it is in the midst of a fine farming community. There are a large number of farms between that place and the city of Baltimore. I confess that when I heard the other day the fact that it had been consolidated and made a substation of Baltimore I became perfectly frightened, not knowing what might happen in my own part of the country. I did not know but that if this scheme of consolidation should prevail they would undertake to consolidate all the little offices with the office at the county seat, making one great post-office for the whole county.

Within recent years there has been a revolution going on in the commercial world in the way of stores, commerce, and traffic. A few years ago we had little stores, each handling one line of goods. We had clothing in one store; we had dry goods in another; we had stores for boots and shoes; we had hardware stores, and we had furniture stores, each store managed by the owner himself, with the aid of a few clerks who were treated almost as his equals, and the public were well accommodated. All that is being fast done away with. It went out of existence by that devil-fish of modern society, the department stores. The department stores have crushed out everything in the commercial world, and we have a great big chief man who sits in his office and plans how to consolidate all the different varieties of trade and commerce under one single roof; his clerks and employees are treated practically as an army of serfs, and the public at large get, to be sure, cheaper goods, but they are oftentimes nastier.

Mr. President, I believe that the department stores are a curse in the commercial world, and I should like to see them eliminated. I am opposed to injecting the department system into the post-office system. I do not believe in reducing it to the mere basis of a department store, a mere matter of dollars and cents.

In most of our local and municipal affairs the people deal with the constitutions and the laws of their respective States. It is only in little matters that they occasionally come in contact with the Federal Government. Those who are wealthy and who do a large business have the luxury of coming in contact with the Federal Government in the United States; but with the most of us in the everyday affairs of life the connecting link with our Federal Government here at Washington is the Post-Office Department. Would you, Mr. President, for the sake of a few dollars and cents, sever this connection and reduce our postal system, just for the sake of the almighty dollar, to the mere principle and basis of a department store? I hope that the American people have not got to that low level. From what little I know of the feeling of the public at large, it is that there is no fault found with the expenses of the Post-Office Department. There is not a Department of this Government in whose affairs the people take so much interest and the expenses of which are so cheerfully borne. I am sorry to see that this Department is put on the mere basis of dollars and cents. We want a good postal service, and we want that service to be on the old fashion, so that the postmasters of our little places in the country can be a part of the community in which they live and be looked up to as leaders.

It does not cut much figure whether the postmasters be Democrats or Republicans. The great body of the American people belong to one or the other of these parties, and they do not care to have a mere machine, a mere Department clerk, put into a post-office. We want a representative of our common humanity, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, and we want him there as the representative of our great Government. If we put no limitations upon it and leave to the Postmaster-General unlimited power of consolidation, there is no telling to what it may lead. I have before me a letter of the Postmaster-General on this subject. He first cites the opinion of Postmaster-General Wanamaker, in which he recommended that the country be divided into districts, and a head placed over each district. Then he cites the opinion of Postmaster-General Bissell, in which he suggests something of a similar kind. Then the Postmaster-General adds:

Fortunately, the natural growth of the country, and the consequent development of the postal service, has suggested a plan which, by the test of experiments already made, promises to effect this substantial improvement without further legislation than an increase in the allowance for clerk hire, more than counterbalanced by a still larger decrease in the appropriation for the salaries of postmasters.

This plan contemplates the consolidation of smaller and contiguous post-offices with the free-delivery offices.

There is no limit to this, and unless we in this legislation inject some limit, this thing may go on without limit. As I say, there is nothing under it to hinder the Postmaster-General from taking and consolidating all the offices in a rural community, with the office at the county seat, and having all the little offices mere suburban stations, with one great office in the county.

I wish to say that the American people want nothing of that kind. They want the old system as we have had it in the country

in many forms. It is all right if you consolidate the little suburban towns that are connected with the large cities by electric cars and by interurban cars and streets at places where men do business, and go and spend their evenings and stay over night. That is all right; but you do, as has been done in the case of Baltimore and Ellicott City, a great wrong to the people of the United States and a great wrong to the whole postal system.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—
Mr. PASCO. I had the floor and yielded it, and I should like to dispose of the proposition to amend the amendment that I offered. It will take but a moment, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. I only desired to speak to the amendment which has been pending.

Mr. PASCO. I suppose I had better put the amendment in proper shape before it is discussed. I think the amendment as I originally offered it might enable us to test the views of the Senate with reference to the establishment of these substations, and I prefer the language in which I have already prepared it to that offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and without adopting the suggestion offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL]. I do not accept any of the proposed amendments, and shall offer the amendment in the language in which it was originally proposed, and with that language will submit it to the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator offer the amendment now?
Mr. PASCO. I have already offered it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a great many objections have been made to this amendment which has been moved by the Senator from Colorado and which I originally had the pleasure of presenting to the Senate for the consideration of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

I think as the debate has proceeded we have got gradually down to the real objection to the amendment. We were first told that it enlarged enormously the powers of the Postmaster-General. It does not, Mr. President. It does not add to his powers, nor will it deduct from his powers. The power which he has had from the beginning is the power to establish and discontinue post-offices. The Post-Office Department can not be carried on without that power, and nobody proposes to take that power away from the Postmaster-General, and nobody can. Under that power this matter of the establishment of branch offices, that is, of post-offices in another form, has grown up. It can not be stopped; it is bound to go on. The only question is whether we shall struggle against it and show how far behind the times we are, or whether we shall provide for its being done properly and sensibly. The modern department shop may be a terrible thing, but you are not going to prevent people doing business in the cheapest, most expeditious, and best way by assailing them in the Senate. The best methods of doing business, whether in the postal service or in trade, are going to prevail, and there is no use of trying to stop it by legislation.

Another objection that has been made is that post-offices are to be abolished. Nobody proposes to abolish post-offices. It is a perfectly disingenuous objection. There is to be substituted for one kind of post-office another kind of post-office, and that is all—for a clumsy system a better system. Then lurid pictures have been drawn of sweeping the country post-offices of a whole State into a metropolitan district, thus introducing into a town or a harmless village some dangerous stranger from the classified service who happens to have been born in another village of the same State. All these awful pictures have been conjured up to frighten the Senate.

Mr. President, the Postmaster-General has the power of putting offices into a single district, and he is going to exercise it with reasonable discretion. There is no possibility of providing by law against every conceivable abuse of power. It is to be assumed that a Cabinet officer will exercise his powers reasonably. He is not going to rush out and take in all the country post-offices in a State or do any other absurd thing; but where a large city is so situated that a number of suburban post-offices can be advantageously consolidated with it, it is going to be done. It is certain to come sooner or later.

Mr. President, the system of consolidation which has been going on for some years has brought economy. That is a matter provable by figures. It is not true to say that it is said to have brought economy; it has brought it. In 90 post-offices consolidated last year the average saving has been \$350 annually per office. The system of consolidation also brings better service as a matter of fact. It is not a matter of experiment or prediction.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] is quite aware, from his familiarity with business, that consolidation in railroads, in mills, in telegraph offices, and anything else almost always brings greater economy in the management of the business. It requires fewer persons, perhaps, and gives better service in the end.

But, Mr. President, none of these objections is the real objection

to this amendment. The amendment will give better service and will give more economy. It abolishes no offices; it does not add to the Postmaster-General's power; it does not deduct from it. The real objection and the foundation of the opposition to it here is that it facilitates changing certain kinds of post-offices into post-offices of another kind. The postmasters at those new offices will cease to be the creatures of patronage, and will become clerks. That is the real source of the opposition to this amendment.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has just told us that he wants the postmasters to belong to our common humanity and not be men taken from the classified service. I should like to know, Mr. President, after a man has passed an examination in an honorable way, and when he has got an appointment under his Government in a fair and honorable way, how he ceased to belong to our common humanity? Is the only being who has got common humanity in him the man who has done some political service to the Congressman in the district? I think not. Those men from the classified service are better fitted for their duties than the men who are selected after a bitter village wrangle as to who shall have the post-office, which the Senator from Maryland tells us is the corner stone of American Government—think of it, fighting over small post-offices the corner stone of American Government!

As to the county seats, that amendment has been put in the bill by the Committee on Appropriations so that they can not possibly be consolidated, and it appears that there are three county seats affected, two in Maryland and one in Massachusetts. I asked to have Cambridge omitted because it was consolidated some years ago with the Boston office. I have never heard it questioned that the result was better service. This outrage, Mr. President, was consummated on the people of Cambridge almost without their knowing it. That is a city of 70,000 inhabitants. It is quite as old a city and—I say it with all respect—it is quite as famous a city as Ellicott City, near Baltimore, and yet the people of Cambridge seem to have borne this outrage on their rights with perfect philosophy. They have not been stirred up to anger, but, on the contrary, I think they have welcomed the better service that they have obtained. The only reason that Cambridge is brought into this discussion is because it happened to be a county seat. There are a number of other large cities of separate corporate limits near to Boston which have been consolidated with Boston's postal service, but, not being county seats, they do not necessarily come up in this discussion.

I have said, Mr. President, that the real objection to this amendment was because it took away a few fourth-class postmasters, or second or third class postmasters, and turned them ultimately into the classified service. It takes very few. As the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] has suggested, it perhaps in one year would take a thousand, and we should make 2,000 fourth-class offices in that time. Personally I am very glad to have them consolidated and have them put into the classified service, but it is a very trifling advance in the right direction, as it seems to me. I wish it went much further and that every fourth-class office could be taken finally out of politics. But I am glad to get anything that tends in that direction.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the pathetic appeals which have been made to leave the people their rights; to the earnest objections that we were depriving the people of their rights by taking from them a fourth-class or third-class postmaster here and there and changing him ultimately into a clerk in the classified service. I think we might as well be honest about this business.

Mr. President, the only people Senators are disturbed about in this connection are themselves and members of the other House. The people do not select the postmaster under the present system. Under the present system there is a struggle of factions in a town or city, and then the postmaster is appointed on the recommendation of the member of the House of Representatives, with the indorsement, perhaps, of the Senator. That is the way postmasters are now selected. We all know it; we have all done it; and we might as well be honest about it and not talk about the people being so much injured by our giving up something which we have ourselves.

I do not in the least undertake to put forward any superior claim to virtue in this respect for myself or anybody else who thinks as I do in regard to this amendment. I have recommended men for post-offices when I was in the other House, and I have no doubt I shall do so again; but when I do it and recommend a postmaster for appointment to office, I am not going to get up in the Senate and object to having that patronage taken from me on the pretense that the people are going to be interfered with. The only persons who will be interfered with by a consolidation of offices are those who now have the gift of those offices, and those persons are the members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. I do not think that patronage belonging to the Senate or the other House ought to stand in the way of the

proper administration of the postal service of the Government. It is a great business service; it comes home closer to the people than any other part of the Government service. You may be perfectly certain that if the people get bad service through consolidated offices they will remonstrate and they will bring it to an end.

Mr. HAWLEY. May I ask the Senator a question there?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. HAWLEY. Is it not their habit now under the present system to remonstrate against bad service?

Mr. LODGE. I did not say it was not.

Mr. HAWLEY. What is the difference?

Mr. LODGE. The argument I am trying to meet is that this amendment is taking from the people something which belongs to them. I say it takes from them nothing whatever. It takes away from Senators and Members of Congress a certain amount of patronage and kills it; but that is not taking anything from the people. The people are not going to submit to a bad service under a consolidated district any more than they will submit to bad service very long from a fourth-class postmaster. They mean to have good service; and if they have a good office, well managed, well lighted, with a civil clerk and a civil postmaster, that contents them, as the Senator from Colorado said. That is what they want. They are not worrying as to whether the friend of some Representative or Senator has got the place or whether he is a Democrat or Republican. They want to get their letters, and they want to get them in the best way. They want to get as many deliveries as they can have and as many mails as they can have. Those are the wishes of the people; and they are troubling their heads very little about how many offices members of the other House and Senators may have to dispose of.

In the few words I said about this amendment when it first came up I did not undertake to argue it on civil-service grounds, because I am sorry to say that I think that is only a very small part of it. It does not seem to me to go very far in that direction. I wish it went much further. Incidentally it takes a few offices out of the present system and puts them into another, which I think is an excellent thing.

But the great argument for it is that it is going to give us a better and more economical postal service. Five hundred thousand dollars can be saved in one year. That is admitted by the Committee on Appropriations, and yet better service be given. There is no need of conjuring up bugbears or seizing in imagination whole States and wiping out all the delightful and delectable country post-offices in order to interfere with and stop a measure of economy and good sense.

Whether the amendment carries or not, attention has been called to it, and I think Senators will find that what the people really want is the best possible postal service, and that this amendment helps in that direction. They want the greatest economy, because economy in the postal service means in a very short time cheaper letter postage to them; and if we keep or make a more expensive system, we simply deprive the people of the advantages which they ought to have and will ultimately get. If they do not get this reform this year they will get it later. You can no more put back the wheels of progress in a thing like this—a pure question of intelligent business management—than you can put back the course of human invention or human enterprise.

It has been intimated that there was politics in this. I can not conceive how there should be any politics in it. This is the scheme of a Democratic Postmaster-General. I think it carries out the principles which have been advocated by Postmasters-General of both parties. It certainly has been advocated on this floor by a former Democratic Postmaster-General—the one man here who, by actual experience, knows more about the administration of the post-office than all the other members of the Senate put together, because he had to run it and knows exactly what it is. We have, in fact, the opinion of every man who has been charged with the duty of postal administration in favor of the principle of this amendment.

The present Postmaster-General is not of my party. I disagree with his policy in regard to the tariff, for instance, as widely as one man can differ from another, but that does not prevent me from realizing and saying that he has made an excellent Postmaster-General, and that when he proposes an improvement it ought to be passed, and that his support gives great weight to the argument. I can not for the life of me see any politics concealed in this thing anywhere. It seems to me purely a case of improved administration. That is the reason I introduced the amendment; that is the ground on which it has been advocated by the Senator from Colorado and myself, and that is the reason why I hope it will be adopted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing

votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution of the Senate in regard to the insurrection in Cuba.

The message also returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 941) granting to the Atchison and Nebraska Railroad Company and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, its lessee in perpetuity, the right of way over a part of the Sac and Fox and Iowa Indian reservations in the States of Kansas and Nebraska.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 136) granting an increase of pension to Horace Townsend;

A bill (S. 344) granting a pension to Mary A. Hall;
A bill (S. 345) granting a pension to Catherine R. Jardine, widow of Brig. Gen. Edward Jardine;

A bill (S. 507) to pension Mollie Crandall;
A bill (S. 640) to increase the pension of Joseph W. Fisher;

A bill (S. 1271) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moore English; and

A bill (S. 2132) for the relief of settlers upon lands within the indemnity limits of the grant of the New Orleans Pacific Railway Company.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution with amendments; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (S. 249) granting a pension to Charles E. Jones;
A bill (S. 894) granting a pension to Nancy G. Allabach; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 116) authorizing the Public Printer to print the annual report of the Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in quarto form and to bind it in one volume.

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. 152) granting a pension to Mary Ann Tračy;
A bill (H. R. 486) for the relief of William Henry Johnson;

A bill (H. R. 491) granting an increase of pension to Francis Walsh, of Stockham, Nebr.;

A bill (H. R. 569) granting a pension to Sophia J. Hamilton, widow of Charles S. Hamilton, major-general of volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 577) granting a pension to Lydia A. Taft;
A bill (H. R. 708) to increase the pension of Albert Ellis;

A bill (H. R. 951) to amend the military record of Dan S. Place, first lieutenant Eighteenth Indiana Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 1050) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Deshler Whiting, widow of Lieut. Henry Whiting;

A bill (H. R. 1094) granting a pension to Francis E. Hoover;
A bill (H. R. 1104) granting a pension to Isaac N. Williams;

A bill (H. R. 1109) granting a pension to Elizabeth Marshall;
A bill (H. R. 1139) granting a pension to Caroline D. Mowatt;

A bill (H. R. 1181) for the relief of Maria E. Wilson;
A bill (H. R. 1185) granting a pension to Rachel Patton;

A bill (H. R. 1602) for the relief of A. P. Brown, late postmaster at Lemars, Iowa;

A bill (H. R. 1634) to grant a pension to William F. Good, Company L, Tenth Indiana Cavalry Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 1836) granting an honorable discharge to Wilson Kale;

A bill (H. R. 1838) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Corigan;

A bill (H. R. 2054) to correct the military record of Charles W. Rinehardt and to grant him an honorable discharge;

A bill (H. R. 2142) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Theodore Werner;

A bill (H. R. 2151) to restore to the pension rolls the name of Agnes A. Blackman;

A bill (H. R. 2224) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Schilling;

A bill (H. R. 2234) granting a pension to Joseph A. Cooper;
A bill (H. R. 2320) for the relief of Samuel Burrell;

A bill (H. R. 2326) granting a pension to Thomas Holaday;
A bill (H. R. 2604) to increase the pension of Caroline A. Hough, widow of Brig. Gen. John Hough;

A bill (H. R. 2605) granting pension to Henry V. Andrews, of Fulton County, Ill., a survivor of the Black Hawk war;

A bill (H. R. 2698) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, from some suitable point between the north line of St. Clair County, Ill., and the southwest line of said county;

A bill (H. R. 3046) for the relief of Frederick Van Guilder;
A bill (H. R. 3139) for the relief of M. R. William Grebe;

A bill (H. R. 3216) granting an increase of pension to James P. Hurley;

A bill (H. R. 3221) granting a pension to John Dalton;
A bill (H. R. 3234) granting a pension to Williamson Durley;

A bill (H. R. 3426) to increase the pension of Eugenia R. Sweeney, widow of Brig. Gen. Thomas W. Sweeney, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 3689) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson Fueston, of Company M, Tenth Ohio Volunteer Cavalry;

A bill (H. R. 3749) to increase the pension of Mrs. Eunice Ida Rhoades;

A bill (H. R. 3993) granting a pension to Joseph Porter;
A bill (H. R. 4122) granting an increase of pension to James H. Jones;

A bill (H. R. 4182) to increase the pension of Georgianna C. Hall, dependent mother of Maj. John W. Williams, deceased, late surgeon, United States Army;

A bill (H. R. 4265) granting a pension to Eliza Wilson;
A bill (H. R. 4606) to grant an increase of pension to Mary B. Houk;

A bill (H. R. 4887) granting a pension to Sarah G. Ivès;
A bill (H. R. 4968) granting a pension to Helen A. Jackman, dependent daughter of Lieut. William Jackman, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment of Maine Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 5140) for the relief of Michael H. J. Crouch, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Cavalry;

A bill (H. R. 5254) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer G. Howell, late a private Company F, One hundred and sixtieth New York Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 6644) granting a pension to Gen. John M. Thayer, United States Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 7395) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to reconvey to the former owners a certain tract of land in Valverde County, Tex.;

A bill (H. R. 7664) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 163) to amend the act approved August 1, 1894, making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, etc.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 25,000 additional copies of Bureau of Education Circular of Information, No. 200, Catalogue of the American Literary Association Library; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 2,500 copies of Commercial Relations for 1894 and 1895, and 10,000 copies of the Review of the World's Commerce, etc.; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 300 copies of the Proceedings of the Board of Supervising Inspectors of Steam Vessels for the years 1895 and 1896; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

NANCY G. ALLABACH.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 894) granting a pension to Nancy G. Allabach, which was, in line 9, after the word "month," to insert "in lieu of that she is now receiving."

Mr. PALMER. That is an unimportant amendment and I move that the Senate concur in it.

The amendment was concurred in.

PROCEEDINGS OF BOARD OF INSPECTORS OF STEAM VESSELS.

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

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Treasury Department, Steamboat Inspection Service, 300 copies each of the Proceedings of the Board of Supervising Inspectors of Steam Vessels for the years 1895 and 1896.

CATALOGUE OF AMERICAN LITERARY ASSOCIATION LIBRARY.

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

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound, in paper covers, 25,000 additional copies of Bureau of Education Circular of Information, No. 200, Catalogue of the American Literary Association Library; 5,000 copies for the Senate, 10,000 copies for the House of Representatives, and 10,000 copies for the Bureau of Education.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS FOR 1894 AND 1895.

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

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to print, for distribution by the Department of State, 2,500 copies of Commercial Relations for 1894 and 1895, and (in separate form) 10,000 copies of the "Review of the world's commerce," etc., being pages 1 to 235, inclusive, of said Commercial Relations.

REPORT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. R. 116)

authorizing the Public Printer to print the annual report of the Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in quarto form and to bind it in one volume, which was, in line 4, to strike out "six" and insert "five."

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

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

A bill (H. R. 152) granting a pension to Mary Ann Tracy;
 A bill (H. R. 491) granting an increase of pension to Francis Walsh, of Stockham, Nebr.;
 A bill (H. R. 569) granting a pension to Sophia J. Hamilton, widow of Charles S. Hamilton, major-general of volunteers;
 A bill (H. R. 577) granting a pension to Lydia A. Taft;
 A bill (H. R. 708) to increase the pension of Albert Ellis;
 A bill (H. R. 1050) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Deshler Whiting, widow of Lieut. Henry Whiting;
 A bill (H. R. 1094) granting a pension to Francis E. Hoover;
 A bill (H. R. 1104) granting a pension to Isaac N. Williams;
 A bill (H. R. 1109) granting a pension to Elizabeth Marshall;
 A bill (H. R. 1139) granting a pension to Caroline D. Mowatt;
 A bill (H. R. 1181) for the relief of Maria E. Wilson;
 A bill (H. R. 1185) granting a pension to Rachel Patton;
 A bill (H. R. 1634) to grant a pension to William F. Good, Company L, Tenth Indiana Cavalry Volunteers;
 A bill (H. R. 1838) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Corigan;
 A bill (H. R. 2151) to restore to the pension rolls the name of Agnes A. Blackman;
 A bill (H. R. 2224) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Schilling;
 A bill (H. R. 2234) granting a pension to Joseph A. Cooper;
 A bill (H. R. 2326) granting a pension to Thomas Holaday;
 A bill (H. R. 2604) to increase the pension of Caroline A. Hough, widow of Brig. Gen. John Hough;
 A bill (H. R. 2605) granting a pension to Henry V. Andrews, of Fulton County, Ill., a survivor of the Black Hawk war;
 A bill (H. R. 3216) granting a pension to James P. Hurley;
 A bill (H. R. 3221) granting a pension to John Dalton;
 A bill (H. R. 3234) granting a pension to Williamson Durley;
 A bill (H. R. 3426) to increase the pension of Eugenia R. Sweeney, widow of Brig. Gen. Thomas W. Sweeney, deceased;
 A bill (H. R. 3689) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson Fueston, of Company M, Tenth Ohio Volunteer Cavalry;
 A bill (H. R. 3749) to increase the pension of Mrs. Eunice Ida Rhoades;
 A bill (H. R. 3993) granting a pension to Joseph Porter;
 A bill (H. R. 4123) granting an increase of pension to James H. Jones;
 A bill (H. R. 4182) to increase the pension of Georgianna C. Hall, dependent mother of Maj. John W. Williams, deceased, late surgeon, United States Army;
 A bill (H. R. 4265) granting a pension to Eliza Wilson;
 A bill (H. R. 4606) to grant an increase of pension to Mary B] Houk;
 A bill (H. R. 4887) granting a pension to Sarah G. Ives;
 A bill (H. R. 4968) granting a pension to Helen A. Jackman, dependent daughter of Lieut. William Jackman, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment of Maine Volunteers;
 A bill (H. R. 5140) for the relief of Michael H. J. Crouch, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Cavalry; and
 A bill (H. R. 5254) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer G. Howell, late a private Company F, One hundred and sixtieth New York Volunteers; and
 The bill (H. R. 6644) granting a pension to Gen. John M. Thayer, United States Volunteers, was read twice by its title.
 The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:
 A bill (H. R. 486) for the relief of William Henry Johnson;
 A bill (H. R. 951) to amend the military record of Dan S. Place, first lieutenant, Eighteenth Indiana Volunteers;
 A bill (H. R. 1836) granting an honorable discharge to Wilson Kale;
 A bill (H. R. 2054) to correct the military record of Charles W. Rinehardt and to grant him an honorable discharge;
 A bill (H. R. 2142) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Theodore Werner;
 A bill (H. R. 2320) for the relief of Samuel Burrell;
 A bill (H. R. 3046) for the relief of Frederick Van Guilder;
 A bill (H. R. 3139) for the relief of M. R. William Grebe; and
 A joint resolution (H. Res. 163) to amend the act approved August 1, 1894, making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, etc.
 The bill (H. R. 1603) for the relief of A. P. Brown, late post-

master at Lemars, Iowa, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The bill (H. R. 2698) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, from some suitable point between the north line of St. Clair County, Ill., and the southwest line of said county, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (H. R. 7395) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to reconvey to the former owner a certain tract of land in Valverde County, Tex., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The bill (H. R. 7664) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

WAR IN CUBA.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to present a conference report, which will take but a moment. No action is required upon it, the other House having receded from its action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The report will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate concurrent resolution No. 19, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment to the Senate concurrent resolution and agree to the same.

JOHN SHERMAN,
JOHN T. MORGAN,
H. C. LODGE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

ROBERT R. HITT,
ROBERT ADAMS, JR.,
JAMES B. MCCREARY,

Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that no action is required on the report.

Mr. ALLISON. I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the report as it appears upon the Secretary's desk. Of course, the ordinary procedure would have been for the House of Representatives to have receded from its disagreement to our resolution and agree to it, but the report, as it appears on the Secretary's table, simply says that the House of Representatives agree to the conference report. I do not know what the Journal of the other House may show, but that Journal certainly ought to show that they have agreed to the resolution of the Senate. The report does not show it.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is the action of the House. I do not know how the report is worded.

Mr. HARRIS. Let the report be read again.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us again hear the conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be again read. The Secretary again read the report of the committee of conference.

Mr. HARRIS. That covers the whole case.

Mr. ALLISON. Let the message be read which was just laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, April 6, 1896.

Resolved, That the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution of the Senate in regard to the insurrection in Cuba.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] would know whether that is sufficient. I think it covers the whole ground.

Mr. HARRIS. I think clearly the House of Representatives recedes from its disagreement to the Senate resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. The House does not say so.

Mr. ALLISON. The message does not show that; and that is the point I am making.

Mr. LODGE. The report of the conferees shows it.

Mr. ALLISON. That is not the report submitted to the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. I think it does clearly show that the other House has agreed to the Senate resolution, receding from its amendment to that resolution. If the report shows anything, it shows that unquestionably, as it seems to me.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator will allow me, I am told that the report was agreed to by a majority of 244 to 27.

Mr. ALLISON. As a matter of fact, the committee of conference did not need to make a report in this case. Whenever the other House agreed to recede from its disagreement to our resolution that settled the whole question. The conferees have made a report. That report has gone to the other House, and the report here at our Secretary's desk says that that House have agreed to it. It does not show, and they have not reported to us, that they

have receded from their disagreement to the Senate resolution and have agreed to it. That is the point I make.

Mr. SHERMAN. They have agreed to the conference report, which shows that the House have receded from their disagreement to the Senate resolutions.

Mr. ALLISON. I defer to the Senator from Ohio. I assume for myself, at least, that the House of Representatives have not in form receded from their amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks no action is required upon the report.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6614) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the discussion of the pending amendment which took place on Thursday last and which has taken place so far to-day is a revelation to me. I have learned from the remarks of the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], and also of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that we have had in this country since its organization a tyrannical system of administering the affairs of the Post-Office Department. I believe the people of the United States will be deeply interested in reading the discussion of Thursday last and in reading that portion of the discussion of to-day which has taken place up to this hour. I turn to page 3483 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday last, when this question was under discussion, where I interrupted the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] and put him this question:

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator how far can the Postmaster-General, through the postmaster, for instance, in Baltimore, extend these substations?—

Speaking at that time of the substations around the city of Baltimore—

Mr. GORMAN. I have no doubt he may embrace the whole State of Maryland.

Mr. ALLEN. Over a hundred miles?

Mr. GORMAN. There is no limit except the amount of money at his disposal.

Mr. ALLEN. Then the postmaster at Baltimore would be practically the postmaster of Maryland?

Mr. GORMAN. He would be, and it would be the same in any other State. There is absolutely no limit except as to the amount of money.

Further along in the discussion the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] used this language:

Mr. President, my understanding, unfortunately, is that the effect of this amendment is not to enlarge the power of the Postmaster-General in the application of the fund. I should be very glad if it did. I understand—I should be glad to have the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations correct me if I am wrong, as I am very apt to be [laughter]—that the effect of this amendment is simply to declare the opinion of Congress that it recognizes the right of the Postmaster-General to so distribute, coalesce, and consolidate these offices as the public business shall require. The necessary effect will be at a subsequent Congress that the necessary appropriations will be changed from such sums as are applicable to fourth-class postmasters, so that they will be gradually applied, as necessity may require, to the payment of clerks. I take it that that will be so. I should be very glad if this amendment did enlarge the powers of the Postmaster-General; but I do not see that it does, and I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to tell me if it does.

Later in the discussion I had the honor to interrupt the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], who was discussing this matter, in the following language:

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question or two which I regard as very important. Do I understand that as the law exists now and as it is proposed to perfect it the Postmaster-General may, for instance, say that a post-office 50 miles from the city of Omaha in the country shall be a subpost-office of Omaha?

Mr. VILAS. The law as it stands now gives the Postmaster-General power to establish or discontinue a post-office at pleasure. It gives him power to establish substations within any post-office district, and it is within his power to define what the post-office district shall be.

Mr. ALLEN. Then I understand the Senator to assert this—

Mr. VILAS. But I wish to add that it is not to be presumed that a law which has existed like that since the beginning of the Government, since the establishment of the Post-Office Department under Benjamin Franklin, is to be abused as is indicated by that question.

Mr. ALLEN. But I do not understand that since the time of Benjamin Franklin the law has existed to establish subpost-offices. I understand that the power to establish or abolish a post-office exists, but what I want to know of the Senator—

Mr. VILAS. It has existed since the system was begun.

Mr. ALLEN. What I want to know of the Senator is how long there has been a law upon our statute books that would authorize the postmaster of the city of Baltimore, for instance, to create subpost-offices beyond the corporate limits of that city?

Mr. VILAS. I think since the system was originally devised.

Mr. ALLEN. Since the system was originally devised?

Mr. VILAS. Yes. The law now directs, and always has directed, everything within the postal service to be done by the Postmaster-General. The law says the Postmaster-General shall stamp and back stamp letters. The Postmaster-General carries the mail. The Postmaster-General does everything. Congress simply provides him with authority to employ means to do it. Originally postmasters were known as and called deputy postmasters, because they were the deputies only of the Postmaster-General. The phrase "deputy" was afterwards dropped.

Mr. ALLEN. The question I put to the Senator, which he does not answer—at least I have not heard his answer—is, how long has the Postmaster-General had the right, for instance, to create a subpost-office to the main post-office of the city of Baltimore beyond the corporate limits of the city of Baltimore?

Mr. LODGE. He has always had it.

Mr. VILAS. I think he has enjoyed the same right that he now has since the Government of the United States was instituted and the Post-Office Department was established, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. LODGE. He has always had it.

Mr. VILAS. He has always had it.

Mr. ALLEN. How long has the system of substations been in existence?

Mr. VILAS. A very great many years. I can not undertake to tell the Senator when the first substation was established. Probably it was in the city of New York. But it must be understood that there is a vast difference in the character and classes of substations. The Postmaster-General now has in the city of New York, etc.

Further along there occurred the following colloquy:

Mr. ALLEN. If the position of the Senator from Wisconsin is correct, what is there to prevent the Postmaster-General from making, for instance, a post-office 400 miles across the entire width of the State of Nebraska a substation of the post-office at Omaha?

Mr. VILAS. We do not as a rule have Postmasters-General made of that stuff.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask what is there in the laws to prevent it?

Mr. VILAS. There is nothing in the law to prevent it.

So the discussion runs on over several pages of the RECORD of Thursday last, revealing what is to me at least the astounding fact that the Postmaster-General from the organization of the Government has been a supreme and unlimited dictator in the administration of the affairs of that Department. The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] seemed to think it was something peculiar that a man should show any ignorance upon the subject. Of course the senior Senator from Wisconsin, having himself at one time occupied the important position of Postmaster-General, is entirely familiar with the laws governing that Department. I take it he states the law as it exists when he says there never has been a time when the Postmaster-General could not abolish or establish an office at any place in the United States where he might see fit, and that there has never been a time when the Postmaster-General could not take a post-office removed three or four or five hundred miles from a given post-office and make it the substation of that office. In fact, the Senator in the discussion on Thursday last stated that he could do so with an office a thousand miles distant, or any distance. I think I can find the remark, and I shall find it before the discussion is over.

Now, what is proposed? Is it proposed to limit the power of the Postmaster-General, whose power is plenary, unrestrained? No, sir. It is proposed to enlarge it if it were possible to enlarge unrestrained power. The Postmaster-General is to have the power to absorb all the little post-offices in a State or in two or three States and make them subpost-offices of some central point, and by that means make them all tributary to a central point. Why should that be done? Why does the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] or the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] ask the Senate to adopt this amendment? They say to us that it is in the interest of civil-service reform, and that we will get better service from it; that it is proper to put all those offices in the classified service, because thereby the people of this country will obtain for less money better service than they now enjoy.

There has not been one word said here, there has not been a fact adduced in the discussion, showing that the service would be improved. It is true we have heard the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] so argue, but not one fact has been adduced by any of those gentlemen to prove that the service as it now exists would be improved by enlarging the powers of the Postmaster-General or by giving him power to absorb all these offices.

Then, what is the purpose of the amendment? The honorable Senator from Colorado and the honorable Senator from Massachusetts say that there is nothing of sentiment in this matter; that it is a mere business transaction. There is something of sentiment in it. There is a great deal of sentiment in it. We are told by the advocates of civil-service reform that a republican form of government upon this continent is a failure, for that is what it means. Why not continue the system as it is? Why have a man who wants a fourth-class post-office answer 400 or 500 questions that may be put to him by some boy who is just out of his knickerbockers and who has recently left the graduating class of a high school? Why not continue the service as it is? Certainly there is no complaint coming from any responsible source that the little fourth-class post-offices are not properly administered. It is just and right that this power should be diffused among the people, and among all classes of people, so far as it can be done.

We are told that the boy who graduates from school to-day, under better advantages than his father enjoyed, by force of that fact is more clearly eligible to the service of his country than is his father, and the father who did not enjoy those opportunities and who can not answer the questions which a few gentlemen put to him is by virtue of that fact denied the privilege of entering the civil service of his country. Senators say that the people do not complain. They do complain. If the question were to-day put to the people of this country by a popular vote whether substations should be created and clerks sent to them from a distant

part of the country to administer them, for instance, in a neighborhood where some old man has administered the office for ten, fifteen, or twenty years, the vote would be almost unanimous against the adoption of the system. The people look upon those offices as theirs, and they are theirs. Sir, the people of this country are supreme. They are supreme in electing everybody from the roadmaster of an obscure road to the present occupant of the White House, and anything that looks like absorbing power, anything that looks like taking power from the people, is wrong. It is not only not democratic or republican, but it is not American.

How much education must a man in this country have to run a fourth-class post-office which has a salary of one hundred, or two hundred, or five hundred dollars attached to it? With some of us it was a misfortune that we did not enjoy an opportunity to procure an education. We were not to blame for it. I remember distinctly when my education began in a log schoolhouse in the State of Ohio, where I was born, and when I graduated from a sod schoolhouse in the State of Iowa, to which I had removed. I had no opportunity to procure a more complete technical school education. I had not the means to procure such an education if the opportunity had otherwise been presented. Yet millions of citizens of this country who were born in or who in early manhood went to the great West and Southwest are, under this system of classification, to be deprived of their interest in the Government, and of the right to participate in the administration of the affairs of this and other Departments of the Government in consequence of a lack of a perfect technical school education.

Mr. President, I venture the statement that there is no Senator in this Chamber who, without some preparation, can go down to the Civil Service Commissioner's office and pass an examination in any classified department. Necessarily the man or the boy who is freshest from the books passes the most creditable examination. Yet all of the men who, under the rule laid down by the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Massachusetts, are deprived of the right to participate in the affairs of this Government in holding these little offices and in holding little offices in other departments of the Government have a right to vote as American citizens. They have a right to choose other officers. They have a right to choose the very officers who appoint the Civil Service Commissioners, as well as those who create the law authorizing the existence of such a commission. Yet because they do not pass a particular examination or answer correctly a certain percentage of questions which may be put to them by the examiners under the civil service, they are rendered ineligible to hold the position of postmaster of a fourth-class post-office.

Senators say that the people have no interest in this matter. There are hundreds and thousands and tens of thousands of little towns scattered through the country where the post-office is the place at which the men of the neighborhood meet to discuss political and other questions. It is an important matter to them to have a man chosen from the community with whom they are acquainted and who will be responsible to them for the administration of the affairs of the office. Does the honorable Senator from Colorado believe, does any candid man believe, that a man sent into that community from another community to hold this little office and administer its affairs can be in sympathy with the people who reside there? Not at all. He is not answerable to the people. He is answerable alone to some postmaster situated three or four hundred miles from the office or the substation he occupies. Would not appeals from the people of that community fall upon deaf ears if they should complain of the manner in which that man administered the affairs of his office?

Sir, he may not be a voter in the community. He may not have reached the years at which he is eligible to vote. He is not a taxpayer. He does not participate in the affairs of the community. He is not responsible to the people of the community, and therefore he has no sympathy with them and gives ear to no grievance which they may lay before him or before the office to which his station is tributary. But what can he do? He will carry out the behest of the man who appoints him in working political schemes in that neighborhood. It is the most gigantic attempt ever made in this country to control the political affairs of the nation. Here is an army of 150,000 men responsible, not to the communities in which they discharge their duties, but to some central point, who are not in sympathy with those communities, who are there for the purpose of working in the interest of a particular political party or organization which they represent.

The Civil Service Commissioners tell us that the appointees are not to take any part in politics. There was an illustration of that under the Administration of Mr. Hayes, I think. The very first order that was issued by the late President Hayes was his celebrated Order No. 1. Under it no man holding an office was permitted to go to a convention or a caucus and participate in the affairs of the community or locality or State in which he resided. Was it observed? Were not those who advocate the system of civil-service reform, as they call it, the first to trample down

Order No. 1 of President Hayes? Was it not openly violated and flagrantly abused by them from that time on? So strong was the protest of the Republican party against the issue of the order that there was not the slightest attempt to carry it into execution, and the old order of rewarding those who worked during the heat and burden of the day in the campaign was reinstated, and, Mr. President, it is in practice in this Government to-day, notwithstanding the sham pretense of civil-service reform.

How was it under a Democratic Administration? The great Mugwump of this country to-day is installed in the White House. It is very difficult to tell whether Mr. Cleveland is more Mugwump than he is imperial Democrat, but certainly he has led the hosts of Mugwumps in this country for the last ten or fifteen years. Has it not been a common thing under the present Administration to remove for political causes men who were holding positions under the so-called civil-service reform? What became of Mr. Johnston, a member of that Commission, two years ago? I refer to George D. Johnston, of Louisiana. He had the temerity to disagree with Teddy Roosevelt, the great New York Mugwump, second only to Cleveland himself. He did not agree with him as to the administration of some of the affairs of that office. Mr. Johnston seems to have been an honest reformer. It did not seem to have dawned upon his mind until about the time he was removed that civil-service reform was an absolute sham; a sham, Mr. President, under which dishonest men undertake to work political ends and then claim great virtue for having done so.

Mr. Johnston disagreed with his associates, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Lyman. Immediately he was removed. The President of the United States could not even suffer this Commissioner to entertain an independent opinion. We are told that this system is desired so that men can be free from annoyance for expressing their opinions upon political questions; that it shall be nonpartisan; that a man, if he is a Republican and well qualified, can hold his office through a Democratic Administration, and that a Democrat who is well qualified can hold his office through a Republican Administration. Yet when one of those Commissioners at the head of this branch of the service disagreed with his associates and seemed to block the way of carrying out political schemes and purposes in the Commission itself; when he seemed to think that the law was an honest law and should be honestly administered, suddenly he found the President calling for his resignation, and offering to transfer him to a different line of the public service.

I wish to call attention to some letters which appeared in the press some time ago:

EXECUTIVE MANSION, November 25, 1893.

DEAR SIR: I am sorry to hear through your friends, Senator CAFFERY and Mr. Secretary Herbert, who conveyed to you my request that you acquiesce in your transfer from the Civil Service Commission to another post of honorable duty, that you decline the proposition and refuse to resign your present position. I am so certain that the public good requires a change in the Commission, involving your retirement, that I am constrained to request you to reconsider your decision and put me in possession of your resignation as early as Monday afternoon, the 27th instant, at 4 o'clock.

Yours, very truly,

GROVER CLEVELAND.

Hon. GEORGE D. JOHNSTON.

The world, however, has remained in ignorance of the good that the public service would derive by the transfer of Mr. Johnston from the Civil Service Commission to the consular service of the Government. What had Mr. Johnston done? Had he been guilty of violating any statute? Had he said or done anything that was not proper for him to say or do? No. He had simply seen fit to enter a dissenting opinion upon some question of legal construction entertained by his associates, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Lyman. The President might as well say to a man whom he is about to appoint a justice of the Supreme Court, "I have appointed a Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States who believes that every corporation has wings, who believes that corporations have all the rights and the people have none. Now, I appoint you as an associate justice upon that bench; but, mark you, whenever you manifest any independence of opinion or character or disagree with the Chief Justice you will be removed." Here were three commissioners appointed with coordinate powers, the office of one as high as the office of the other, and yet because Mr. Johnston saw fit in the exercise of an honest conviction to disagree with his associates he was removed for the good of the public service from that Commission and was to be transferred to the consular service. But where did he go? He went where all such men go under this Administration.

Now, Mr. Johnston replied to this letter, and he replied in perfectly polite language. He wrote under date of "Washington, November 27, 1893," two days later, and said:

THE PRESIDENT.

SIR: Your letter of the 26th instant is received. Senator CAFFERY and Mr. Secretary Herbert conveyed to me your offer of the consulship at Victoria, which meant, of course, that you propose to retire me from the Civil Service Commission—

The President was ready to dicker with him; he was ready to transfer him to the consulship at Victoria if he could only get rid

of him, get him off of the Civil Service Commission and give his henchmen a full opportunity at that tribunal—

You did not communicate to me through these gentlemen your reasons for my retirement, nor have you ever spoken to me in regard to this or any other matter connected with the discharge of my duties, or relating to the Commission or its work. Though conscious of having discharged the duties of my office faithfully, and, as I believe, in furtherance of the best interests of the people and the Government, I would promptly acquiesce in your wish that I resign had you given me an opportunity to be heard before you decided upon your action. Under present circumstances, however, I can not, consistently with my sense of duty to myself or my friends who recommended my appointment, consent either to resign or accept a position inferior to the one I now hold.

Respectfully,

GEORGE D. JOHNSTON.

Mr. Johnston had not been informed of the charge made against him. He had not been called to the White House and given an opportunity to explain anything. He had been the victim of a star-chamber judgment upon the part of the Chief Executive of this nation. He was not even permitted to go before some person representing the President and lay his cause before him. I suppose that is Democracy according to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, without knowing the charge against him, and being ignorant of the charge against him to this day, for that matter, as I am informed, except that he disagreed in the construction of a statute from his associate Commissioners, this man was removed after the President could not purchase him and dispose of him by sending him as consul to Victoria. Then his majesty—or his excellency, I should say—sent the following letter to Mr. Johnston:

Hon. GEORGE D. JOHNSTON.

SIR—

He ceased to be "Dear sir." In the first letter it was "Hon. George D. Johnston, dear sir," an affectionate sort of a letter, but when informed that Mr. Johnston would not resign and could not be bought—for that is what he undertook to do with him—the President for the first time shows his hand in the cold and stereotyped expression, "Sir"—

Hon. GEORGE D. JOHNSTON.

SIR: You are hereby removed from the office of United States Civil Service Commissioner.

Yours, truly,

GROVER CLEVELAND.

For what cause was he removed? Why was this man, who was at the head of the Civil Service Commission of the United States, taken, so to speak, by the nape of the neck and thrown out of office without a charge being made against him, without being given an opportunity to be heard in his defense? Will the President of the United States hear a charge that involves the character, the integrity, or the manhood of a public officer and not give that officer an opportunity to explain it or to be heard upon it? If he will do that, Mr. President, then he is a disgrace to the great office he occupies, and he should not be returned, as he doubtless will not be returned, to that position.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to make an inquiry, if the Senator from Nebraska will allow me to ask him a question.

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. Does the Senator himself know what was the alleged cause of Mr. Johnston's removal?

Mr. ALLEN. I can not give it in detail. I read it at the time and I have read it since, but it is not important here. That is not the question I am discussing. I have discussed the action of a man who will pursue the tactics that were pursued in the days of Jeffreys and the Old Bailey, a man who will hear whisperings and charges against the character or against the fitness of a man holding a public position and remove him without giving him an opportunity to be heard in his defense. Then Mr. Johnston acknowledged the receipt of the letter of removal, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT.

SIR: Your note of this date informing me that you have removed me from the office of United States Civil Service Commissioner is hereby acknowledged.

Respectfully,

GEORGE D. JOHNSTON.

And Mr. Johnston passed from an important office in this country, with headquarters in this city, into private life, not knowing the accusation made against him except that he had disagreed with his associates in some respects.

Now, Mr. President, this is civil service. What is to be gained by the introduction of such a system of civil service when it is rotten at the very fountain source, when it is used by the Chief Executive, when it is used by his Cabinet officers, as a mere cloak to the accomplishment of their political and personal desires and purposes? There may be a few persons in this country who are gullible enough to think that this is a wonderful scheme for renovating offices, putting competent men at the head of affairs, reducing the crimes in offices and the cost of their administration. There may be a few such people, I say, but there are not many. There are but few of the people of the United States who do not know to-day that the so-called civil-service reform is a snare, a fraud, and a delusion, and that it is made to work out political purposes as much now as the old system did before the introduction of the present system.

Mr. President, if the Senators who advocate this measure are to be believed, every man who enters the classified service is a saint; there is some peculiarity in the blood that courses through his veins; and every man who is not eligible to it is by force of that fact dishonest or unfit to be considered as a citizen of the United States, or he is a mere groundling with water coursing through his veins instead of blood. It counts for nothing that the Revolutionary fathers established this Government for all, not alone for the educated man, but in the interest of the man who was not educated. It matters not to the distinguished Senator from Colorado or the Senator from Massachusetts that those men spilled their blood from Concord to Yorktown in rescuing our country from the yoke of English oppression.

It matters not that their descendants from that time to this have upheld the flag of this country in every great struggle we have had for the maintenance of our Government and the maintenance of our freedom. After this country has been brought in safety to its present position we are to have this un-Democratic, un-Republican, un-Populistic, un-American distinction introduced into our service that the man who spells "copy" with one "p" is to have an office against another fellow who was taught forty years ago to spell it with two "p's." That is the distinction. That is the crown of the distinction. And a lot of men, boys from school, who have never done anything in defense of their country, who might prove the most impotent of all if called upon to discharge any great public service in the hour of danger, are to be enthroned in the most important offices of the country, and the old men and the old women, the middle-aged men and the middle-aged women, who did not enjoy equal opportunities of education with them, are to be placed in the background.

Now, what can be accomplished by the scheme before us? We are told that there are something like 150,000 persons in the mail service of this country. I will ask the Senator from Wisconsin if I am right.

Mr. VILAS. About that number.

Mr. ALLEN. How are they to be used? They are to be nonpartisan. Mr. President, you and I know how this nonpartisan civil service works. You know, and so does the Senator from Wisconsin, what would be the result if the postmaster at Milwaukee, for instance, should say to the clerk who is holding a subpost-office 50 miles from there: "See the people in your community and get as many of them to go to the Democratic caucus as you can and support the good old party."

Mr. President, do you suppose that clerk would refuse to carry into execution the order? Suppose it were not placed as an argument, but said to him, "Now, would it not be a pretty good plan for you to see some of the old men in the communities where your subagents are and see if you can not induce them to go to the town caucuses and get on the delegations from the towns to the county conventions," do you not suppose the clerks would carry into execution the request and wishes of their master? Sir, the clerk does it to-day in the classified service and out of it, and if in the classified service he is not answerable to the people upon whom he would commit and does commit such an outrage.

Mr. President, it has been a common thing since I have been a member of this body to have employees in the Departments in this city come to me (I am not at liberty to call their names, nor am I at liberty to speak as plainly as I should upon the subject for fear that some Civil Service Commissioner or his agent may be around and chase them down and chase them out of their offices) and say that they had risen under the civil service from a six or eight hundred dollar job a year up to \$1,800, and sometimes as high as \$2,000 or more, and they had been in the service for years.

When Mr. Harrison went out and Mr. Cleveland came into power they were told that they would have to take a reduced position. I will venture the remark that 50 per cent of the Republicans that are in appointive positions in this city to-day have been reduced from the position they occupied when Harrison went out of the White House and Cleveland went in. They were told that they must take a reduced position, and some Democrat in the same service, who came in later than they did, or who has been appointed to the service since the present Administration, was promoted above them.

I could call the names and the offices this moment if I were permitted to do so, but the interests of those persons will not permit me. I have known a few instances where the occupants of the office thought the law was passed to be observed, where they had not discovered that it was a mere cloak under which political parties were masking their purposes. I recall an instance right now where a man had been in the service for over ten years in one of the Departments in this city. I have known the man personally for twenty-five years—a thoroughly competent, honest, and well-equipped man.

Within a short time after Mr. Cleveland came into power in 1893 it was indicated to this gentleman that he must take a reduced position at \$1,200 a year, as the chief of the bureau wanted his place for a Democrat. He rebelled. Did not the statute say,

does not the President say, do not the Civil Service Commissioners say, do not the Mugwumps say as well, that a man in such a position can not be removed for political causes, that if he is a gentleman and qualified and in the classified service he can remain whether he is a Democrat or a Republican? They all said this, the law said this, and the man construed the statute and he construed their words to be honest and as showing the evident purpose of the framers of the statute. When he informed the chief of the bureau under whose charge he was that he could not take the reduced position, the chief of the bureau said to him, "Well, you will have to resign, because I want your office for a good Democrat here." He did not resign; the chief could not get rid of him that way; but finally he did get rid of him by abolishing the office.

You know we permit these Departments to establish a limitless number of offices and fill them. The office was abolished. Then the victim of civil-service reform discovered for the first time that it was a delusion and a snare, and he went out into the cold, chilly atmosphere of the world to struggle for himself, and he is down along the cool waters of Babylon, I presume, at this moment. Now, what was the result? The Republican had not left that office three weeks until the office was created again, and it was filled by the Democrat who sought it.

Mr. President, I speak of this not as an isolated case. Cases can be found by the hundreds right in this city and in other cities and centers of population in this country. Yet Senators will stand in this Chamber and advocate the adoption and enforcement of this iniquitous system of doing business. They will say, notwithstanding this, that the great body of the American people should be shut out of holding these little offices that are scattered throughout the States and Territories of the Union. Why, Mr. President, what would you do with one of the little fellows who had been reared in the civil service and who could not tell a horse from an ox except that the one has horns and the other has not? What would you do with such a person as that, who feels himself above all responsibility in a moral, a social, and a business sense to the people whose office he administers, in putting him out at some country crossroad store to administer the mail service, at a salary of \$100 or \$200 a year, for the people who congregate there, when some young man living in the community who has a little store and carries on a little business can administer the affairs of that office in the interest of the people who live around it and who are tributary to it? Under the system advocated by these gentlemen a man might be sent a distance of 100 or 500 or 1,000 miles to administer one of these offices and the people of the community where he went be given to understand that he was sent there because there could not be found in that community a man who had intelligence enough to discharge the duties required of a little fourth-class postmaster.

But the Senator from Wisconsin says this is Democratic. I think I heard him say on Thursday last that this is Democratic, and the Senator says now that it is Democratic. Well, Mr. President, it may be Democratic. I do not know; I would not say that it was not modern Democracy. It is certainly not ancient Democracy. What did the fathers of the Democratic party teach in this country? They said liberty was most secure when the power of administering the affairs of the Government ramified all communities and was held in the hands of the common people. I suppose after a while we shall be carrying the rules of civil-service reform into the New England town meetings, and the junior Senator from Massachusetts will tell the people of that Commonwealth that it is necessary for the efficient administration of the public service in these communities that only the highly educated classes shall be permitted to levy the taxes and discharge the various duties devolving upon town offices.

This spirit has run wild; it has gone to the very verge of idiocy; it stands stamped with the condemnation, in my judgment, of every man who is a true friend of this country, of every man who does not want to erect upon this continent a ruling class and a class to be ruled. I imagine it would be a remarkable scene, if it could be so, to witness the senior Senator from Wisconsin discussing this question with the illustrious Jefferson. I imagine if Mr. Jefferson could rise from his grave to-day and walk into the Senate Chamber and hear the Senator from Wisconsin declare that this is Democratic doctrine, he would believe that his great rival, Hamilton, or the descendants of Hamilton, had come into control of the Government. Jefferson did not believe this doctrine; it was not even believed in by the most radical men of that age.

Mr. President, it proves another thing. There is no difference between Cleveland Democracy and gold-bug Republicanism. I classify gold-bug Republicanism because it leads to many other heresies, but that is the chief one. What distinction is there between the opinion of the junior Senator from Colorado or the junior Senator from Massachusetts and the illustrious Senator from Wisconsin upon this subject? They are glad to embrace, so says the junior Senator from Massachusetts, and he walks over toward

the senior Senator from Wisconsin as though he were going to embrace him on this subject; he is glad to agree with him upon this great, supreme proposition of the hour, civil-service reform. There is not the slightest distinction between them upon any other great political question now agitating the country. They are simply agreed upon these great propositions, except that the senior Senator from Wisconsin is on the Democratic stage driving the team, and the Senator from Massachusetts is on the Republican stage driving a like team. They are in perfect harmony, in perfect accord upon this, as well as upon other great political questions which are now agitating the people.

Of course, Mr. President, men like myself are away behind. We have not had the opportunities of seeing the beauties of civil-service reform as administered under the Administration of Mr. Cleveland and under the Administration of Mr. Harrison. We are not supposed to have cultivated taste enough to appreciate it if we came in close contact with it. The great masses of the people are supposed, according to this system, to be absolutely incapable of conducting their own affairs. When you say that that distinction shall be erected, that it shall be incorporated into our laws and applied, do you not say to the great majority of the people of this country that they are incapable of self-government and that self-government is a failure?

You say to these men, "Yes, you can pay taxes, that is all right; you can support the Government in discharging your duties as a citizen in the payment of taxes; you can support the Government by discharging your duty as a juror when called into court, in determining great questions that are submitted to you; you can support your Government by taking your musket and joining the Army and fighting your country's battles, if you will; you do not have to spell very well when you do that; no, you are a good citizen when you do that; you can fight in defense of your country; you may stand by its flag on fifty occasions when it is imperiled and endangered by its enemies. All these as a citizen of this country you can and must do; but when you come home you find the dudes entrenched in the civil service, and if you fail to pass an examination such as is described in this book [indicating], you can get nothing out of this Government, not even a fourth-class post-office." We who do not believe in this are told that we are not aesthetic, that we do not rise to that high, keen intellectual appreciation of how this great Government should be run by the few and the masses excluded from any responsibility.

There is nothing political in it; of course not. You let Mr. Wilson, the present Postmaster-General, have all these great offices, some 68,000, I think, consolidated with your substations at 40 or 50 different points in the United States, with a superintendent over every division, and every postmaster or clerk in every division will be throwing up his hat for the Democratic party this year, or, if he does not, his office will be abolished, and after a while the office will be restored and a Democrat put in his place.

Mr. President, I recall a year ago last fall, in 1894—and I am speaking now of the bond of sympathy which exists between Democrats and Republicans here—the great contest for the office of governor in my State, where the present chief executive, a Populist, was finally elected by 3,100 majority over his Republican competitor. When the news first came to the centers of population in that State, it was that his Republican competitor had been elected. Every Cleveland Democrat in the State of Nebraska supported the Republican candidate for governor, every man who believed in the gold standard, every man who wore a collar round his neck labeled "My dog," every Government official walked to the ballot box and cast his vote for the Republican candidate for governor. When the news came that he was elected—it was a mistake, however—there were a dozen or more places in the State of Nebraska where the postmasters walked into the streets, threw their hats into the air, and almost split their lungs in cheering for the supposed triumphant election of the Republican candidate for governor. It was only two or three days after that when they discovered their mistake and found that the Populist had slipped through and that the Republican had not succeeded.

What difference is there between these parties? I say, Mr. President, that the gold wing, the Cleveland element of the Democratic party of the State of Nebraska, has supported the Republican ticket for the last seven or eight years in that State. So it has been in other sections of the country. Those gentlemen who are solidified upon this question and upon other questions would rather see a certain element of the Republican party win, or a certain element of the Republican party would rather see a certain other element of the Democratic party win, than to see any person win who is in full accord and sympathy with the masses all the time.

Mr. President, this is not a question of sentiment, these gentlemen say; it is a question of efficiency of the service. I say it is a question of sentiment to a certain extent. There is nothing to which the people of this country are more securely attached, especially in the rural districts, than to the postmaster and the administration of the little post-offices in which they feel a personal

interest, a place where they can congregate and get their mail; where they can exchange ideas upon neighborhood and other subjects, if they see fit. To send a stranger among them, who is not of them or for them, who does not pay a cent of taxes in the community where he has been sent, who is not a part and parcel of their organization, and not eligible to any other office there, would be like sending a man from Russia or from some distant country into their midst to administer the affairs of their community.

The process has begun; the process of absorption has already taken place. In the last fiscal year the number of post-offices discontinued by order of the Postmaster-General was 94; the number of stations established in lieu of the 94 independent post-offices was 74, of the carrier stations 20, and the substations 54. How long will it take under this system until all the principal States of this Union will be affected by this process of absorption?

Then, Mr. President, these gentlemen are not contented with turning over the entire Post-Office Department to so-called civil-service reform, but it will appear from this bill that they are going into partnership with the manufacturers of bicycles. We have suffered every trust in this country to organize with impunity that wanted to do so without restraint. Notwithstanding we have statutes containing ample provisions against the formation of trusts of various kinds, we sit here powerless, and the different branches of the Government sit here powerless to enforce these statutes, or refuse absolutely to enforce them, in many instances refusing to enforce the statutes against these trusts because they are depending upon the trusts for a campaign fund to conduct the Presidential and other important campaigns of this country. I heard it charged openly but a short time ago that \$300,000 was raised by certain parties in Wall street, New York, for the nomination of Mr. Cleveland for the Presidency in 1892, and that the same identical individuals raised a like sum to secure the nomination of Mr. Harrison as the Republican nominee in the same year. The statement was made in the presence of some gentlemen who sit here at this time and who ought to know, and it was not denied, and if there is any denial to be made to it I am perfectly willing that it should be made now.

Mr. GRAY. Were not some such charges made against Mr. McKinley?

Mr. ALLEN. I have not read the latest evidence upon the McKinley case. I have the primary evidence, however, in my desk here, which I shall use at the proper time.

It was charged, furthermore, that up to four weeks before the election of 1892 these gentlemen in Wall street, who manipulate the affairs of this country, and all of whom are civil-service reformers, of course, did not know whether they would support Mr. Cleveland or support Mr. Harrison. Their affection was divided. Of course the average Wall street shark has nothing like patriotism about him. It is only a question, as has been said, of cent per cent with them; a question as to whom they can control and manipulate to the best advantage. So they were divided in their affection.

Mr. Harrison had swung around the circle, and had given utterance to that phrase, which finds expression in the Republican platform, that he was in favor of every dollar being as good as every other dollar. No man ever saw one dollar that was not as good as another; but he coined that phrase, and it went into the Republican platform of 1892. Finally they concluded that Harrison was a little too far West; that he could not be depended upon at a critical time; that Cleveland had his office on Wall street, and that his associations and sympathies there were such that \$400,000 of money went from those people into the campaign fund, and Cleveland was elected and Harrison defeated. One of those gentlemen who contributed so largely to this fund was Mr. John J. Van Alen. I think he gave \$50,000. He was one of those American citizens who has become "so English, you know," that when he can not find a genuine fox to chase, he puts a darky on a horse, ties a piece of white paper to the horse, sends him through the woods, sets his hounds after that, and he and his friends chase it.

That man gave \$50,000, as appeared in the sugar investigation—it is in a public document, and there is no question about it—to the Cleveland campaign fund, and in the course of events, Mr. Cleveland found something in his views of civil-service reform which permitted him to appoint that individual as minister or ambassador extraordinary to Italy. We had quite a contest over it, and that man was finally confirmed. Here was a man who gave \$50,000 to the Presidential campaign fund, who was getting his quid pro quo in the form of a foreign appointment, and such a man as that received the approval of this Senate by a majority vote.

Was it any different when Mr. Harrison was elected? Not at all. The great and good Mr. Wanamaker, the superintendent of Sunday schools, it is said, gave \$400,000 for the elevation of Benjamin Harrison to the Presidential office, and after a few suns had risen and set, after a few months had elapsed, the President saw

fit to invite the great and good John into his Cabinet to act as Postmaster-General from that time on, and he did.

I speak of these things as conspicuous examples of civil-service reform. This rotten system is corrupting the very foundations of the Government itself. This placing of the Presidential office on an auction block for bids, and selling it to a man who will pay the most boodle for it, can go on uninterruptedly; but when it comes to a question of disposing of a little fourth-class post-office with a salary of \$50 or \$100 a year attached to it, civil-service reform must be enforced and insisted on!

Mr. HAWLEY. May I interrupt the Senator a moment?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAWLEY. I take it for granted that neither the Senator from Nebraska nor anybody else in the world supposes that John Wanamaker gave \$400,000 to make Benjamin Harrison President. Mr. Wanamaker is an active and influential politician, and I have no doubt that all he did was to circulate a paper for subscriptions and that he raised a large sum of money—how much I do not know, but I heard the sum mentioned once at \$10,000. That, however, is the private business of the gentlemen contributing, and nobody supposes that Mr. Wanamaker gave \$400,000 or that he bought his office, and I do not believe that there is a respectable Democrat in the United States who will say that he believes that Benjamin Harrison would have gone into any such contract or that anybody bought him or that he bought anybody else.

Mr. ALLEN. There was never a man in this world caught in doing what he ought not to do who did not have an apology and some subterfuge to offer for his conduct. I say that charge was made against Mr. Wanamaker and ex-President Harrison openly through the press of this country, and it never has been denied from that moment until this, when the distinguished Senator from Connecticut rises at his desk and denies it.

Mr. HAWLEY. Which charge? I do not understand distinctly what the charge is.

Mr. ALLEN. I will make it so distinct that you can understand it—that John Wanamaker contributed \$400,000 to the Harrison campaign in 1892. That is the charge I refer to.

Mr. HAWLEY. I wish to say that I do not believe it, and I do not know of anybody else besides the Senator who believes that Mr. Wanamaker contributed any such sum.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, there is not a Democrat on this side—mark you, now, a Democrat; I do not mean a Democrat sailing under Democratic colors who is a Republican—who will get up and say he does not believe it. No; they are perfectly silent here; but a bitter, uncompromising partisan of Harrison and of Wanamaker can say he does not believe it, and that he does not believe that anybody in this country believes it but me. I do not know whether it is true or not; I know the charge was made; that it rang from Maine to California, through the press of this country, and I have never heard it openly denied until this moment. The statute of limitations has run against it, I suppose, by this time at least. Harrison served out his term and passed into private life. To-day he undertakes the discharge of additional duties, and I suppose the American people will forgive him.

Mr. Cleveland will pass from the White House within the next eleven months back to his office in Wall street, to enjoy the fruits of his fortune, if he has one, made out of the misfortunes of this country, and the people will lose sight of him, and the crime that was committed in 1892 in contributing to his campaign fund will be forgotten; but the Mugwump who stands on his heel and howls every time he gets an opportunity about civil-service reform or the civil-service reformer, who has himself been particeps criminis in these greater offenses, will still continue to stand up and howl that all the old men and the old women in the little country post-offices must be swept aside for the dude.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I desire to say a very few words.

Mr. ALLEN. I send to the desk an amendment which I desire to offer at the proper time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend by inserting, on page 2, after line 6, the following, as an additional proviso:

Provided further. That no subpost-office or station shall be established outside of or beyond the corporate limits of the town or city in which the principal office is established, nor shall a postmaster or clerk of any such subpost-office or station be appointed to administer the affairs thereof who is not at the time of his appointment a bona fide resident and elector of the community in which said subpost-office or station is located.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I desire to say a very few words on the amendments. The amendment which the Committee on Appropriations put into the bill requires the establishment of a post-office at every county seat, restoring them where they have been discontinued. The present amendment proposes to give authority to the Postmaster-General to apply the money appropriated to the payment of any superintendent or other officer who may be substituted in place of the discontinued postmaster.

There is no doubt that the power to discontinue a post-office is

involved in the power to establish it. There is no question that the power to establish a post-office was conferred in the creation of the Department; but, as has been truly said, the importance of this provision is that it places the officer substituted for the person who was the postmaster and upon whom the duties of that office were imposed subject to the civil-service law. That is all. It makes the selection of that officer from the general list of eligible persons having been examined and having passed. So from all parts of the United States, not from the State alone, a person eligible in the highest degree may under the amendment be assigned to the performance of the duties of postmaster at any place.

That brings up the whole question as to how far it is consistent with the theory of this Government to divorce the appointment of officers from the source in which the Constitution of the country has placed it. That is the question. The superior efficiency of such an organization may or may not be questioned, but certainly it could be attained equally by requiring the postmaster in any particular region of country to report to and be under the supervision of some one person in that particular locality. So it is not of the essence of the amendment that there should be superior efficiency to that which exists. But upon that subject it may be said that the constitutions of government are not formed upon the sole idea of efficiency. I believe it is Blackstone who in his Commentaries says, quoting from Montesquieu, that the best government in the world is a monarchy, provided you can be assured of the greatest wisdom and the greatest integrity in the person of the monarch. Certainly the greatest efficiency and the most direct execution of the law is to be found in the person of a monarch, a single person. But other considerations require that there should be different forms of government. Personal liberty, the preservation of the rights of every man as against arbitrary power constitute the foundation upon which liberal governments are established.

Now, what do we find upon the subject of civil-service reform, as it is called? We find that in this country the power of Executive duty was carefully considered and framed. And where was it placed? Where was the power to create offices and to fill them placed by the Constitution? I need not say that it was in the President of the United States and in the Congress of the United States, who are authorized to create inferior offices and vest the appointment in the heads of Departments. Is it an idle purpose to vest the appointing power of officers created by Congress in the heads of Departments? Has it any utility at all? Is it to be supposed that it has no purpose in this form of government and that the Executive power, the President of the United States, should have all power of appointment, of even the smallest officers of this Government, which may be created by Congress?

It is the proposition of those who advocate the amendment that the whole power of appointment of officers created by Congress shall be vested in the President of the United States and in three Commissioners, who shall execute this power under the sole will of the President, an officer who holds two-thirds of the legislative power of the Congress of the United States in every vote that is cast less 1 vote. That is the scheme which is now proposed in this and like amendments, that a single official, having two-thirds of the legislative power of this Government in his hands less 1 vote, shall have the sole power to appoint every officer in this Government from the smallest to the highest.

Now, is it safe to so intrust this power, contrary to the provisions of the Constitution? In the midst of this vast concentration of power, in the alienation of the franchises of taxation into private and individual hands as property, when the great corporations of this country, owned by a few men, some domestic and largely foreign, collecting three times the tax that the Government itself can collect, when a few individuals have accumulated by the power of taxation upon the people from one to five hundred million dollars each, is it wise and according to our system of Government, is it consistent with the preservation of this Government, that you should vest the power of appointing every officer from the lowest to the highest in the President of the United States and three men who are his creatures and subject to his will?

It seems to me that there is a consideration which should give us pause. It does not matter what the provisions of the statutory law are. It is true that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] ought to be adopted which limits the power of creating substations and of putting into them, not postmasters of the vicinage, which ought to be required, for every postmaster ought to be selected according to the will of the patrons of the office in the locality, but persons selected from a list of eligibles embracing all the people of the United States. I undertake to say that if we continue the system by which you disfranchise from eligibility to office every man over 40 or 45 years of age and every man or woman under 20 years of age, and leave to the individual possessing this great power, the Presidency, the right still further to limit the qualifications, he may limit them to persons over 21 years of age and under 30 years of age. He therefore

possesses the absolute power of depriving of eligibility the larger portion of the people of the United States.

But it is said that you must consider that officials will interpret the law reasonably and execute the law reasonably. That is not the proposition upon which constitutions and institutions of government are formed. They are formed upon the idea that public officials will not execute the laws fairly and justly, and restraints and limitations and checks and prohibitions are imposed upon the theory that the people shall be guarded against the abuse of power. So when it is proposed now that a list of eligibles shall be formed from persons who are over 20 and under 40 or 45 years of age, the power of appointment to be conferred not upon the heads of Departments, but upon rules formulated by a single man, the President of the United States, in my judgment you overthrow this form of government or place it in a condition where it may be subjected to great danger. But at all events, upon the pending appropriation bill a scheme of such great influence should not be allowed to go.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it appears that the consideration of the pending amendment does not involve necessarily, or, indeed, at all, any criticism either of the President of the United States or of the Postmaster-General. While I am not in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], and while I believe that the system with which we are to some extent threatened, looking to the consolidation of remote post-offices with city post-offices, is a bad one, I express that view without feeling that I am criticising anybody particularly. I have great personal respect for the Postmaster-General, but I also have my own views upon this subject.

In the report of the Postmaster-General made during the present session, page 40 of House Document No. 4, I find the following:

The question of extending civil-service methods to the selection of fourth-class postmasters has naturally received my attention since I have been at the head of this Department. It is beset with difficulties which my experience as a Representative in Congress of a large country district during three changes of Administration has brought home to me more clearly than they might appear to a theoretical reformer or to the Representative of a city constituency. I have studied various bills introduced in both branches of Congress in recent years and welcomed suggestions from other quarters. But I do not find myself able to make, as yet, any specific recommendations on this important subject in the line of the legislation which has been proposed.

Here is a statement, therefore, made officially by the Postmaster-General to Congress, wherein he notifies us that, in his opinion, it is inadvisable, as the matter now appears to him, to pass any of the bills proposing to extend the classified service to postmasters of the fourth class.

Mr. President, there is an effort, as we learn from the discussion here, at least by some of those who advocate the amendment, indirectly to do that which the Postmaster-General does not feel that he is prepared to recommend.

Mr. VILAS. I should like to ask the Senator from California to read the next paragraph following the one he has read.

Mr. WHITE. I shall do so with pleasure.

Mr. VILAS. The Senator will see, then, that all the suggestion there is in regard to this amendment is in line with what the Postmaster-General has said.

Mr. WHITE. I will read the next section:

The order which you have recently approved, providing that when the Postmaster-General shall consolidate with a free-delivery office any other post-office, such consolidation shall carry into the classified service at the free-delivery office the Post-Office Department roster of employees of the office consolidated, including the postmaster, may be accepted as the beginning and foundation not only of a better postal service of the public, a better and more business-like accounting to this Department, but also a wise extension of the civil-service system to postmasters. It is my purpose to proceed under the authority of this order as discreetly as I can, and in the long run as far as experience will justify, so as to secure these commendable results.

Is that all the Senator from Wisconsin alluded to?

Mr. VILAS. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Reading that portion of the report of the Postmaster-General I arrive at a conclusion entirely opposite to that suggested by the interruption of the Senator from Wisconsin. It is well known to us all that as a rule the fourth-class post-offices are small affairs. As a general thing there are no clerks. In many of the rural regions of the United States some one attends to the post-office duties in his own house. This recommendation plainly has reference to larger offices where more business is done, because the Postmaster-General says:

The order which you have recently approved, providing that when the Postmaster-General shall consolidate with a free-delivery office any other post-office such consolidation shall carry into the classified service at the free-delivery office the Post-Office Department roster of employees of the office consolidated, etc.

I would construe that recommendation, coupled with the other which precedes it, as meaning that the Postmaster-General does not favor consolidation in the case of small fourth-class offices, but that he does as to larger offices situated near a free-delivery office. Such would be my construction. However, as to what he intended perhaps others know better than I do.

Mr. President, I admit that the evil which must result from this amendment will depend upon the extent to which the Postmaster-General carries the authority with which he is to be clothed. I agree, also, that it is dangerous to extend power too far, but I likewise concur in the observation made by some one that it is impossible to place a nice, an absolutely correct, limitation. But we must construe the intention of the officers who are to execute this authority by what they have recently said, even since this report was written.

We find a suggestion by the Postmaster-General on page 4 of Report No. 592, as follows:

A few days ago an order was issued from this office consolidating with the Brooklyn post-office 14 independent post-offices hitherto existing in the corporate limits of that city. Every post-office on Long Island Sound might thus be consolidated with the Brooklyn post-office, with an improvement of the service.

My attention was directed to the radical change proposed in the administration of the Department by the statement that every post-office on Long Island Sound might properly be consolidated with the Brooklyn post-office. Such an extensive and radical alteration in modes of procedure heretofore adopted seems to me worthy of more than passing consideration, and when I reflect that this discussion and this matter are injected into an appropriation bill, when it is impossible for us adequately to place before our view and to fully consider and act upon the various phases of the subject, I at once think that the amendment should be retired, so that it may be more fully and completely discussed.

My distinguished friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] referred to several cities in the United States within the corporate limits of which I understood him to say there were post-offices which should be or could be successfully consolidated. He has, I believe, a list before him—officially prepared, I suppose, as he tells us he has obtained the information from reliable sources—showing that within certain municipal jurisdictions there are various post-offices which really should be under central control. If I remember rightly, in the case of San Diego, which was the only instance in California cited by him, he referred to Point Loma and Sorrento and Lajolla and North San Diego as places within the jurisdiction or limits of the city of San Diego.

I wish to call the attention of my friend to this proposition. Point Loma is a very small office. The Senator himself will observe by looking at the returns that certainly it can not contribute more than a hundred or two hundred dollars per annum to the Government coffers. I do not believe it contributes that much. It is located 8 miles from the city of San Diego. Lajolla is 12 miles from the city of San Diego, not within the municipal limits at all. Sorrento is 15 miles distant, and they are all very small offices. It would be impracticable to bring them under one jurisdiction.

But it seems to me it would be bad policy at least to adopt any system which must result in sending a young man who has passed a civil-service examination from some of our cities, on his bicycle or by other mode of conveyance, to distribute mail in the rural regions to persons with whom perhaps he is not acquainted and to whom to some extent he may be a cause for alarm. Surely the particular instance cited by the Senator from Colorado as affording a justification for consolidation does not come even within the theory which he has advanced, and therefore I simply submit that he has been misinformed regarding it.

It is true that we ought to have the best service we can get, but it is likewise true that there are thousands of small post-offices in this country in towns where there reside a population who wish to administer the post-office as nearly as they can themselves, and in most cases they do. I know it has been said here, and it is true in many instances perhaps in larger offices, that communities do not obtain the men for postmasters whom they desire. But that is not generally true, especially in the smaller places where some one accepts the office really as a matter of accommodation to his neighbors. Take counties—and I am thinking of some in my own State—where there may be a town of eight or ten thousand inhabitants, and where there is a man of a higher class, so far as education and attainments are concerned, in the central post-office than in some of the country post-offices. I would not, for that reason, place the smaller offices under his jurisdiction. They get along very well. Of course, there may be burglaries committed; but I submit that the burglar will be just as liable to get into the office when it is attended by a gentleman who rides a bicycle as he will when it is attended by some old farmer in the country, who would be far more able in dealing with an unwarranted intrusion. There is nothing, I think, in the matter of loss.

When we come to the matter of embezzlement, I do not think there would be anything found there. I know, of course, that there may be frauds committed in the little post-offices, but I do not believe they are very extensive. There will be frauds committed in every service which we can devise, but I do not believe that if we change the method we will obtain any more honest men than we have now; and while theoretically it may be a good

thing to create a great post-office trust and to put all of those people under one central control, practically I believe it will lead to a great deal of trouble.

For myself, so far as the patronage is concerned, I do not believe it is of any benefit to an individual to enjoy patronage. I do not think it is any satisfaction to an individual to have the authority to fill fourth-class post-offices throughout the United States. I would welcome a law which would consign to instantaneous death a member of Congress who would apply for any sort of an office for anybody.

But I do not think that now at this date we should add anything to the bill in this direction. The Senator from Iowa informs us that without any particular mention in the bill of the matter, \$750,000 have been diverted into the clerk-hire channel, so as to enable the Postmaster-General to further experiment. I am unwilling to add anything to his power in this matter, because I do not think that a theory which is supported by an example which tells us that all the post-offices on Long Island Sound can be successfully consolidated in Brooklyn is a good system. It has nothing to commend it to me, or if there were any commendatory features they are overborne by others.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I know the Senator from California wishes to be accurate. May I suggest to him that the post-offices proposed to be consolidated are not on Long Island Sound, but on Long Island?

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator from Colorado will lend me his ear, I will read to him from the report of the Postmaster-General upon that subject, and it sounds to me as though I were right:

Every post-office on Long Island Sound might thus be consolidated with the Brooklyn post-office.

So I said, or intended to say if I did not, that the proposition of the Postmaster-General was to consolidate all of the post-offices on Long Island Sound and bring them within the Brooklyn jurisdiction, and I think I was right about that. It rather astonished me, but I stated it upon that authority upon which I was told later in the discussion the Senator from Colorado largely relied.

I desire to say (though I do not consider it essential to this controversy) that I do not wish anything I have said to be construed into any reflection upon the civil-service system. Properly applied I approve of it, but I agree with the Postmaster-General that it is inapplicable to the conditions surrounding the service of the fourth-class postmasters of the country.

That is all I wish to say upon the matter, Mr. President.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have listened to the argument of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] with a good deal of interest, particularly that portion of it in which he said that the business could be conducted so much more cheaply. I have heard that from several. There is no doubt that the whole Government could be carried on much more cheaply if we trusted entirely to one man; but the question is, would it be as successful? All the arguments in regard to consolidation that I have heard have a tendency to advocate a system of one-man power with regard to the Post-Office Department. We all know that the post-office has been exceedingly popular, and that, although the Executives under different Administrations have sometimes appointed unfit men, they have invariably suffered politically for it, for it is the only outrage that can be usually met with adequate punishment if any political party attempts to interfere with the post-office. It belongs to the people in their local capacity, so much so that it has been very popular ever since I can remember to advocate the election of postmasters by the people, leaving the Executive the power of removal. Many Congressmen have been in the habit, when they were allowed to nominate, so to speak, or recommend the appointments in their districts, to submit it to a vote of the people. I think that very few members of Congress who have the responsibility of recommending a postmaster will now disregard the views of the citizens in the locality.

With regard to the post-office, the people have more to do with it. We are aware that republican government costs more to conduct than a monarchical government, but here is a branch of the service which has been regulated practically by the people and we see how popular the post-office is. The post-office is the most popular branch of the public service; everybody refers to it as a benefaction, and I believe it is, because it has been brought clearly home to the people.

With reference to supplying the local post-offices in the small localities, at the crossroads, under any civil-service arrangement, it would be impossible to do it as satisfactorily as the service is now performed. I believe nine times out of ten in very small places the man who takes the post-office is the country storekeeper at that point, or he has a drug store where everybody goes, and he is appointed practically by the people by unanimous consent. If he does not act right, complaints promptly made. There are generally two persons, one Democrat and one Republican, where they are divided politically in that way, who live at the crossroads, and one or the other takes it when his party is in power, and both of them

conduct the office satisfactorily. If either should prove unsatisfactory, there would be protest, and it is generally heeded.

I would be opposed to any consolidation that interfered with the favorite system of popular self-government as it has been conducted with regard to the Post-Office Department. Before we make any serious changes it should be discussed on something besides an appropriation bill, and the manner in which it can be carried out should be considered more at length than is possible at the present time. This is all I have to say.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I hope to finish the bill to-night, if practicable. We have now spent about five hours in the debate upon this proposition.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me just a moment to propose an amendment?

Mr. ALLISON. I will yield a moment for that purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. I propose an amendment, to come in at the proper place. I ask that it be read for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated. The Secretary read as follows:

Provided further. That when two towns or cities lie adjoining, but are situate in different States, the post-offices in said towns or cities shall not be consolidated in one office.

Mr. ALLISON. That is only an added reason why I should make the motion which I propose to make. I think the Senate thoroughly understand this question, and I move to lay the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, with all the amendments thereto, upon the table.

Mr. PASCO. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me one moment? In order that there may be a direct vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, and without having it affected by the amendment which I offered, I will ask leave to withdraw my amendment to the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I withdraw my motion for that purpose.

Mr. PASCO. Then the question will be settled entirely upon that amendment.

Mr. VILAS. I hope the Senator from Iowa will not make that motion yet. I wish to engage the attention of the Senate for a few moments in respect to some things that have been said regarding the remarks I made on Thursday. I do not believe the Senator would gain anything in time by pressing a vote on this subject unreasonably. I doubt whether it would be possible for us to dispose of the bill to-night.

Mr. ALLISON. I certainly do not wish to press the bill unreasonably or the disposition of the amendment unreasonably. If the Senator from Wisconsin could indicate to me how much time he desires I would withdraw the motion for that purpose; or if I can have an understanding that the amendment shall be voted upon after the Senator from Wisconsin has concluded his observations I will yield to him.

Mr. VILAS. So far as the time required by me is concerned, it will be just such as I find necessary to make the few remarks I desire to make. I can not engage for a vote for anybody else after I am done.

Mr. ALLISON. After the observations to be made by the Senator from Wisconsin I will test the sense of the Senate by moving to lay the pending amendment on the table.

Mr. VILAS. I trust the Senator from Iowa will withdraw that motion, because it cuts off debate.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that.

Mr. VILAS. And no debate is practically going to be cut off in that way. I certainly trust the Senator will not insist upon making the motion.

Mr. ALLISON. I understood the Senator to make that threat, and I understand perfectly well that the Senator from Wisconsin can make such observations as he chooses upon the bill at such time as he chooses; and that being true, I wish to test the sense of the Senate upon the amendment; that is all.

Mr. VILAS. The Senator from Iowa did not understand me correctly; I am sure he did not. I simply made a request which I think it is very common to have granted in the Senate. I certainly trust the Senator from Iowa is not, in his urgency to pass this appropriation bill, going to adopt a course of practice that is so unusual in this body. I have not engaged the attention of the Senate at length upon the subject. Several things have been said by the Senator from Florida on my right [Mr. PASCO] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] with respect to some observations I submitted to the Senate on Thursday that demand brief reply.

Mr. ALLISON. I wanted to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin and was asking him about how much time he would require, when he said to me that he did not expect to limit himself, but would occupy such time as he chose, and then notified me that the bill could not be finished to-night. If we are going on in this way, without having any arrangement, of course the Senator will make such motions as he sees proper to make. That is all I wish to say to the Senator from Wisconsin.

I desire to get through with the appropriation bill in a reasonable time. I desire also to give every Senator an opportunity to debate the pending question. But we have now spent from half past 12 until 5 o'clock upon this single amendment of the Senator from Colorado. I do not know, but from everything I can see about me the sense of the Senate is against the amendment. I only desire to test the sense of the Senate, not to cut off debate. Now, I will yield to the Senator from Wisconsin to make such observations as he chooses, and I give notice that after he has finished his remarks I shall renew my motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to inquire of the Senator from Iowa whether he withdraws his motion to lay the amendment of the Senator from Colorado on the table?

Mr. ALLISON. I withdraw it for the time being.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion is withdrawn. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for a moment?

Mr. VILAS. With pleasure.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I shall try not to trespass upon the time of the Senate for more than three or four minutes, if I have to do so at all; but in view of the fact that I reported the amendment, it may be possible that I shall ask the Senator from Iowa to yield a moment to me to respond to one or two suggestions which have been made.

Mr. ALLISON. I shall certainly yield for that purpose. What I want is to have the bill disposed of before we adjourn to-day.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have no desire to take up any time.

Several SENATORS. Let us adjourn.

Mr. VILAS. If the Senator from Iowa does not insist upon going on to-night, I am willing that that motion shall be made. I do not feel that I am at liberty to yield for the purpose of making it.

Mr. ALLISON. I will try to be as amiable as possible. If we can fix an hour to-morrow when the pending bill shall be disposed of without further debate, and all amendments made to it or proposed to it hereafter shall be disposed of without debate, and the bill shall pass before final adjournment to-morrow, fixing an hour, I will yield to the wishes of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That there shall be no debate upon any other amendment? Is that the Senator's suggestion?

Mr. ALLISON. It is not. My suggestion is that we shall fix an hour to vote upon the bill and all amendments relating to it, and after that hour we shall proceed to vote without further debate. Then I will yield to the disposition of Senators as respects adjournment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have only to say that except as to the amendment respecting experimental offices, which I desire to call to the attention of the Senator from Iowa, I suppose very briefly, I know of no other amendment, so far as I am concerned, which will take any time in discussion.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent, then, that to-morrow at 3 o'clock we shall proceed to vote, without further debate, upon all amendments to the bill then pending or of which notice has then been given.

Mr. VILAS. I suggest to the Senator from Iowa that he ask that the vote be taken to-morrow, without fixing an hour.

Mr. ALLISON. I will ask unanimous consent that we may vote at 4 o'clock.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. ALLEN. I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa one question. Why not take the bill at the conclusion of the routine morning business and discuss it up to a certain hour, and then proceed with it under the five-minute rule for an hour or so and consider other amendments, and vote on it at 4 o'clock? Agreements upon other measures, such as the one proposed, have shut out the offering of amendments, the Senate having fixed a definite hour upon which to vote and the discussion having occupied the entire time up to that moment.

Mr. ALLISON. Then I will modify my proposition, in view of the suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska. I request that we agree to take the bill up immediately after the routine business in the morning, proceed with it until 3 o'clock, and at 3 o'clock proceed with it, say, from 3 to 4, under the five-minute rule as provided by Rule VIII, and that at 4 o'clock we shall proceed to vote upon the bill and amendments without further debate.

Mr. ALLEN. And during which time amendments may be offered.

Mr. ALLISON. If they can be disposed of in the meantime, of course I shall make no objection.

Mr. VILAS. I suggest again to the Senator from Iowa that he simply ask the Senate to agree that a vote shall be taken to-morrow. We have had only one day's debate, practically, on the bill. There were some things said on it in a hurried way in the latter part of the afternoon for two or three days last week, but there has been very little discussion upon the bill of as much consequence as this is, and unfortunately, as I think, a good deal of it has been

devoted to this very simple amendment to-day, taking a wide range beyond perhaps what the nature of the amendment called for. That is uncontrollable, but that ought not to prevent the discussion of the bill in other particulars in which it may be necessary to present some amendments and observations on the part of different Senators.

Mr. ALLISON. Then I will modify my request still further and ask the Senate to agree that we shall proceed until half past 3 o'clock to-morrow with the general debate; that from that hour we shall debate the bill under the five-minute rule, and at 5 o'clock proceed to take a vote upon amendments and on the bill without further debate.

Mr. CULLOM. Unless it is sooner disposed of.

Mr. ALLISON. Unless it is sooner disposed of.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from Iowa pardon me? I have an amendment that I want to offer to the bill which might be ruled out on a point of order if the chairman of the committee objected to it. I should like permission to have the amendment read, so that I may know whether it would be objected to.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to my friend from North Carolina that I will be reasonable in respect to amendments and as to points of order.

Mr. BUTLER. But, if the Senator from Iowa will pardon me, if the point of order should be made against my amendment, it would have to go before the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, which will not hold a meeting until Wednesday morning.

Therefore, I much prefer the bill should not be acted on before Wednesday, so that the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads could make a report upon it, in which case it would not be subject to the point of order. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me to have the amendment read so as see if there is any objection to it?

Mr. ALLISON. I would prefer to have that subject considered when we reach it. Of course I know that it is within the power of a Senator to object if he chooses. I assure him that I will be reasonable with him as respects the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not think there will be any objection to it, but I want to protect it against objection, which may be done by having the amendment read. It will take but a moment's reading.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator will see that in making an adjustment now for a vote to-morrow I can not accept such a condition. Therefore I must decline his suggestion. Of course he has it in his power to object and thus to prevent me from obtaining the agreement which I very much desire.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. ALLEN. I want just one definite understanding and then there is no objection on my part. That is, that at any time during the discussion under the five-minute rule amendments may be offered up to the hour of 5 o'clock.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly, up to 5 o'clock.

Mr. VILAS. I wish to call the attention of the Senator, under that suggestion, to the fact that I shall desire to strike out from the bill the provision for necessary and special facilities on railroads, and if that amendment be not adopted I shall ask the Senate to reduce the amount to \$175,000.

Mr. ALLISON. I will take no advantage of Senators as respects amendments. All I desire is to complete the consideration of the bill to-morrow and have unanimous consent that it may be done. I do not wish to detain the Senate here beyond a reasonable hour on that day. Therefore I have made every proposition that will facilitate what I wish to have done to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair submits again, Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

Mr. HAWLEY. I desire to send to the desk an amendment to come in on page 7, line 25.

GEN. JOHN M. THAYER.

Mr. THURSTON. I ask unanimous consent to make a momentary statement concerning a bill that came over from the House to-day, and then I shall ask unanimous consent to have it passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill (H. R. 6644) granting a pension to Gen. John M. Thayer, United States Volunteers, as follows:

As 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 M. Thayer, late brigadier-general and brevet major-general of volunteers, at a pension of \$100 a month.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

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

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I rose to call up a pension bill, but I yield to the Senator from Iowa to make a statement.

Mr. ALLISON. I asked the Senator from Illinois to yield to me that I might state the unanimous understanding as respects the disposition of the Post-Office appropriation bill to-morrow. The request I made was, that immediately after the completion of the routine business in the morning the bill should be taken up and continued under the general rule of debate until half past 3; that from that time until 5 o'clock it should be considered under the five-minute rule, and at that hour we should proceed to vote upon all amendments and upon the bill without further debate.

Mr. ALLEN. With the right to move to amend up to what hour?

Mr. ALLISON. Up to 5 o'clock.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wish to ask a question for information. For instance, an amendment is to be offered suggesting that the experimental free-delivery offices be discontinued. The discussion upon that when it comes will be limited to the five-minute rule under this agreement?

Mr. ALLISON. If it does not come until half past 3 it will.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is very certain, of course, not to come until half past 3.

Mr. PASCO. Before we pass away from the appropriation bill, I ask leave to offer an amendment. I ask that it may be printed in the ordinary form and also in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. Pasco's amendment is as follows:

On page 2, after "sent," in line 6, insert the following additional proviso: "And provided further, That nothing herein contained shall authorize the establishment or maintenance of any station, substation, or branch post-office beyond the limits of any city or town in which the principal office to which such station, substation, or branch office is attached is located."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 2912) granting to the Atchison and Nebraska Railroad Company and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, its lessee in perpetuity, the right of way over a part of the Sac and Fox and Iowa Indian Reservation in the States of Kansas and Nebraska;

A bill (H. R. 4632) for the relief of Frederick B. Betts, surviving partner of the firm of Betts, Nichols & Co.;

A bill (H. R. 5736) to authorize the Light-House Board to proceed with the construction of the light-house and fog signal on North Manitou Island, Lake Michigan; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 159) to authorize the Secretary of War to prepare and submit estimates for the improvement of the harbor at Portland, Me.

MISS MARY E. HULL.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask the Senate to put on its passage the bill (H. R. 1141) granting a pension to Miss Mary E. Hull, dependent sister of John A. Hull, deceased, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry, in the late war of the rebellion.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place upon the pension rolls the name of Miss Mary E. Hull, dependent sister of John A. Hull, deceased, late of Company F, in the Eighty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry, in the late war of the rebellion, and to pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in that case.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. GALLINGER February 27, 1896, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1141) granting a pension to Miss Mary E. Hull, have examined the same, and report:

The report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives hereto appended is adopted, and the passage of the bill is recommended.

HOUSE REPORT.

The evidence fully establishes the fact that the beneficiary in said bill was the sister of James and John A. Hull; that said James died in the service of his country in the war of the rebellion; that said John A. was a member of Company F, Eighty-first Illinois Volunteers, in the war of the rebellion, and also was in the Mexican war; that said Mary E. is now and always has been a single woman.

That her brother John A. was a widower when he entered the service of the United States in the war of the rebellion; that she lived with and was keeping house for him at said time; that he then had three young, helpless children, and the said Mary E. took charge of them during his absence, cared for and educated them; that she had no money or property of her own, but devoted her energies and life to her said brother John A. and his children both during and after the war; that her brother John A. remained a widower till his death.

That he died about eight years ago, leaving no property or money, and that

said Mary E. has no property or money, is near 63 years of age, from disability is unable to support herself, and is dependent upon her friends for support; that said John A. Hull contracted disabilities while in the line of duty in the service of his country in the late rebellion from which he never recovered and of which he died; that he was at the date of his death drawing a pension for such disabilities; that said Mary E. was dependent upon her said brother John A. for support during his life, and since his death on the charity of friends; that from medical evidence furnished your committee she is now, from age and disability, unable to work or labor to support herself.

That she is and always has been a lady of good and irreproachable character and reputation, respected by those who know her; that said Mary E., by her devotion to the family of her said brother John A., caring for and rearing them from childhood to maturity, lost and abandoned the opportunities of young womanhood, and your committee, fully believing that after these years of devotion to this soldier of the Union and his children she should in her old days be cared for by a generous Government, recommend that said bill do pass at the rate of \$12 per month.

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

PERRY COUNTY, TENN.

Mr. BATE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 4053. It is purely a local bill which has passed the other House. It will take but a few moments.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4053) repealing chapter 148 of the Supplement of the Revised Statutes of the United States. It proposes to repeal the act of March 3, 1875, chapter 148 of the Supplement of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and that the county of Perry, in the middle judicial district of the United States in the State of Tennessee, shall hereafter compose a part of the western judicial district of the United States in that State; and all cases now commenced or depending in the district affected by this act shall be heard, tried, and determined in the same manner as if this act had not been passed; and the prosecution of all crimes heretofore committed in the district shall be prosecuted and punished in the same manner as if this act had not been passed.

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

CAPITAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WALTHALL. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 888.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 888) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Capital Railway Company," approved March 2, 1892.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, to strike out all after the words "striking out," in line 6, and insert:

In the first section all after the words "a common seal," to the end of the section, and inserting the following: "Said corporation is hereby authorized to construct and lay down and complete a single or double track street railway in the District of Columbia, and run cars thereon for carrying passengers by and along the following route: Beginning at a point on the District line near the Potomac River southeast of Shepherd's Ferry, thence by such route as shall be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the south side of the Eastern Branch or Anacostia River at the Navy-Yard Bridge; thence across said bridge to Eleventh street east; thence north on Eleventh street east to M street south; thence west on M street to a point to be located by the District Commissioners near Eighth street east, connecting with the lines of the Capital Traction Company, and returning over the same route to the point of beginning. Also, beginning at the eastern end of the Navy-Yard Bridge, easterly along Monroe and Harrison streets and Good Hope road, and from Good Hope road to the District line, over such route as the District Commissioners shall approve, and returning over the same route to the point of beginning: *Provided*, That within the city of Washington a double-track railway shall be constructed."

SEC. 2. That the motive power to be used on the lines in this act specified shall be the underground electric system within the city of Washington and the overhead trolley system outside the city of Washington. For crossing the Navy-Yard Bridge the said company may, in the discretion of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, use either horse power or the underground electric system to propel its cars; and the said company shall have the privilege of carrying an electric current across the said Navy-Yard Bridge in such manner as the said Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall prescribe.

SEC. 3. That the Capital Railway Company and the Capital Traction Company are hereby required to issue free transfers at the point of intersection of their respective lines, so that for the payment of one fare a passenger on either road shall have the privilege of riding over the lines of both.

SEC. 4. That the portion of the company's route from Congress or Pencote Heights to Shepherd's Landing shall be completed within four years from the date of the passage of this act.

SEC. 5. That Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal 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.

ELIZA CRAIG HECKMAN.

Mr. SEWELL. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1816) granting a pension to Eliza Craig Heckman, widow of Brig. Gen. Charles A. Heckman.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place the

name of Eliza Craig Heckman, widow of Brig. Gen. Charles A. Heckman, on the pension roll at \$50 per month.

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

CUSTOMS OFFICERS AND ASSISTANT TREASURERS.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 972) to provide for the continuance in office of customs officers and assistant treasurers until successors shall have been appointed and qualified.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It provides that hereafter all customs officers and assistant treasurers appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, for a term of four years, shall hold their offices until their successors shall have been duly appointed and qualified according to law.

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

RAILROAD DEPOT GROUNDS IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. CHILTON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 5672.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5672) to grant to railroad companies in the Indian Territory additional powers to secure depot grounds.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, to insert at the end of the bill, as a new section, the following:

SEC. 4. That all lands acquired under the provisions of this act shall be used for railroad purposes strictly, and not more than 20 acres of land at any one station shall be acquired hereunder by any one railroad company; nor shall any additional land be so acquired which is not contiguous to land already occupied for railroad purposes.

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.

A. H. M'LAWS.

Mr. GORDON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5083) granting an increase of pension to A. H. McLaws.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to increase the pension of A. H. McLaws, of Dublin, Ga., late second lieutenant in Captain Dill's Company (B), First Georgia Regiment, Mexican war, to \$20 per month.

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

RIBBONS OF HONOR.

Mr. SHOUP. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 85) relative to the medal of honor authorized by the acts of July 12, 1862, and March 3, 1863.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been 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 to issue to any person to whom a medal of honor has been awarded, or may hereafter be awarded, under the provisions of the joint resolution approved July 12, 1862, and the act approved March 3, 1863, a rosette or knot to be worn in lieu of the medal, and a ribbon to be worn with the medal; said rosette or knot and ribbon to be each of a pattern to be prescribed and established by the President of the United States, and any appropriation that may hereafter be available for the contingent expenses of the War Department is hereby made available for the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That whenever a ribbon issued under the provisions of this act shall have been lost, destroyed, or rendered unfit for use, without fault or neglect on the part of the person to whom it was issued, the Secretary of War shall cause a new ribbon to be issued to such person without charge therefor.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to strike out the proviso from that amendment. I do think it is too small a business for this Government to engage in to be furnishing ribbons to men who have had medals. It is small enough, I think, to furnish them in the first place; but when a man loses or defaces his ribbon, then to have the Secretary of War solemnly issue a little piece of ribbon to him, and send it to him by mail or express, seems to me to be absurd. I move to strike out that part of the amendment.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to inquire of the Senator if he knows of what the cross of the Legion of Honor is composed, which all French soldiers prize more than they do their lives?

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not. Is there any little ribbon attached to it?

Mr. HOAR. Oh, yes.

Mr. SHOUP. Yes; there is a ribbon attached to it, and if it wears out, it is replaced.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why could not the man replace it himself?
Mr. SHOUP. The demand for these ribbons will be so small that dealers will not be justified in carrying them in stock, and the cost is but trifling.

Mr. COCKRELL. The cost is such a minimum and such a little thing that I do not think the Government should be called upon to furnish the ribbons; and I must insist on my amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri, to strike out the proviso which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the proviso at the end of the amendment, which reads:

Provided, That whenever a ribbon issued under the provisions of this act shall have been lost, destroyed, or rendered unfit for use, without fault or neglect on the part of the person to whom it was issued, the Secretary of War shall cause a new ribbon to be issued to such person without charge therefor.

Mr. SHOUP. I hope the Senator will not insist on that.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COCKRELL. I object to the further consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being interposed, the bill will go over.

CONDEMNED CANNON TO GUILFORD BATTLE GROUND COMPANY.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of the joint resolution (S. R. 112) donating a condemned cannon and some shells to the Guilford Battle Ground Company, near Greensboro, N. C.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

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

FOG SIGNAL AT MENOMINEE HARBOR, MICHIGAN.

Mr. McMILLAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5363) authorizing the construction of a fog signal on the north pier of the entrance to Menominee Harbor, Wisconsin.

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 Commerce with an amendment, in line 4, after the word "Harbor," to strike out "Wisconsin" and insert "Michigan"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., There is hereby authorized to be constructed, at the north pier of the entrance to Menominee Harbor, Michigan, a fog signal, to cost not exceeding \$5,000.

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the construction of a fog signal on the north pier of the entrance to Menominee Harbor, Michigan."

W. H. L. PEPPERELL.

Mr. BAKER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 250) for the relief of W. H. L. Pepperell.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Postmaster-General to cause the accounts of W. H. L. Pepperell, late postmaster at Concordia, State of Kansas, to be credited with \$1,545, and cause the credit to be certified to the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department, being on account of the loss of \$1,345 in postage stamps and \$200 in postal funds stolen from the post-office on August 27, 1887, it appearing that the loss was without fault or negligence on the part of the late postmaster, and appropriates \$1,545 to pay the claim.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GORMAN. 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 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 7, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 6, 1896.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

William A. Little, of Georgia, to be Assistant Attorney-General.

PROMOTION IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Asst. Engineer Willits Pedrick, of New Jersey, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

INDIAN AGENT.

John C. Keenan, of Stringtown, Ind., to be agent for the Indians of the Neah Bay Agency in Washington.

POSTMASTERS.

Ansel E. Chamberlin, to be postmaster at Dalton, in the county of Berkshire and State of Massachusetts.

Martin McCabe, to be postmaster at Winchenden, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 6, 1896.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

SEED DISTRIBUTION.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask the regular order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief announcement, with the consent of the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a moment?

Mr. HITT. Certainly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following letter be read for the information of the House. It is from the Secretary of Agriculture and relates to the subject of seed distribution.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1896.

SIR: Complying with your request, and what seems to be the almost unanimous desire of the House of Representatives, I have telegraphed Landreth & Sons that their proposition to put the seeds into packages of 5 instead of 15 packets (making 2,025,000 packages instead of 675,000) for \$5,000 extra compensation has been accepted, and the seeds will be so done up.

Respectfully, yours,

J. STERLING MORTON, *Secretary.*

Hon. J. W. WADSWORTH.

Chairman Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives.

Mr. HULICK. That is right.

[The reading of the letter was received with applause.]

CUBAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House, the vote will now be taken on the report of the conference committee on the resolutions relating to Cuba.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. HITT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the yeas and nays.

Mr. HITT. I withdraw the demand.

Mr. TUCKER. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 247, nays 27, not voting 80; as follows:

YEAS—247.

Abbott,	Cannon,	Dockery,	Hemenway,
Adams,	Catchings,	Dolliver,	Henderson,
Aitken,	Chickering,	Doollittle,	Henry, Ind.
Aldrich, Ala.	Clardy,	Dovener,	Hepburn,
Allen, Utah	Clark, Iowa	Eddy,	Hermann,
Arnold, Pa.	Clark, Mo.	Ellis,	Hilborn,
Avery,	Cobb, Mo.	Evans,	Hill, Conn.
Babcock,	Cockrell,	Fairchild,	Hitt,
Bailey,	Codding,	Fenton,	Hooker,
Baker, Kans.	Colson,	Fischer,	Hopkins,
Baker, N. H.	Connolly,	Pletcher,	Howe,
Barham,	Cook, Wis.	Foss,	Howell,
Barney,	Cooke, Ill.	Gamble,	Hubbard,
Bartholdt,	Cooper, Fla.	Gardner,	Huff,
Beach,	Cooper, Tex.	Gibson,	Hulick,
Belknap,	Cooper, Wis.	Graff,	Hull,
Bell, Colo.	Corliss,	Griffin,	Hunter,
Bell, Tex.	Cousins,	Griswold,	Hurley,
Bennett,	Crowley,	Grosvenor,	Hyde,
Bishop,	Crump,	Grow,	Jenkins,
Blue,	Cummings,	Hadley,	Johnson, Cal.
Broderick,	Curtis, Iowa	Hager,	Johnson, Ind.
Bromwell,	Curtis, Kans.	Hainer, Nebr.	Johnson, N. Dak.
Brosius,	Curtis, N. Y.	Halterman,	Kem,
Brown,	Danford,	Hauly,	Kerr,
Brumm,	Dayton,	Hardy,	Kiefer,
Buck,	De Armond,	Harris,	Kirkpatrick,
Burrell,	Denny,	Hart,	Knox,
Burton, Mo.	De Witt,	Hartman,	Kulp,
Barton, Ohio	Dingley,	Hatch,	Lacey,
Calderhead,	Dinsmore,	Heatwole,	Latimer,

Lawson, Layton, Leighty, Leisenring Leonard, Lester, Lewis, Linney, Linton, Little, Livingston, Long, Loudenslager, Low, Maddox, Mahany, Mahon, Marsh, McCall, Tenn. McClellan, McClure, McCormick, McCreary, Ky. McCulloch, McDearmon, McLachlan, McLaurin, McMillin, McRae, Meiklejohn, Mercer,	Meredith, Meyer, Miles, Miller, W. Va. Milliken, Milnes, Minor, Wis. Mondell, Money, Mozley, Murphy, Newlands, Noonan, Northway, Odell, Ogden, Otey, Otjen, Overstreet, Owens, Patterson, Payne, Pearson, Pendleton, Perkins, Phillips, Pickler, Powers, Prince, Pugh, Quigg,	Ray, Reeves, Reyburn, Richardson, Robinson, Pa. Royle, Russell, Conn. Sauerherring, Sayers, Scranton, Shafroth, Sherman, Shuford, Smith, Ill. Smith, Mich. Southard, Spalding, Sparkman, Spencer, Sperry, Stahle, Stephenson, Stewart, N. J. Stewart, Wis. Stokes, Stone, C. W. Stone, W. A. Strait, Strong, Strowd, N. C.	Sulloway, Sulzer, Swanson, Taft, Talbert, Tate, Tawney, Taylor, Terry, Thomas, Towne, Tracey, Treloar, Underwood, Updegraff, Van Horn, Van Voorhis, Walsh, Wanger, Warner, Washington, Watson, Ohio Wellington, Wilber, Willis, Wilson, Idaho Wood, Woodard, Woodman, Yoakum.
---	---	---	--

NAYS—27.

Arnold, R. I. Atwood, Berry, Black, Ga. Black, N. Y. Boutelle, Culberson,	Daniels, Draper, Ellett, Va. Elliott, S. C. Gillett, N. Y. Gillett, Mass. Grout,	Lefever, Lockhart, McCall, Mass. Moody, Poole, Simpkins, Tucker,	Turner, Ga. Tyler, Wadsworth, Walker, Mass. Walker, Va. Wright.
---	--	--	--

NOT VOTING—80.

Acheson, Aldrich, Ill. Allen, Miss. Anderson, Andrews, Apsley, Baker, Md. Bankhead, Barrett, Bartlett, Ga. Bartlett, N. Y. Bingham, Bowers, Brewster, Bull, Clarke, Ala. Cobb, Ala. Coffin, Cowan, Cox,	Crisp, Crowther, Dalzell, Downing, Erdman, Faris, Fitzgerald, Foote, Fowler, Hall, Mo. Harmer, Harrison, Heiner, Pa. Hendrick, Henry, Conn. Hicks, Howard, Huling, Hutcheson, Jones,	Joy, Kendall, Kyle, Lorimer, Loud, Maguire, McCleary, Minn. McEwan, McKenney, Miller, Kans. Miner, N. Y. Morse, Moses, Neill, Parker, Pitney, Price, Raney, Robertson, La. Rusk,	Russell, Ga. Settle, Shannon, Shaw, Skinner, Snover, Sorg, Southwick, Stallings, Strode, Nebr. Tracewell, Turner, Va. Watson, Ind. Wheeler, White, Williams, Wilson, N. Y. Wilson, Ohio Wilson, S. C. Woomer.
--	---	---	--

So the conference report was adopted. The following pairs were announced: Until further notice:
 Mr. DALZELL with Mr. CRISP.
 Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. HUTCHESON.
 Mr. WOOMER with Mr. SORG.
 Mr. HICKS with Mr. MOSES.
 Mr. HARMER with Mr. DOWNING.
 Mr. BARTLETT of New York with Mr. CLARKE of Alabama.
 Mr. BREWSTER with Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi.
 Mr. HULING with Mr. STALLINGS.
 Mr. WATSON of Indiana with Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 Mr. RANEY with Mr. COWEN.
 Mr. WHITE with Mr. HARRISON.
 Mr. SETTLE with Mr. RUSK.
 Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. LAYTON.
 Mr. MILLER of West Virginia with Mr. WOODARD.
 Mr. HULICK with Mr. COX.
 Mr. HEMENWAY with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.
 Mr. LOUD with Mr. KYLE.
 Mr. ANDREWS with Mr. MINER of New York.
 Mr. TRACEWELL with Mr. HENDRICK.
 Mr. LORIMER with Mr. MAGUIRE.
 On this vote:
 Mr. DRAPER with Mr. GAMBLE.
 Mr. JONES with Mr. TURNER of Virginia.
 Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia with Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia.
 Mr. STRODE of Nebraska with Mr. ERDMAN.
 Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. LORIMER, is necessarily absent to-day. If present, he would vote "yea" on this question.
 Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a general pair with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CROWTHER], but it was expressly understood that I might vote on this proposition; and he asked me to state that if present, he also would vote "yea."
 My colleague, Mr. SORG, was called suddenly away, and requested me to announce that if present, he would vote "yea."
 Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I find that I am paired with my colleague, Mr. TURNER, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I find that I am paired with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN]. I voted "yea," but withdraw my vote.

Mr. DRAPER. I understand that I am reported as being paired. I paired when going away, a week ago, with the understanding that the pair would expire on Saturday last. The pair related to political questions, and has expired; besides, this is not a party question; and I therefore voted and desire my vote to be recorded in the negative.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I inadvertently voted on this resolution, forgetting the fact that I was paired with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUTCHESON]. I voted "yea," and withdraw my vote. He would vote "nay," if present. I wished to explain this fact.

Mr. TRACEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I see that I am paired, by a friend, with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HENDRICK]. If not paired, I should have voted "yea."

Mr. MERCER. My colleague [Mr. ANDREWS] is paired. If present, he would vote in the affirmative on this question.

Mr. McDEARMON. I was erroneously reported as paired. I voted, and wish the announcement of the pair to be withdrawn.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to have my vote recorded. The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall and listening to his name?

Mr. WHEELER. I was detained at the door talking to a man, and when my name was called, in the confusion, I did not catch it in time to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman listening for his name?

Mr. WHEELER. I was, as well as a man can who is talking. I should like to have my vote recorded in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not entertain a request under the rule, as the gentleman is aware.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I was in the corridor when my name was called. If present, I should have voted "nay."

Mr. DAYTON. My colleague, Mr. HULING, was called home unexpectedly. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MILES. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to ask that the gentleman from Alabama be permitted to record his vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not entertain the request under the rules.

Mr. NEILL. I desire to have my vote recorded, Mr. Speaker. The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present?

Mr. NEILL. I was in the House during the second call. The SPEAKER. Under the rule that is not sufficient.

Mr. NEILL. I can not say whether I was actually present when my name was called or not. I came in during the call. I should have voted "yea," if present.

Mr. BABCOCK. I ask a recapitulation of the vote. Mr. WHEELER. Would it be in order to state that I should have voted "yea"?

Mr. DALZELL. I find that I am paired with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP]. I voted "yea," but not knowing how he would vote, I will withdraw mine.

Mr. HULICK. I find, since recording my vote, that I am paired generally with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX]. I learn that he would have voted "yea," if present, and with the understanding that he would have so voted, I desire to let my vote stand.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have my name recorded. I was in the Hall when the first roll was called.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman listening to his name?

Mr. FOOTE. I was just across in the cloakroom—

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not allowed to entertain a request, under the rule, unless the gentleman was present and failed to hear his name.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. ACHESON, is unavoidably detained from the House. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. RICHARDSON. My colleague, Mr. COX, is absent by permission of the House. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. JOY. I supposed, Mr. Speaker, that I was paired, and did not vote when my name was called. I find by the list of pairs, however, that the information given me was erroneous, and I ask to have my name recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to entertain the request under the circumstances.

Mr. JOY. I desire to say that I should have voted "yea," had I not been under the impression that I was paired.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. The announcement was received with prolonged applause.

On motion of Mr. HITT, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HOOKER] moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7977) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, is it not proposed to read this bill at all? I understand that it carries ten millions of appropriations and authorizes about \$50,000,000 of contracts.

Mr. HOOKER. This is generally the way this bill is passed. It passed this way in the last Congress.

Mr. DOCKERY. A bill carrying \$62,000,000 of obligations ought to be read.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask that the bill be read.

The SPEAKER. The bill will have to be read, if gentlemen desire it, of course.

Mr. HOPKINS. Every member is familiar with this bill. It seems to me it is useless to take up the time—

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HOOKER] has the floor.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, after a second shall have been considered as ordered, or has been ordered by the House, I propose to ask unanimous consent that debate upon the pending bill may be extended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I simply want about five minutes to speak upon this bill. Can I have that?

Mr. HOOKER. You shall have the time. There will be no objection to that.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to considering a second as ordered, but I shall object to dispensing with the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. There being no objection, a second is ordered. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLSON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. COLSON. I rise to ask if any changes have been made in the bill since it was printed?

Mr. HOOKER. Yes; there have been some changes. I will state to the gentleman that there have been some immaterial changes ordered by the committee this morning, which changes I will explain when the bill is being considered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate be extended until 3 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HOOKER] asks unanimous consent that the time for debate be extended until 3 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. UPDEGRAFF. Is it to be general debate?

Mr. HOOKER. General debate, under suspension of the rules.

Mr. CATCHINGS. What was the request? I was unable to hear it.

The SPEAKER. That the time for debate be extended until 3 o'clock.

Mr. OWENS. I object.

Mr. HOOKER. Unless some agreement can be had, then only the debate can be had which is provided by the rule. I hope no objection will be made.

Mr. GIBSON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOOKER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums of money be, and are hereby, appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available, and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, for the construction, completion, repair, and preservation of the public works hereinafter named:

Improving harbor at Camden, Me.: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.
Improving harbor at Rockland, Me.: Continuing improvement, including project recommended by Chief of Engineers under date of December 14, 1895, \$25,500, of which \$1,500 may be expended for the removal of an old hulk sunk in the harbor: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary for the completion of said projects for the improvement of said harbor, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$760,500, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

Improving Mooseabec Bar, Maine: Continuing improvement, \$12,000.
Improving Portland Harbor, Maine, according to the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April, 1896, and continuing improvement of Back Cove, according to existing project, \$20,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary for the completion of such projects, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$810,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated.

Improving harbor at Belfast, Me.: Continuing improvement, \$8,000.
For construction of breakwater from Mount Desert to Porcupine Island, Maine: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

Improving harbor at Sullivan Falls, Me., in accordance with approved project, \$5,000.

Improving Carvers Harbor, at Vinal Haven, Me., \$10,000, in accordance with plans submitted by the Chief of Engineers.

Improving harbor of refuge at Little Harbor, N. H.: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

Improving harbor at Burlington, Vt.: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

Improving harbor at Boston, Mass.: Continuing improvement, \$70,000: *Provided*, That this sum shall be used in the preservation and improvement of said harbor other than the project for improving the main ship channel, and that \$7,000 of this sum shall be used in improving Chelsea Creek: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to carry out such improvement, submitted August 11, 1892, such contracts to provide that said ship channel shall be widened to a minimum width of 1,000 feet and a minimum depth of 27 feet, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, in the aggregate not to exceed \$1,145,000, exclusive of amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

Improving harbor at Lynn, Mass.: Continuing improvement, \$30,000.
Improving harbor of refuge at Nantucket, Mass.: Continuing improvement, \$20,000.

Improving harbor at Plymouth, Mass.: Completing improvement, \$1,500.

Improving harbor at Provincetown, Mass.: Completing improvement, \$1,500.

Improving harbor at Newburyport, Mass.: Continuing improvement, \$16,000.

Improving harbor at Scituate, Mass.: Continuing improvement, \$6,000.

Improving harbor at Hyannis, Mass.: Continuing improvement, \$6,000, of which sum \$2,500 shall be expended for dredging.

Improving harbor at Vineyard Haven, Mass.: Continuing improvement, \$7,000.

Improving harbor of refuge at Sandy Bay, Cape Ann, Mass.: Continuing improvement, \$150,000.

Improving harbor at Gloucester, Mass.: Continuing improvement, \$34,000: *Provided*, That of this appropriation a sum not exceeding \$2,000 may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be expended in removing from Gloucester Harbor a pinnacle rock in the outer harbor, a rock called "Elisha's Rock," in the inner harbor, and a rock near the ferry landing at Rocks Neck, in the inner harbor.

Improving Woods Hole Channel, Massachusetts, \$20,000, in accordance with project approved by Chief of Engineers.

Manchester Harbor, Massachusetts: The Secretary of War is directed, out of the appropriation on hand, to make a resurvey of Manchester Harbor with a view of straightening the channel between its mouth and Proctors Point, removing obstructions at the mouth of the channel and at the point of rocks, dredging the channel for its entire length between its mouth and the town wharf to a width of from 200 feet narrowing to 150 feet and a depth of 8 feet, and providing turning basins and anchorage for boats by the dredging of the flats for that purpose.

Improving New Bedford Harbor, Massachusetts: Continuing improvement, with a view of securing an increased area for anchorage in the upper harbor, in accordance with report submitted by Maj. D. W. Lockwood, in House document No. 59, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, \$10,000.

Improving harbor Great Salt Pond, Block Island, R. I., \$10,000, in accordance with the report of Chief of Engineers, November 29, 1895.

Improving harbor at Newport, R. I.: Continuing improvement, \$15,000.

Improving harbor at Wickford, R. I., \$6,300, in accordance with project of September 4, 1895, which said sum the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to expend from the balance on hand heretofore appropriated for entrance to Point Judith Pond.

Improving harbor at Bridgeport, Conn.: Continuing improvement, \$18,000, in accordance with the modified project for the improvement thereof.

Constructing breakwaters at New Haven, Conn.: Continuing construction, \$100,000.

Improving harbor at New Haven, Conn.: Continuing improvement, \$10,000, and the Secretary of War is directed to make a resurvey and submit plans and estimates for the improvement thereof.

For continuing improvements at Stonington Harbor, Connecticut, \$5,000, this sum to be applied for the completion of a dike or water break around Stonington Point.

Improving harbor at Five Mile River, Connecticut: Continuing improvement, \$2,500.

Improving harbor at Duck Island, on Long Island Sound, Connecticut: Continuing improvement, \$24,000.

Improving harbor at Stamford, Conn.: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

Improving harbor at Coscob and Miamus River, Connecticut: Continuing improvement, \$8,000, in accordance with the modified and approved project.

Improving harbor at Norwalk, Conn., \$10,000, in accordance with the approved modified project for the improvement thereof.

Improving harbor at Westport, Conn., in accordance with approved project for the improvement thereof. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to expend the sum of \$3,000 out of the balance unexpended for entrance to Point Judith Pond, Rhode Island, for the improvement of said harbor at Westport, Conn.

Improving harbor at Buffalo, N. Y.: Improvement by extending the breakwater southerly to Stony Point: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to carry out such extension and the plan of such improvement as modified in the report of the Chief of Engineers for the improvement of that harbor for 1895, such contracts to provide that the sand-catch pier be extended to the bulkhead line, at a cost not exceeding \$35,000, and that the northerly section of said extension to Stony Point and the sand-catch pier extension shall first be constructed, to be paid for as appropriations may, from time to time, be made by law, in the aggregate not to exceed \$2,200,000.

Improving harbor at Canarsie Bay, New York: Continuing improvement, \$16,000.

Improving harbor at Charlotte, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$12,000.

Improving harbor at Wilson, N. Y.: For dredging and maintenance, \$5,000.

Improving harbor at Dunkirk, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$10,000, in accordance with the modified project for its improvement: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the modified project for its improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$308,258, exclusive of amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

Improving harbor at Flushing Bay, New York: Continuing improvement, \$4,000.

Improving harbor at Glencove, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$8,000.

Improving Bay Ridge, Gowanus Creek, Red Hook, and Buttermilk channels, and removing triangular area between Red Hook and Bay Ridge channels, in the harbor of New York, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$60,000: *Provided*, That the work shall be begun at the southerly end of Bay Ridge Channel and continue through it and the others northerly until completed, so that each shall have a uniform mean low-water depth of 26 feet and width as recommended for each: *And provided further*, That out of said sum \$5,000 shall be expended in dredging Gowanus Canal from Percival street to Hamilton Avenue Bridge: *And provided further*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for the completion of the whole or any part of said work, to be paid for as appropriations may be made from time to time by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$777,300, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

And in order to meet the demands of the greatly enlarged size of vessels,

and of increasing commerce, it is hereby further provided that such piers as may be built between Seventeenth street, on the south shore of Gowanus Creek, and Fort Hamilton may be constructed so that so much thereof as shall be between the pier and bulkhead lines may be of a linear width not to exceed 300 feet, and, whether of that width or of less width, may be filled with solid materials when an equal tidal prism or space to receive the inflow of the tides is provided in compensation therefor, behind the authorized bulkhead line and adjacent to said piers.

For the purpose of straightening the channel of Gowanus Bay, the harbor line of the northerly shore of Gowanus Bay, instead of extending from a point on the easterly side of Court street (as said Court street existed and was laid out May 20, 1875), distant 500 feet southerly from the intersection of the said easterly side of Court street with the southerly side of Bryant street (as said Bryant street existed and was laid out May 20, 1875), running thence westerly parallel with said Bryant street and 500 feet therefrom, 380 feet, and thence southerly and at right angles to the last-mentioned line and parallel with Clinton street 383 feet, to the exterior sea wall, as at present established, shall extend from the point first above described in a straight line in a south-westerly direction to said point where the above-described line parallel with Clinton street and 383 feet in length intersects the above-mentioned exterior sea-wall line.

Improving Newtown Creek, part of the harbor at New York: Continuing improvement in accordance with modified project submitted in report of Maj. H. M. Adams, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 24, 1896, \$30,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the modified project of improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$420,000, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

Improving harbor at Great Sodus Bay, New York: Continuing improvement, \$8,000.

Improving harbor at Little Sodus Bay, New York: Continuing improvement, \$8,000.

Improving harbor at Ogdensburg, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$20,000.
Improving harbor at Oswego, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$60,000, in accordance with the modified project for its improvement.

Improving harbor at Rondout, N. Y.: For maintenance, \$2,500.

Improving New York Harbor, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$60,000.

Improving harbor at Saugerties, N. Y.: For completion, \$2,500.

Improving harbor at Port Chester, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Tonawanda Harbor and Niagara River to the north line of the village of North Tonawanda, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$50,000.

Improving channel between Staten Island and the New Jersey shore, New York and New Jersey: Continuing improvement, \$13,000, out of which sum \$5,000 shall be used in dredging Lemon Creek, on Staten Island.

Improving harbor at Huntington, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving harbor at Larchmont, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving harbor at Port Jefferson Inlet, New York, \$7,500.

Improving harbor at Putneyville, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$1,500.

Improving harbor at Peekskill, N. Y., in accordance with report submitted by Col. G. L. Gillespie, Corps of Engineers, November 26, 1894, \$10,000.

Improving harbor at Mattituck, N. Y., according to the approved project for the improvement thereof, \$10,000.

Improving harbor at Cape Vincent, N. Y., according to the approved project for the improvement thereof, \$25,000.

Improving harbor at Raritan Bay, New Jersey: Continuing improvement in accordance with modified project, \$50,000.

Improving Keypoint Harbor, New Jersey: For maintenance, \$2,500.

Improving harbor at Erie, Pa.: The Secretary of War is hereby directed to cause a resurvey to be made of the harbor at Erie, Pa., out of the unexpended money heretofore appropriated for the improvement of said harbor.

Improving Delaware Breakwater, Delaware: Continuing improvement, \$80,000.

Constructing harbor of refuge, Delaware Bay, Delaware, in accordance with plans submitted by the Chief of Engineers January 29, 1892, \$5,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such material and work as may be necessary to complete said harbor of refuge, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$1,600,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated.

Improving harbor at Wilmington, and Christiana River, Delaware: Continuing improvement, \$20,000, in accordance with the modified project for the improvement of the same: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the project of improvement, not including estimate for flushing basin and extension of jetty, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$225,846.

For maintenance and repairs of iron pier, Delaware Bay, near Lewes, Del.: Continuing improvement, \$7,660.

Improving Rock Hall Harbor, Maryland: Completing improvement, in accordance with report submitted by Gen. William P. Craighill in House Executive Document No. 200, Fifty-third Congress, third session, \$9,000.

Improving Queenstown Harbor, Maryland: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving harbor of Southwest Baltimore (Spring Garden), Md., in accordance with report of Col. Peter C. Hains, dated March 7, 1896, for constructing channel 100 feet wide on the bottom, \$5,000.

The proviso relating to the appropriation of \$10,000 for continuing the improvement of harbor at Cape Charles City, Va., and its approaches, as contained in the act of July 13, 1892, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Improving harbor at Norfolk and its approaches, Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$100,000.

Improving harbor at Beaufort, N. C.: Continuing improvement, \$4,000.

Improving harbor at Winyaw Bay, South Carolina: Continuing improvement, \$110,000.

Harbor of Savannah, Ga.: Continuing improvement, \$5,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the project of further improvement recommended by Capt. O. M. Carter in his reports of December 7, 1894, and July 1, 1895, and to complete the project for the steamboat channel between Beaufort, S. C., and Savannah, Ga., recommended by Capt. O. M. Carter in his report of December 4, 1895, and mentioned in that report as route 2; to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed the amounts recommended in said reports, the aggregate of which for both projects is \$1,093,950, exclusive of amount herein or heretofore appropriated.

Improving harbor at Brunswick, Ga.: For maintenance, \$15,000, \$7,000 of which may be expended in improving Academy Creek.

Improving the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga.: C. P. Goodyear, the contractor with the Government of the United States to deepen the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga., under the river and harbor act of 1894, shall be paid the sum of \$30,000 for a 23-foot depth when he shall receive a certificate that a 24-foot depth has been obtained under said act, together with the \$40,000 to which he will be entitled for such 24-foot depth, out of moneys heretofore appropriated by said river and harbor act of 1894. The survey provided for in said act

shall be made by an experienced official of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to be designated by the Secretary of War.

Improving Cumberland Sound, Georgia: Continuing improvement, \$5,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such material and work as may be necessary to complete the present project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$1,641,500, exclusive of amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

Improving harbor at Darien, Ga.: Continuing improvement, \$20,000; and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to report what is necessary to be done to deepen the bar known as Dobby Bar to 24 feet at mean high water, and whether the present obstruction can not be removed by means of dredging, and what the estimates of cost may be.

Improving harbor at Apalachicola Bay and River, Florida: Continuing improvement, \$12,000.

Improving harbor at Pensacola, Fla.: Continuing improvement, \$100,000.

Improving entrance to harbor at Key West, Fla.: Continuing improvement, \$80,000.

Improving Charlotte Harbor and Pease Creek, Florida: Continuing improvement, \$16,000.

Improving Carrabelle Bar and Harbor, Florida, \$10,000, which sum shall be used in making a 10-foot channel from the mouth of Carrabelle River to the channel in the bay.

Improving mouth and passes of Calcasieu River, Louisiana: Continuing improvement, \$10,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the present project of improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$325,000, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

Improving and maintaining ship channel in Galveston Bay, Texas: Continuing improvement according to the existing project, \$50,000.

Improving channel in West Galveston Bay, Texas: Continuing improvement according to existing project, \$5,000.

Improving harbor at Sabine Pass, Texas: Continuing improvement, \$50,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the present project of improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$1,406,856, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

Improving harbor at Ashtabula, Ohio: Continuing improvements, \$50,000, of which amount not less than \$40,000 shall be applied toward the construction of breakwaters according to a survey and recommendation approved in 1894.

Improving harbor at Black River (Lorain), Ohio: Continuing improvements, including necessary dredging between piers, \$20,000; and the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to cause a survey of said harbor to be made with a view to recommending such improvements as may be necessary to provide better access to said harbor and the safety of boats therein.

Improving harbor at Cleveland, Ohio: Continuing improvements, \$80,000, to be used for extension of breakwater, according to plans heretofore adopted; also, in accordance with the recent report and recommendation of the local engineer, Col. Jared A. Smith, for repair and rebuilding, as well as relocation, when desirable, of the piers and breakwater already constructed, and for widening and extending the channel between the piers and in the outer harbor and maintaining the necessary depth: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to enter into contracts for the completion of the above projects, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, the cost not to exceed in the aggregate \$1,354,000: *And provided also*, That the Secretary of War be directed to cause a survey to be made of the said breakwater, as heretofore planned, with a view of determining the advisability of changing the plan thereof, so as to abandon the proposed construction of the eastern shore arm, and in lieu thereof extending the said breakwater eastwardly in a general direction parallel with the shore; and the sums hereby appropriated, or authorized to be expended, may be expended in such manner as the Secretary of War may deem best for the improvement of said harbor.

Improving harbor at Fairport, Ohio: Continuing improvement, \$20,000, of which amount not less than \$20,000 shall be applied toward the construction of a breakwater according to the approved project for the improvement thereof.

Improving harbor at Huron, Ohio: Continuing improvement and making necessary repairs to piers, \$8,000.

Improving harbor at Port Clinton, Ohio: Continuing improvement, including necessary repairs, \$6,000.

Improving harbor at Sandusky, Ohio: Continuing improvement, \$40,000; and the Secretary of War is directed to cause a survey to be made of the bar at the mouth of the harbor, with a view to recommending such means as shall secure and maintain a permanent navigable channel of sufficient depth next to Cedar Point.

Improving harbor at Toledo, Ohio: Continuing improvements of straight channel through Maumee Bay, including necessary expense for dredging and maintenance of the harbor, \$150,000, a part of which may be used in the discretion of the Secretary of War in removing shoal in the old channel and in extending the improvement up the Maumee River.

Improving harbor at Vermillion, Ohio: Continuing improvement, \$4,000.

Improving harbor at Conneaut, Ohio: For improvements under existing plans, \$40,000, of which amount not less than \$20,000 shall be applied toward the construction of a breakwater according to the latest approved project recommended for the improvement thereof.

Improving outer harbor at Michigan City, Ind.: Continuing improvement, \$70,000.

Improving inner harbor at Michigan City, Ind.: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

Improving outlet to Wolf Lake, Indiana, in accordance with the approved project for the improvement thereof, \$8,000.

Improving Calumet Harbor at Chicago, Ill.: Continuing improvement, including the amended project proposed by Maj. W. L. Marshall, of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, under date of June 30, 1895, \$75,000.

Improving harbor at Waukegan, Ill.: Continuing improvement, \$20,000.

Improving harbor at Charlevoix and entrance to Pine Lake, Michigan: Continuing improvement, \$20,000.

Improving harbor at Frankfort, Mich.: Continuing improvement and repairs, \$15,000.

Improving harbor at Grand Haven, Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$20,000.

Improving harbor of refuge at Grand Marais, Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$24,000.

Improving harbor at Manistee, Mich.: Continuing improvements, and for repairs, \$12,000: *Provided*, That all money heretofore appropriated and now on hand unexpended may also be used in this same project.

Improving harbor at Holland (Black Lake), Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$8,000.

Improving harbor at Monroe, Mich.: Continuing improvement by dredging channel, \$5,000.

Improving harbor at Muskegon, Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$30,000.

Improving harbor at Ontonagon, Mich.: Continuing improvement and for repairs, \$10,000.

Improving harbor at Pentwater, Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving harbor of refuge at Sand Beach, Mich.: Continuing improvement according to the existing project, \$18,000.

Improving harbor of refuge at Portage Lake, Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$25,000.

Improving Benton Harbor Canal and harbor at St. Joseph, Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$30,000.

Improving harbor at South Haven, Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$15,000.

Improving harbor at White Lake, Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving harbor at Marquette, Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$24,000.

Improving harbor at Ludington, Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$20,000.

Improving harbor at Petoskey, Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$8,000.

Improving harbor at Saugatuck, Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

Improving harbor at Menominee, Mich. and Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$7,150.

Improving Cheboygan Harbor, Michigan: Continuing improvement, \$12,000.

Improving harbor at Alpena, Mich.: Continuing improvement, \$2,500.

Constructing harbor of refuge at Presque Isle Point, Marquette Bay, Michigan, in accordance with report of Chief of Engineers under date of March 21, 1896, in House Document No. 318, of Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, \$20,000.

Improving harbor at Ahnapee, Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving harbor at Green Bay, Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$25,000, of which sum \$5,000 may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be expended on the Fox River, below Depere, Wis.

Improving harbor at Kenosha, Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$24,000, of which sum \$4,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be expended in dredging in the harbor basin, and the balance of said \$24,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be used for repairing piers and deepening and maintaining channel.

Improving harbor at Kewaunee, Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$25,000.

Improving harbor at Manitowoc, Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$24,500, to be expended on plan submitted and approved by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 300, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, for extending piers to the 22-foot contour and deepening channel.

Improving harbor of refuge at Milwaukee, Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$20,000; *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into contracts for such material and work as may be necessary to complete the present project of said harbor of refuge, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$168,737.91, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

Improving harbor at Milwaukee, Wis.: For maintenance, \$7,000.

Improving harbor at Port Washington, Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$5,500.

Improving harbor at Racine, Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$27,000; of which sum so much as may be necessary may be used for repairs of piers and maintenance of channel.

Improving harbor at Sheboygan, Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$26,000.

Improving harbor at Ashland, Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$27,000.

Improving harbor at Two Rivers, Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Sturgeon Bay Canal harbor of refuge: For maintenance of channel and piers, \$5,000.

Improving harbor at Oconto, Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$4,000.

Improving harbor at Pensaukee, Wis.: For maintenance, \$1,000.

Improving Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal: Continuing improvement, \$20,000.

Improving harbor at South Milwaukee, Wis., in accordance with report and plan submitted by Capt. Carl F. Palfrey, Corps of Engineers, July 8, 1895, \$5,000.

For improving the harbor at Duluth, Minn., and Superior, Wis., at the west end of Lake Superior: Continuing improvement, \$50,000, whereof \$30,000 shall be expended upon the Duluth portion of said harbor, and \$20,000 shall be expended upon the Superior portion thereof; and contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the project for deepening said harbor and the entrances thereto, reported to the War Department by the commission of engineers appointed under the joint resolution of Congress approved June 29, 1894, consisting of Col. O. M. Poe, Maj. James F. Gregory, and Maj. Clinton B. Sears, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate the sum of \$3,080,533, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated: *Provided*, That such project of improvement may be subject to modification in the interests of commerce, as the Secretary of War may direct, as the work progresses, without, however, increasing the above aggregate: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War may reserve out of appropriations for such work, as the same shall become available, a sufficient amount, to be applied under his direction, to the repairing and maintenance of the present piers at the entrances to said harbor.

Improving harbor at Grand Marais, Minn.: Continuing improvement, \$3,000.

Improving harbor at Agate Bay, Minnesota: Continuing improvement, \$30,000.

Improving harbor at Oakland, Cal.: Continuing improvement, \$100,000, of which \$12,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used in opening the western end of the tidal canal in said harbor to the depth of 8 feet below low tide.

Improving harbor at San Diego, Cal.: Continuing improvement, \$40,000.

Improving harbor at San Luis Obispo, Cal.: Continuing improvement, \$32,000.

Improving Wilmington Harbor, California, in accordance with the report of Col. W. H. H. Benyard, submitted in Senate Executive Document No. 61, Fifty-third Congress, third session, \$50,000.

Improving entrance and harbor at Coos Bay, Oregon: Continuing improvement, \$95,000.

Improving Yaquina Bay, Oregon: Continuing improvement, \$25,000; *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the project as recommended by the board of officers of the Engineer Corps, October 11, 1895, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$1,000,000, exclusive of amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

Improving harbor at Coos Bay, Oregon: Dredging to complete, \$14,360; *Provided*, That so much of this sum as may be necessary shall be added to the amount now on hand for the construction or purchase of a dredge, and that dredging may be contracted for in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, and in such portion of the bay as may be found necessary.

Improving Port Orford Harbor, at Grave Yard Point, Oregon, according to plan recommended by Capt. Thomas W. Symons, of the Corps of Engineers, as per House Document No. 312, Fifty-third Congress, third session, January 30, 1895, to cost not to exceed \$203,335, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation heretofore made March 3, 1879, for the establishment of a harbor of refuge on the Pacific coast is hereby transferred to be expended on this improvement.

Improving Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Continuing improvement, \$17,000.

Improving Grays Harbor and bar entrance, Washington, \$10,000, as recommended by Capt. T. W. Symons, Corps of Engineers, March 20, 1895: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete said improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$990,000, exclusive of the sum herein appropriated.

Improving Olympia Harbor, Washington: Continuing improvement, \$32,000; and that a survey be made of the Deschutes River at its entrance in Olympia Harbor, with a view to its improvement.

Improving Everett Harbor, Washington: Continuing improvement, \$20,000.

Improving Bagaduce River, Maine: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Kennebec River, Maine: Continuing improvement, \$40,000.

Improving Narragansett River, Maine: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Saco River, Maine, including breakwater: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

Improving Lubec Channel, Maine: Continuing improvement, \$32,000.

Improving Georges River, Maine, in accordance with plan submitted by Col. D. P. Heap, January 10, 1895, \$10,000.

Improving Sasanoa River, Maine, according to plan submitted by Col. D. P. Heap, December 13, 1894, \$12,000.

Improving Cochecho River, New Hampshire: Continuing improvement, \$15,000.

Improving Otter Creek, Vermont: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Powow River, Massachusetts: Continuing improvement, \$12,000.

Improving Taunton River, Massachusetts: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Weymouth River, Massachusetts: Continuing improvement, \$15,000, of which \$10,000 shall be used in the improvement of Weymouth Back River.

Improving Essex River, Massachusetts: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Mystic and Malden rivers, Massachusetts: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

For the improvement of the channel of the Merrimack River, Massachusetts, by removing certain rocks therein below Rock Bridge, \$5,000. The Secretary of War is directed to furnish to the House of Representatives an estimate of the cost of improving the Merrimack River, Massachusetts, by dredging the channel thereof between Newburyport and Haverhill of the width of 150 feet and of the depth of 7 feet at mean low water, provided the estimate can be furnished from surveys already made.

Improving Town River, Massachusetts, in accordance with recommendations submitted by Col. S. M. Mansfield December 31, 1890, \$10,000.

Improving Sakonnet River, Rhode Island: For widening and deepening the passage at the draw of the Stone Bridge over the Sakonnet River, Rhode Island, \$20,000.

Improving Pawtucket River, Rhode Island: Continuing improvement, \$20,500.

Improving Pawcatuck River, Rhode Island and Connecticut: Continuing improvement, \$6,000.

Improving Providence River and Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island: Continuing improvement, \$14,000.

Improving Green Jacket Shoal, Providence, R. I.: Continuing improvement, \$7,500.

Improving Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn.: Continuing improvement, \$20,000.

Improving Housatonic River, Connecticut: Continuing improvement, \$25,000.

Improving Thames River, Connecticut: Continuing improvement, \$12,000.

Improving Mystic River, Connecticut: Continuing improvement, \$3,500.

Improving Harlem River, New York: Continuing improvement, \$125,000.

Improving East River and Hell Gate, New York: Continuing improvement, \$60,000.

Improving Browns Creek, Sayville, Long Island, New York: For maintenance, \$4,000.

Improving East Chester Creek, New York: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

Improving Patchogue River, New York: Continuing improvement, \$9,000.

Improving shoal between Sister Islands and Cross-Over Light, St. Lawrence River, New York: Continuing improvement, \$25,000, to be expended for improving shoals between Sister Islands and Cross-Over Light, and in the St. Lawrence River between Ogdensburg and the foot of Lake Ontario.

Improving Niagara River from Tonawanda to Port Day, in accordance with plan adopted by river and harbor act of August 17, 1894: Continuing improvement, \$15,000.

Improving Bronx River, New York, in accordance with the plan submitted by Col. G. L. Gillespie, August 25, 1891, \$10,000.

Improving Passaic River, New Jersey: Continuing improvement, \$15,000.

Improving Raritan River, New Jersey: Continuing improvement, \$20,000.

Improving Shrewsbury River, New Jersey: Continuing improvement, \$15,000.

Improving South River, New Jersey: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Alloway Creek, New Jersey: Continuing improvement, \$3,000.

Improving Dennis Creek, New Jersey, in accordance with the approved project for its improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Elizabeth River, New Jersey: Continuing improvement, \$3,160.

Improving Mattawan Creek, New Jersey: For dredging, \$3,000.

Improving Rancocas River, New Jersey: Continuing improvement, \$2,000, which sum shall be expended in the improvement of the Lambert branch of said river.

Improving Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, New Jersey: Continuing improvement, \$5,000, which sum shall be expended for extending the improved channel farther toward the 5-foot contour of Baritan Bay.

Improving Goshen Creek, New Jersey: Continuing improvement, \$3,000.

Improving Cooper Creek, New Jersey: Completing improvement in accordance with the plan recommended by Maj. C. W. Raymond, and printed in House Executive Document No. 176, Fifty-third Congress, third session, \$35,000, of which amount \$2,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be immediately available, to be expended in rebuilding the dike on Government reservation in the Delaware River at Woobury Creek.

Improving Allegheny River, Pennsylvania: Continuing improvement, \$12,500.

For completion of lock and dam at Herr Island, Allegheny River, and construction of the two locks and dams referred to in the report of Maj. R. L. Hoxie in House Document No. 204, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, \$50,000; *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the projects of improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$894,500, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

Improving Schuylkill River, Pennsylvania: Continuing improvement, \$20,000.

Improving Delaware River, from Trenton to its mouth, Pennsylvania and New Jersey: Continuing improvement, \$500,000, of which \$5,000 shall be expended in the improvement of the channel over Perriwig Bar.

Improving the Monongahela River, Pennsylvania: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to institute and carry to completion

proceedings for the condemnation of all the property and its appurtenances of the Monongahela Navigation Company, a corporation of Pennsylvania, said condemnation proceedings to be as prescribed and regulated by the provisions of the general railroad law of Pennsylvania approved February 19, 1849, and its supplements, except that the United States shall not be required to give any bond, and except that jurisdiction of said proceedings is hereby given to the circuit court of the United States for the western district of Pennsylvania, with right of appeal by either party to the Supreme Court of the United States. And the sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay the necessary costs of said proceedings; and upon final judgment being entered therein, the Secretary of War, if in his opinion the judgment is reasonable, is hereby authorized and directed to draw his warrant on the Treasury for the amount of said judgment and costs, and said amount for the payment thereof is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. And when said property and its appurtenances shall have been acquired by the United States, whether by purchase or condemnation, the Secretary of War shall take charge thereof and the same shall thereafter be subject to the provisions of section 4 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1884.

Improving Appoquinimink River, Delaware: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Smyrna River, Delaware: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Murderkill River, Delaware: Continuing improvement, \$6,500.

Improving the inland waterway from Chicoteague Bay, Virginia, to Delaware Bay, at or near Lewes, Del., to be used from Delaware Bay to Indian River: Continuing improvement, \$25,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended until the right of way is secured without cost to the United States.

Improving Broad Creek River, Delaware: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Choptank River, Maryland: Continuing improvement, \$2,000.

Improving Chester River, Maryland: Continuing improvement, \$1,500.

Improving Manokin River, Maryland: Continuing improvement, \$4,000, of which sum \$2,000 shall be expended in improving said river between Daniels Creek and a point on said river known as the Red Bridge or County Wharf.

Improving Wicomico River, Maryland: Completing improvement, \$3,700.

Improving Pocomoke River: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Warwick River, Maryland: Continuing improvement, \$2,000.

Improving Patapsco River and channel to Baltimore: For maintenance, for main ship channel to Curtis Bay, \$50,000.

Improving Nanticoke River, Delaware and Maryland: Continuing improvement, in accordance with report and plan submitted by Maj. William F. Smith in House Executive Document No. 323, Fifty-third Congress, third session, \$3,000.

Improving Potomac River, Washington, D. C.: Continuing improvement, \$100,000.

Improving Appomattox River, Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Nansemond River, Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving James River, Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$120,000.

Improving Mattaponi River, Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$2,500.

Improving Nomin Creek, Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$2,500.

Improving Pamunkey River, Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$2,000.

Improving Rappahannock River, Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$8,000.

Improving Urbanna Creek, Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$3,000.

Improving York River, Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$16,000.

Improving Western Branch of Elizabeth River, Virginia, according to report submitted by Chief of Engineers March 25, 1896, \$45,000, to complete.

Improving Aquia Creek, Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$3,000.

Improving Occoquan Creek, Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$2,500.

Improving Lower Machodoc Creek, Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$1,500.

Improving Nandua (historically known as Andura) Creek, Virginia, in accordance with approved project for the improvement thereof, \$3,000.

Protecting Jamestown Island from the encroachments of James River, \$6,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Improving Elk River, West Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$2,000, to be expended on said river from Frametown, Braxton County, up said river.

Improving Guyandotte River, West Virginia: For maintenance, \$1,000.

Improving Gauley River, West Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$3,000.

Improving Cheat River, West Virginia: Continuing improvement in accordance with recommendations of Maj. R. L. Hoxie, submitted July 10, 1895, \$9,000.

Improving Little Kanawha River, West Virginia: For maintenance, \$1,500.

Improving the upper Monongahela River, West Virginia: Continuing improvements, \$20,000; and the Secretary of War, at such time as the United States shall become the owner, by condemnation or otherwise, of the dams on the Monongahela River belonging to the Monongahela River Navigation Company, in Pennsylvania, may place the construction of the six dams heretofore recommended and reported by the United States engineers on the Monongahela River, in the State of West Virginia, under contract at a sum not exceeding \$1,000,000, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law.

Improving inland waterway between Beaufort Harbor and New River, North Carolina: Continuing improvement, \$1,000.

Improving Cape Fear River, North Carolina, above Wilmington: Continuing improvement, \$4,000.

Improving Cape Fear River, North Carolina, at and below Wilmington: Continuing improvement, \$100,000.

Improving Neuse River, North Carolina: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Pamlico and Tar rivers, North Carolina: Continuing improvement and maintaining, \$2,500.

Improving Trent River, North Carolina: Continuing improvement, \$2,000.

Improving Black River, North Carolina: For maintenance, \$1,000.

Improving inland water route from Norfolk Harbor, Virginia, to Albemarle Sound, North Carolina, through Currituck Sound: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

Improving Great Pedee River, South Carolina: Continuing improvement, \$12,000.

Improving Santee River, South Carolina: Continuing improvement, \$48,000, to be used in snagging and in making new cut between Estherville and Minim Creek, and in maintaining the Musquito Creek Channel.

Improving Waccamaw River, South Carolina: Continuing improvement, \$6,000.

Improving Wappoo Cut, South Carolina: Continuing improvement, \$2,500.

Improving Wateree River, South Carolina: For maintenance, \$5,000.

Improving Congaree River, South Carolina: Continuing improvement, \$2,000.

Improving Little Pedee River, South Carolina: Continuing improvement, \$3,000.

Improving Beaufort River, South Carolina: Continuing improvement, \$1,000.

Improving Altamaha River, Georgia: Continuing improvements, \$10,000.

Improving Chattahoochee River, Georgia and Alabama: Continuing im-

provement, \$25,000, of which \$5,000 are to be used on that portion of the river between West Point and Franklin.

Improving Flint River, Georgia: Continuing improvement, \$8,000.

Improving Ocmulgee River, Georgia: Continuing improvement, \$10,000, of which \$5,000 are to be expended between Macon and Hawkinsville, and the like sum below Hawkinsville.

Improving Oconee River, Georgia: Continuing improvement, \$10,000, of which \$3,000 are to be expended between Milledgeville and the Central Railroad bridge.

Improving Savannah River, between Savannah and Augusta: Continuing improvement, \$15,000.

Improving Savannah River, above Augusta, Ga.: Continuing improvement, \$3,000.

Improving Coosa River, between Rome, Ga., and the East Tennessee, Virginia and Georgia Railroad bridge, in Alabama: Continuing improvement, \$50,000, \$10,000 of which, or so much as may be necessary, shall be used in deepening the channel over the several shoals and removing the obstructions therefrom between Cedar Bluffs, Alabama, and Rome, Ga.

Improving Coosa River, between Wetumka, Ala., and the East Tennessee, Virginia and Georgia Railroad bridge: Continuing improvement, \$50,000.

Inside water route between Savannah, Ga., and Fernandina, Fla.: Continuing improvement, \$14,000.

Improving Apalachicola River, Florida, including the cut-off and Lower Improving Calosahatchee River, Florida: For maintenance, \$1,000.

Chipola River: For completion, \$5,000.

Improving Choctawhatchee River, Florida and Alabama: Continuing improvement, \$5,000: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be expended above Hollis bridge until a draw, approved by the Secretary of War, is put in said bridge.

Improving Escambia and Conecuh rivers, Florida: Continuing improvements, \$4,000.

Improving Manatee River, Florida: Continuing improvement, \$4,000: *Provided*, That \$3,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be used in dredging, deepening, and otherwise improving the navigation of the channel known as the Cut-Off, extending from said Manatee River, on the north side thereof, and below the town of Palmetto, in Terra Ceia Bay.

Improving Suwannee River, Florida: Continuing improvement, \$3,000.

Improving Volusia Bar, Florida: For maintenance, \$1,000.

Improving Ocklawaha River, Florida: For maintenance, \$3,000.

Improving Sarasoto Bay, Florida: Continuing improvement, \$2,500.

Improving Indian River, Florida: By dredging channel at Negro Cut, near Indian River Inlet, \$7,500.

Improving St. Johns River, Florida, from Jacksonville to the ocean, in accordance with latest approved project for its improvement, \$25,000.

Improving Alabama River, Alabama: Continuing improvement, \$40,000.

Improving Black Warrior River, Alabama, from Tuscaloosa to Daniels Creek: Continuing improvement, \$40,000.

Improving Warrior and Tombigbee rivers, Alabama, from mouth of Tombigbee River to Tuscaloosa: Continuing improvement, \$115,000, of which \$75,000 is to be expended on the Tombigbee River and \$40,000 on the Warrior River; and so much of said sums as may be necessary is authorized to be expended in acquiring, by purchase or condemnation, under the laws of Alabama, the lands needed in making such improvements.

Improving Tombigbee River from Fulton to Columbus: Continuing improvement and maintenance, \$8,000.

Improving Tombigbee River from Demopolis, Ala., to Columbus, Miss.: Continuing improvement, \$50,000.

Improving Tombigbee River from Walkers Bridge to Fulton: Continuing improvement and maintenance, \$1,000.

Improving Big Sunflower River, Mississippi: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Noxubee River, Mississippi: For maintenance, \$3,000.

Improving Pascagoula River, Mississippi: Continuing improvement, \$6,000, and so much of said sum as may be necessary may be used for removal of the bar in Horn Island Pass.

Improving Pearl River, between Edinburg and Carthage, Miss.: For maintenance, \$500.

Improving Pearl River, between Carthage and Jackson, Miss.: For maintenance, \$2,400.

Improving Pearl River, below Jackson, Miss.: Continuing improvement, \$10,000, which shall be expended in work on the river, beginning at the head of Holmes Bayou and continuing up the river to Monticello.

Improving Tallahatchee River, Mississippi: Continuing improvement, \$4,000.

Improving Yazoo River, Mississippi: Continuing improvement, \$20,000, of which so much as may be necessary shall be expended in removing the bar at Yazoo City.

Improving Chickasahay River, Mississippi, from the mouth up to railroad bridge, near Shubuta: Continuing improvement, \$2,000.

Improving Leaf River, Mississippi, from its mouth to Bowie Creek: Continuing improvement, \$2,500.

Improving mouth of Yazoo River and harbor of Vicksburg, Miss.: For the purpose of completing the project of improvement as heretofore adopted and entered upon, in addition to expending the balance on hand, contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the same, or said materials may be purchased and work may be done otherwise than by contract, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$80,000, exclusive of the amount heretofore appropriated.

Improving Amite River and Bayou Manchac, Louisiana: For maintenance, \$2,500.

Improving Boeuf River, Louisiana: Continuing improvement, \$6,000.

Improving Bayou Bartholomew, Louisiana and Arkansas: Continuing improvement, \$4,000.

Improving Tensas River and Bayou Macon, Louisiana and Arkansas: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Red River, Louisiana and Arkansas, from Fulton, Ark., to the Achatfayala River: Continuing improvement, according to the plan of Capt. J. H. Willard, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, \$75,000.

Improving Ticklaw River, Louisiana: For maintenance, \$1,000.

Improving Bayou Plaquemine, Louisiana: Continuing improvement, \$110,000.

Improving Chefuncte River and Bogue Falia, Louisiana: For maintenance, \$1,000.

Improving Bogue Chitto, Louisiana: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving channel, bay, and passes of Bayou Vermilion, Louisiana: Continuing improvement, \$1,000.

Improving Bayou Teche, Louisiana: Continuing improvement, \$6,000.

Improving Buffalo Bayou, Texas: Continuing improvement, \$20,000.

Improving Trinity River, Texas: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Cypress Bayou, Texas: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Sabine River, Texas: For completion, \$2,000.

Improving Arkansas River, Arkansas and Indian Territory: Continuing improvement, \$100,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, cause examinations and surveys to be made at or near Pine Bluff,

Little Rock, Dardanelle, Van Buren, and Fort Smith, to determine whether or not, by reason of dikes or other Government works, any part of the harbors or river banks in their vicinity have been so injured or endangered that the Government should guard against or remedy the same; and for the purpose of making such surveys and works as may be found necessary to remedy and guard against such injury, the Secretary of War is authorized to set apart and use, in his discretion, a sufficient amount of this appropriation: *And provided further*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, the sum of \$15,000 of the amount hereby appropriated for said river may be used in removing obstructions and operating snag boats, in addition to the amount hereinafter appropriated for that purpose.

Improving St. Francis River, Arkansas: Continuing improvement, \$8,000; and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to cause surveys to be made, and submit with his next report on St. Francis River plans and estimates for the improvement of said river by locks and dams to give slack-water navigation from its mouth to Wittsburg and to Marianna on L'Anguille River, its tributary, if in his judgment said improvement is practicable; the cost of the same to be paid out of this appropriation.

Improving Arkansas River: Removing snags and operating snag boats, \$20,000.

Improving Black River, Arkansas and Missouri: Continuing improvement, \$3,000. Of this appropriation \$2,000 may be expended, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, in reconstructing the old dam at or near Big Island.

Improving White River, Arkansas: Continuing improvement, \$22,000; of which sum \$2,000 may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be expended in removing obstructions in Cache River, its tributary.

Improving Ouachita and Black rivers, Arkansas and Louisiana: Continuing improvement, \$70,000; of which sum \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used by the Secretary of War for the completion of the survey of said Ouachita River heretofore authorized, and he is directed to submit as soon as practicable a plan of construction and estimates of the cost of the locks and dams necessary to give slack-water navigation.

Improving Red River above Fulton, Ark.: Continuing improvement, \$3,000.

Improving Current River, Arkansas and Missouri: Continuing improvement, \$2,000.

Improving Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee: Continuing improvement, between the State of Tennessee and the town of Burnside, \$20,000, to be expended in purchasing sites for locks and dams 21 and 22 and in laying masonry for locks 21 and 22.

Improving Cumberland River below Nashville, Tenn.: Continuing improvement, \$80,000, of which sum shall be expended as much as may be necessary for the completion of the lock and dam near the mouth of Harpeth River.

Improving Cumberland River above Nashville, Tenn.: Continuing improvement: The Secretary of War may enter into contracts for the completion of the whole or any part of locks Nos. 5, 6, and 7, above Nashville, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$900,000, exclusive of the amounts heretofore appropriated.

Improving French Broad and Little Pigeon rivers, Tennessee: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Tennessee River below Chattanooga, Tenn.: Continuing improvement, \$50,000.

Improving Tennessee River above Chattanooga, Tenn., \$15,000, of which sum a sufficient amount shall be expended in the removal of the obstructions to navigation at Knoxville.

Improving Obion River, Tennessee, from its mouth to the town of Obion, on the Newport News and Mississippi Valley Railroad, in Obion County: Continuing improvement, \$6,000.

Improving Forked Deer River, Tennessee: For maintenance, \$1,000.

Improving Kentucky River, Kentucky: Continuing improvement, \$50,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the present project of improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$1,349,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated.

Improving the Falls of the Ohio River and Indiana Chute Falls, Ohio River: Continuing improvements, \$10,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the present project of improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$517,250, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated.

Improving Rough River, Kentucky: Continuing improvement, \$43,000.

Improving Levisa Fork, Big Sandy River, Kentucky: For maintenance, \$1,000.

Improving Tug Fork, Big Sandy River, Kentucky: For maintenance, \$2,000.

Improving Green River, Kentucky, about the mouth of Big Barren River: Continuing improvement for Lock No. 5, according to report and recommendation of Maj. D. W. Lockwood, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, submitted August 11, 1891. \$20,000.

Improving Big Sandy River near Louisa, Ky.: For continuing construction of movable dam in accordance with the existing plans, \$30,000.

Improving Ohio River, at or below the mouth of the Beaver River, by the construction of Movable Dam No. 6: Continuing improvement, \$25,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the present project of improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$300,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated.

Improving Ohio River, by the construction of Dams Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5, between Davis Island Dam and Dam No. 6, in accordance with the approved project for the completion thereof, \$10,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for the whole or any part of the material and work as may be necessary to complete said movable dams, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$1,990,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated.

Improving Ohio River, Ohio and West Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$250,000, of which \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to expend in a survey of the said Ohio River from Marietta, Ohio, to the city of Pittsburg, Pa., and report the number of movable dams necessary to improve said river between said points to provide 6 feet of water therein at low water, and the proper location of necessary dams, as well as probable cost thereof: *Provided*, That the sum of \$35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for snagging purposes: *And provided further*, That the sum of \$22,250, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used, at the discretion of the Secretary of War, in the construction of three ice piers substantially similar to those now along the Ohio River, one additional at Middleport, one at Syracuse, and one at or near the mouth of Big Hocking; the precise points for the construction of said piers at said lower points shall be fixed by the Secretary of War so as to best accommodate the commerce of those sections of said river: *Provided further*, That out of said sum there shall be expended in the improvement of the harbor of Evansville, Ind., \$39,532: *And provided further*, That out of said sum there shall be expended for the improvement of the harbor of Golconda,

on the Ohio River in Pope County, Ill., the sum of \$3,000: *And provided further*, That there shall also be expended out of said sum \$5,000 for the improvement and continuance of the work on the harbor at Brooklyn, Ill.: *And provided further*, That there shall also be expended out of said sum \$5,000 for continuation of work on the improvements of the Ohio River near Mound City, Ill.

Improving Saginaw River, Michigan: Continuing improvement, \$50,000, of which \$16,000 shall be expended on the river above Bay City. The Secretary of War is hereby directed to cause surveys to be made and estimates of the cost of improvement of the Saginaw River from its head to a point in Saginaw Bay, with a view of securing a channel 300 feet wide and an increase in depth to 14 feet from the head of the river to the Third Street Bridge, so called, in Bay City, thence of the same width to Saginaw Bay, with a view to securing an increase of the depth of the river to the Third Street Bridge, so called, in Bay City, thence of the same width to Saginaw Bay, with a view to securing an increase of the depth of the west channel of the Saginaw River between Middle Ground and West Bay City, with a view to securing a depth of said channel to 14 feet; also to improve the Shiawassee River from the Saginaw River to the Bad River; Bad River to the village of St. Charles, and the Flint River from the Shiawassee as far as practicable, to such an extent as will afford a reliable navigation for light-draft boats between Saginaw River and the village of St. Charles and on the Flint River as far as practicable.

Improving Belle River, Michigan, in accordance with plans submitted by Col. G. J. Lydecker, November 30, 1895, in House Document No. 72, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, \$5,000.

Improving Sebawing River, Michigan, in accordance with plans submitted by Col. G. J. Lydecker, November 30, 1895, in House Document No. 71, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, \$5,000.

Improving Pine River, Michigan, in accordance with report submitted by Col. G. J. Lydecker, December 7, 1895, in House Document No. 73, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, \$5,000.

Improving Grand River, Michigan: Continuing improvement in accordance with the modified project for constructing an open 10-foot channel of navigable width, \$50,000.

Improving mouth of Black River, Michigan: Continuing improvement, \$4,000.

Improving Clinton River, Michigan: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

Improving Rouge River, Michigan: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving Detroit River, Michigan, by removal of shoals from the city of Detroit to Lake Erie: Continuing improvement, \$30,000.

Improving Black River at Port Huron, Mich.: Continuing improvement up to Washington avenue, \$4,000.

Improving the water communication across Keweenaw Point, Lake Superior, from Keweenaw Bay to Lake Superior, in the State of Michigan: Continuing improvement in accordance with the existing project, \$50,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the present project of improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$1,065,000, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

Improving St. Joseph River, Michigan: Continuing improvement, \$500.

Improving Kalamazoo River, Michigan, from Lake Michigan to Saugatuck, in accordance with plans submitted by Col. G. J. Lydecker in House Document No. 192, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, \$5,000.

Improving Chippewa River, including Yellow Banks, Wisconsin: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

Improving Fox River, Wisconsin: Continuing improvement, \$37,500, of which said sum \$1,500, or as much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used to remove bars and snags from the Wolf River, below Shawano, Wis.: and \$3,500, or as much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used in providing a harbor of refuge on the east shore of Lake Winnebago, Wisconsin, at one of the several landings on said shore, the location of which said harbor of refuge shall be determined by the Government engineer.

Improving Menominee River, Wisconsin and Michigan: Continuing improvement, \$15,000, of which said sum an amount sufficient is hereby appropriated, and shall be used—

First. To widen the main channel to a width of 250 feet for a distance of 600 feet down the river from the present west line of the channel, and to deepen the same to a depth of 16 feet.

Second. To extend the present main channel from its west line up the river a distance of 425 feet to the west line of Wells street, with a width of 75 feet and a depth of 16 feet, the south line of said extension to be the south line of the main channel extended.

Improving St. Croix River, Wisconsin and Minnesota: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

Improving Red River of the North, Minnesota: Continuing improvement, \$12,000.

Improving Minnesota River, Minnesota: Continuing improvement, \$4,000.

Improving Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, above Vincennes: Continuing improvement, \$6,000.

Improving Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, below Vincennes: Continuing improvement, \$15,000.

Improving White River, Indiana: Completing improvement, \$2,500.

Improving Calumet River, Illinois: Continuing improvement, \$50,000: *Provided*, That the expenditure of said money shall be made upon said river from the mouth thereof to the forks in said river.

Improving Illinois River, Illinois: Continuing improvement, \$40,000.

For the construction of the Illinois and Mississippi Canal: Continuing construction, \$25,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into contracts for such material and work as may be necessary to complete the present project of said Illinois and Mississippi Canal and to acquire such further right of way as may be necessary therefor, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$5,710,960, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated: *Provided*, That in acquiring right of way the Secretary of War may make agreements for joint user where the canal crosses other lines of transportation if such agreements can be made upon reasonable terms: *Provided further*, That in acquiring right of way by agreement or otherwise for the crossing of existing public highways over the parts of the canal constructed on land the basis of agreement or condemnation shall be the construction and maintenance of bridges by the United States Government, as provided for in the detailed plans and estimates heretofore submitted to Congress, but this provision shall not apply to bridges constructed over public waters of the United States now occupying part of the line of the said canal, nor to bridges constructed after the completion of said canal or part thereof adjacent to the bridge sites: *Provided further*, That in the event that the Secretary of War shall be unable to obtain such right of way as may be necessary in the prosecution of this work, upon reasonable terms by agreement, purchase, or voluntary conveyance, he is hereby authorized to apply at any term of the circuit or district court of the United States for the northern district of Illinois, and in the name of the United States institute and carry on proceedings to condemn such lands as may be necessary for right of way as aforesaid; and in such proceedings said court shall be governed by the laws of the State of Illinois so far as the same may be applicable to the subject of condemning private property for public use.

For improving the Chicago River, in Illinois, from its mouth to the stock yards on the South Branch, and to Belmont avenue on the North Branch, as far as may be permitted by existing docks and wharves, to be dredged to admit passage by vessels drawing 16 feet of water, according to the recommendation of Capt. W. L. Marshall, of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, in his report under date of August 9, 1893: Continuing improvement, \$50,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the said project of improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$50,000, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

Reservoirs at the head waters of the Mississippi River: Continuing improvement, \$80,000.

Improving the Mississippi River between the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha Railroad bridge at St. Paul to the Washington avenue bridge at Minneapolis: Continuing improvement, \$100,000.

Improving the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River to St. Paul, Minn.: Continuing improvement, \$375,000, of which amount \$200,000 shall be expended on that portion of said river from St. Paul to the mouth of the Missouri River, and \$175,000 from the mouth of the Missouri River to the mouth of the Ohio River: *Provided*, That on and after the passage of this act additional contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to carry on continuously the systematic improvement of the Mississippi River between the points mentioned, or said materials may be purchased and work may be done otherwise than by contract, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$5,025,000: *Provided further*, That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, said contracts and materials purchased and work done otherwise than by contract for the section of said river between St. Paul and the mouth of the Missouri River shall not exceed \$230,000, and thereafter shall not exceed for the three years beginning July 1, 1897, the sum of \$826,666.66 annually: *Provided further*, That such contracts and materials purchased and work done otherwise than by contract for that section of the said river between the mouth of the Missouri and the mouth of the Ohio River for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, shall not exceed the sum of \$325,000, and thereafter for the three years commencing July 1, 1897, shall not exceed the sum of \$673,333.33 annually: *And provided further*, That the money hereby appropriated and authorized to be expended in pursuance of said contracts for the said section of said river between the mouth of the Missouri River and the mouth of the Ohio River, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be expended in the construction of suitable dredge boats, portable jetties, and other suitable appliances, and in the maintenance and operation of the same, with the view of obtaining a navigable channel from St. Louis to Cairo not less than 250 feet in width and 9 feet in depth.

That \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the money herein appropriated for the improvement of the Mississippi River between Cairo and the mouth of the Missouri River shall be expended, under the direction of the Secretary of War, to protect the east bank of the Mississippi River from caving in and being washed away at or near a point opposite the mouth of the Missouri River and extending south along said east bank as far as may be necessary to effect the purpose above mentioned.

That of the money herein appropriated for use on the Mississippi River from Cairo to the mouth of the Missouri River the sum of \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is directed to be expended in removing the bar in front of Chester, Ill., and protecting the west bank of the Mississippi River opposite Chester, Ill.

That of the money herein appropriated for the improvement of the Mississippi River from St. Paul to the mouth of the Missouri River there shall be expended the following respective amounts, or so much thereof as may be necessary, under the direction of the Secretary of War, in improvements at the following places, to wit:

For the protection from erosion of the east bank of the Mississippi River along and in front of the Sny Island Levee in the counties of Adams, Pike, and Calhoun, in the State of Illinois, by revetment work, \$50,000.

For the removal of the bar in the Mississippi River, on the east side thereof, opposite the city of Dubuque, in the State of Iowa, \$5,000.

For the repair and maintenance of the natural and artificial banks of the Mississippi River from Warsaw to Quincy, in the State of Illinois, \$5,000.

For dredging the channel at Quincy Bay, at Quincy, in the State of Illinois, \$5,000.

For removing the sand bar in front of the steamboat landing at Quincy, in the State of Illinois, \$10,000.

For maintaining the harbor at Rock Island, Ill., \$5,000.

For maintaining the harbor at La Crosse, Wis., \$5,000.

For the purpose of constructing a harbor of refuge on the west shore of Lake Pepin, Mississippi River, at or near Kings Coulee, between Lake City and Reeds Landing, Minn., \$20,000.

For the purpose of continuing the work of constructing artificial banks between the mouth of Flint River, in Des Moines County, Iowa, and running along the west bank of the Mississippi River to the mouth of the Iowa River, \$50,000.

And the Secretary of War, out of the money herein appropriated for the improvement of the Mississippi River, from St. Paul to the mouth of the Missouri River, shall cause surveys to be made as follows:

On the east side of the Mississippi River, commencing at Drury's Landing, in Mercer County, State of Illinois, and running along the east bank of said river to New Boston, with a view to the improvement of navigation by preventing the overflow of the natural and artificial banks, and by deepening the channel; also along the east bank of said river, from at or near the city of Quawka, Ill., to at or near Dallas City, in the said State, with a view to the improvement of navigation by preventing the overflow of the natural and artificial banks and by deepening the channel, with an estimate of the cost thereof; also on the west side of said river from the bluff above the city of Madison, Lee County, in the State of Iowa, along the west bank of said river to the mouth of Skunk River, in said Lee County, and along the west bank of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Iowa River, in Louisa County, to the city of Muscatine, in Muscatine County, Iowa, with a view of improving the navigation by preventing the overflow of the natural and artificial banks and by deepening the channel.

Also on the west side of the Mississippi River, commencing at a point near Lagrange, in the county of Lewis and State of Missouri, above high water, running along the bank of the river to a point near the railroad bridge over the Mississippi River, near and above the city of Hannibal, in the county of Marion and State of Missouri, with the view of improving navigation by preventing the water from overflowing the natural and artificial banks along that part of the river and deepening the channel.

Also of the Egyptian levee, beginning at a point on the Des Moines River, in the county of Clark, State of Missouri, running along the south bank of said river to or near the Mississippi River at Alexandria, thence along the west bank of said river to terminus of said Egyptian levee, and estimate the cost of raising and strengthening said levee so as to confine the water to the river and thereby deepen the channel and improve navigation.

Also commencing at Drury's Landing, in Rock Island County, Ill., and running along the east bank of said river to New Boston, Ill., with a view to improving the navigation by preventing the water from overflowing the

natural and artificial banks along those parts of the river and deepening the channel.

Improving Mississippi River from Head of Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River, including salaries, clerical, office, traveling, and miscellaneous expenses of the Mississippi River Commission: Continuing improvement, \$625,000, which sum shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, in accordance with the plans, specifications, and recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission, as approved by the Chief of Engineers, for the general improvement of the river, for the building of levees, and for surveys, including the continuation of the survey between Head of Passes and the head waters of the river, in such manner as in their opinion shall best improve navigation and promote the interests of commerce at all stages of the river: *Provided*, That on and after the passage of this act additional contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to carry on continuously the plans of the Mississippi River Commission as aforesaid, or said materials may be purchased and work done otherwise than by contract, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$3,375,000: *Provided further*, That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, said contracts, and materials purchased, and work done otherwise than by contract shall not exceed the sum of \$625,000, and thereafter shall not exceed the sum of \$2,583,333 annually for the three years beginning July 1, 1897: *Provided further*, That the money hereby appropriated and authorized to be expended in pursuance of said contracts, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be expended in the construction of suitable dredge boats and other devices and appliances, and in the maintenance and operation of the same, with a view of obtaining a navigable channel from Cairo down, not less than 250 feet in width and 9 feet in depth: *Provided further*, That of the sum hereby appropriated and authorized to be expended the sum of \$64,000 shall be expended in the rectification of the banks at Greenville, Miss., and \$64,000 in the rectification of the banks at Helena, Ark., according to late plans submitted by Capt. Graham D. Fitch, Corps of Engineers, and \$16,000 in the rectification of the banks at New Madrid, Mo.

For work in accordance with the plans and specifications of the Mississippi River Commission:

At the harbor of New Orleans, La.: Continuing improvement, \$110,000.

At the harbor of Natchez and Vidalia, Mississippi and Louisiana, \$64,000.

For rectification of Red and Atchafalaya rivers, Louisiana: Continuing improvement, \$40,000.

At the harbor of Memphis, Tenn., \$70,000, of which \$35,000 shall be expended in dredging and improving Wolf River from its mouth to the county bridge on Second street, not exceeding 2½ miles up said stream.

Improving Gasconade River, Missouri: Continuing improvement, \$5,000; and improving Osage River, Missouri: Continuing improvement, \$50,000, to be expended by the Missouri River Commission.

Improving Missouri River, including salaries, clerical, office, traveling, and miscellaneous expenses of the Missouri River Commission, survey, permanent bench marks, and gauges: Continuing improvement, \$250,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War in the systematic improvement of the river according to the plans and specifications of the Missouri River Commission, as approved by the Chief of Engineers: *Provided*, That in the discretion of said Commission a portion of such sum may be expended in protection of harbors and localities on said river: *And provided also*, That on and after the passage of this act additional contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such material and work as may be necessary to carry on continuously the plans of the Missouri River Commission for the improvement of said river, or said material may be purchased and work may be done otherwise than by contract, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$250,000 per annum for three years, commencing July 1, 1897.

Of the money hereby appropriated and hereby authorized to be contracted for, \$80,000 may be expended at Omaha and Council Bluffs; at Rocheport, \$90,000; at Glasgow, \$20,000; at Miami, \$75,000, and at St. Charles, Mo., \$50,000.

Improving the upper Missouri River between Stubbs Ferry, in Montana, and the lower limits of Sioux City, Iowa, \$190,000, of which \$50,000 may be expended in the protection and completion of the works at Sioux City; \$50,000 in the rectification of the river at Pierre and Fort Pierre; \$20,000 for the protection of Bismarck Harbor and the rectification of the river to prevent erosion of the banks, and cutting a new channel at or near that point; \$20,000 between the Great Falls, in Montana, and Stubbs Ferry, in Montana; \$40,000 at Yankton, and \$10,000 for improvement of river at Elk Point.

Improving Flathead River, Montana, \$10,000, which sum shall be expended in snagging from Demersville to the Flathead Lake, in accordance with the plan submitted by Capt. Thomas W. Symons, Corps of Engineers, August 3, 1895.

Improving Yellowstone River, Montana: Continuing improvement, \$10,000, which sum shall be expended at or near Glendive, Mont.

Improving river at and near Greatfalls, Mont., \$15,000.

Improving Sacramento and Feather rivers and their tributaries, California: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to appoint a board, consisting of three engineers of the United States Army, for the purpose of making surveys and examinations of said rivers, and submit the most feasible plan for the improvement of said rivers and the maintenance of navigation thereon; said board may, under the direction of said Secretary of War, expend any balance now remaining to the credit of said rivers in the improvement of the same, after deducting the expense of said surveys and examinations.

For the construction of restraining barriers for the protection of the Sacramento and Feather rivers in California, \$250,000; such restraining barriers to be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of War in accordance with the recommendations of the California Débris Commission, for the purposes set forth in sections 23, 24, and 25 of the act entitled "An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," approved March 1, 1893: *Provided*, That said sum shall be available only on condition that the legislature of the State of California shall have appropriated at least an equal sum for the purposes herein set forth, to be expended in accordance with the recommendations of engineers of the United States Government.

Improving San Joaquin River, California: Continuing improvement, \$20,000

Improving Napa River, California: Continuing improvement, \$4,000.

Improving upper Columbia River, including Snake River as far up as Asotin, Oregon and Washington: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving lower Willamette River in front of and below Portland, Oreg., and Columbia River below the Willamette River in Oregon and Washington: Continuing improvement, \$50,000.

Improving Coquille River, Oregon: Continuing improvement, \$20,000.

Improving the mouth of Siuslaw River: Continuing improvement, \$27,000.

For gauging waters of the Columbia River, measuring tidal and river volumes, \$1,000.

Improving upper Coquille River, between Coquille City and Myrtle Point, Oreg.: Continuing improvement, \$12,000.

Improving Umpqua River, Oregon: Completing improvement \$6,000.

Improving Coos River, Oregon: Completing improvement in accordance with plans submitted by Capt. T. W. Symons in House Executive Document No. 237, Fifty-third Congress, third session, \$5,000.

Improving Alsea River, Oregon: Completing improvement in accordance with plans submitted by Capt. T. W. Symons in House Executive Document No. 235, Fifty-third Congress, third session, \$3,000.

Improving Nestucca River, Oregon, from town of Woods to the ocean, in accordance with plans submitted by Capt. T. W. Symons in House Executive Document No. 224, Fifty-third Congress, third session: Completing improvement, \$8,000.

Improving Willamette and Yamhill rivers, Oregon, \$20,000, as recommended by Capt. W. L. Fisk, Corps of Engineers, for Willamette River from Portland to Eugene (House Document No. 260, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session), and as recommended by Maj. J. C. Post, Corps of Engineers, in report to Chief of Engineers, dated March 6, 1895, for lock and dam on Yamhill River: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete such improvements, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$200,000, including the amount herein appropriated.

Improving Columbia River below Tongue Point, by way of the South Channel in front of Astoria, Oreg., as recommended by Maj. J. C. Post, Corps of Engineers, May 25, 1895: *Provided*, That \$50,000 is hereby authorized to be transferred from the balance on hand to the credit of the mouth of the Columbia River improvement, in the discretion of the Secretary of War.

For improving Clearwater River, Idaho: Continuing improvement, \$25,000.
For improving Kootenai River, in Idaho, between Bonners Ferry and the international boundary line, \$5,000.

Improving Cowlitz River, Washington: Continuing improvement, \$3,000.

Improving Puget Sound and its tributary waters, Washington: Continuing improvement, \$27,000; of which sum \$12,000 shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War for straightening and deepening the channel of the Puyallup River, emptying into Commencement Bay, in Puget Sound, with a view to making said river navigable at all times for vessels drawing 18 feet of water, from the mouth of said river upward a distance of about one-half mile.

Improving Chehalis River, Washington: For snagging, \$3,000.
Improving Swinomish Slough, Washington: Continuing improvement in accordance with existing plan, \$25,000.

Improving Skagit River, Washington: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.
Improving Columbia River between the mouth of the Willamette River and the city of Vancouver, Wash.: Continuing improvement, \$30,000.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is directed to cause to be prepared a compilation of all general laws that have been enacted from time to time by Congress for the maintenance, protection, and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States which are now in force, and to submit the same to Congress at its session in December next, together with such recommendation as to revision, emendation, or enlargement of the said laws, in his judgment, will be advantageous to the public interest.

SEC. 3. That section 13 of "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved September 19, 1890, is hereby amended by inserting the words "fifty thousand dollars" in lieu of the words "twenty-five thousand dollars" therein contained.

SEC. 4. That for preliminary examinations, surveys, except where otherwise herein especially provided for, contingencies, expenses connected with inspection of bridges, the service of notice required in such cases, the examination of bridge sites and reports thereon, and for incidental repairs for which there is no special appropriation for rivers and harbors, \$100,000: *Provided*, That no preliminary examinations, survey, project, or estimate for new works other than those designated in this act shall be made: *And provided further*, That after the regular or formal report on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed is submitted, no supplemental or additional report or estimate for the same fiscal year shall be made unless ordered by a resolution of Congress. The Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this act until funds for the commencement of the proposed work shall have been actually appropriated by law.

SEC. 5. That under the authority to make contracts for materials and work under the provisions of this act, in addition to the sums appropriated herein, the Secretary of War shall not obligate the Government to pay in any one fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1897, more than 25 per cent of the whole amount authorized to be let by any one of said contracts, except as herein otherwise specifically authorized to do: *Provided*, Any part of the annual allotment of 25 per cent herein provided for not earned and paid for material furnished or work done in one fiscal year may be paid for material furnished and work done under the contracts in any subsequent fiscal year: *Provided*, This limitation shall not apply to any project placed under contract wherein the total amount authorized to be expended shall not exceed \$500,000.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to cause preliminary examinations to be made at the following localities, to wit:

ALABAMA.

Beginning at a point at or near the site selected for Lock No. 13 on the Warrior River, and continuing up Valley River from its mouth, following the general course of said stream to Bessemer, Ala., thence up the valley to Birmingham and beyond to Five Mile Creek, at a point where sufficient head can be obtained to supply water for that part of said canal between Five Mile Creek and Bessemer, Ala. Said channel to have a minimum depth of 6 feet and be at least 50 feet in width at the water line.

CALIFORNIA.

Humboldt Harbor, dredging same along city front.
Napa River, to straighten channel from Napa to a point south of Carrs Bend and to make cut through Carrs Bend.
Petaluma Creek; straighten channel from railroad bridge to Donohue Landing.
Suisun Creek.

DELAWARE.

St. Johns River.
Cedar Creek.
Mispillion River.

FLORIDA.

Anclote River.
Jupiter Inlet.
Hillsboro Bay.
Crystal River.
Cedar Keys.

ILLINOIS.

The upper Illinois River and lower Des Plaines River, with a view to extension of navigation from Illinois River to Lake Michigan at or near Chicago.

KANSAS.

Neosho River, from the north line of Neosho County to the south line of Labette County, with a view to straightening and otherwise improving the channel of said river.

KENTUCKY.

Treadwater River.

LOUISIANA.

Bayou Grossetete.

MAINE.

Union River, near the city of Ellsworth, in Hancock County.
South channel of branch of Penobscot River, in Frankfort, in Waldo County, with view of removing an old wreck, and estimate of cost thereof.
Boothbay Harbor.
Chandler's River.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Salt Pond and Herring River, in Harwich.
Gurnet Rock and other rocks at mouth of Plymouth Harbor.
Duxbury Beach, with view to protection of harbor.
Duxbury Harbor, with view to widening and deepening improvement.

MICHIGAN.

Raisin River, in Monroe County, from mouth to Government Canal to the wharves.
Huron River, from mouth to the point of crossing by the Michigan Central Railroad.

MINNESOTA.

Mille Lacs Lake, with a view to the construction of a dam at the outlet on section 33, township 33 north, in range 27 west, in Mille Lacs County, for the aid of navigation on the Mississippi River, the same to be part of the general Upper Mississippi River reservoir system.
Stillwater, for preservation of harbor.

MISSISSIPPI.

Homochitto River, from mouth to the Yazoo and Mississippi Valley Railroad.

Coldwater River.
Ship Island Pass, with view to obtaining a channel of 26 feet depth at low tide in said pass between the Gulf of Mexico and Ship Island Harbor.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Oyster River.

NEW JERSEY.

Oldmans Creek.
Dividing Creek.
Wading River.
Tuckerton Creek and flats at mouth thereof.
Beach Thoroughfare at and near the meeting of tides from Absecon and Egg Harbor Inlet.
Barnegat Bay, between Mantoloking and Bay Head.

NEW YORK.

Channel connecting Flushing Bay and Newtown Creek.
Catskill Creek.
Oswego River, Oneida Lake, and Mohawk River, so as to connect them.
Mohawk River, between Rome and town of Schuyler.
Nyack Harbor.
Alexandria Bay.
Black River to harbor at Dexter.
Coney Island Creek.
Oyster Bay, with a view to its connection with Lloyd Harbor.
Channels between Far Rockaway and Inwood.
Northport Harbor.
Smithtown Harbor.
Wallabout Channel, by cutting off portion of island known as Cob Dock and securing width of 300 feet and depth of 20 feet.
Coney Island Channel, from Nortons Point to the bell buoy to the depth of 16 feet.

NORTH CAROLINA.

For a jetty near Bogue Inlet in order to remove sand bars.

OREGON.

Alsea River, from head of tide water to upper Alsea Valley.
Yaquina River, from the town of Yaquina to head of tide, including Big Elk River to Sunset Quarry.
Long Tom River, from mouth to town of Monroe.
Santiam River, from Jefferson to Willamette River.
Umpqua River, bar and entrance.
Siletz River, bar and entrance.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Removing dam in upper Allegheny near Corydon, and dam at Russell, and the rapids at or near Waterboro in the Conewango Creek, a tributary of the Allegheny River.

RHODE ISLAND.

Channel through Conanicut Island, Narragansett Bay.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Bartrand River.

TEXAS.

Channel between Brazos River and Galveston Bay.

WISCONSIN.

Portwing.

ARIZONA.

Colorado River.

WASHINGTON.

Puyallup River.
Neah River, with a view to its improvement as a harbor of refuge.
Duwamish River and its tributaries.
Mouth of Willapa River.
North River.

North Fork of Lewis River to head of tide water.
SEC. 7. That the Secretary of War is hereby directed, at his discretion, to cause surveys to be made and the cost of improvement to be estimated at the following localities, to wit:

ARKANSAS.

White River, Batesville to Buffalo Shoals, with a view to improving by slack-water navigation.
St. Francis River, Sunk Lands to Poplin, Mo.

CALIFORNIA.

Alviso Creek.
Shag Rock, Arch Rock, Blossom Rock, Two Mission Rocks, Anita Rock, all in San Francisco Harbor.
Redwood Creek.
Mare Island Strait.

CONNECTICUT.

Southport Harbor.
New Haven Harbor.
Housatonic River.
South Norwalk.
Niantic Harbor.

FLORIDA.
Apalachicola Bay.
Tampa Bay.
Withlacoochee River.
St. Lucia Inlet and River.

IDAHO.
Pend Oreille River (Flat Head River).

KENTUCKY.
Mouth of Tennessee River.
Green River, at or near its mouth, for new lock and dam.
Mouth of Cumberland River.

LOUISIANA.
Bayou Teche, St. Martinville to Port Barre.

MAINE.
Royal River.
Bagaduce River, leading up to Penobscot village.
Bangor Harbor and Penobscot River, including mouth of Kenduskeag River.

MARYLAND.
Inner Harbor Rock Hall.
Cambridge Harbor.

MASSACHUSETTS.
Merrimac River, from Lowell to New Hampshire State line.
Marblehead Harbor, with a view to improving the harbor by building a sea wall to protect the isthmus connecting Marblehead with the town of Marblehead.
Provincetown Harbor, with a view of erecting a dike for the protection of that harbor.
Neponset River.
Lynn Harbor, with a view to securing a channel 300 feet wide and 15 feet deep at low water.
Boston Harbor, with a view to securing a channel 1,200 feet wide and 30 feet deep from the navy-yard to the entrance of the present main ship channel, and from the main ship channel in Presidents Roads through Broad Sound Channel.
Mount Hope Bay and Fall River Harbor.
Manchester Harbor.
Connecticut River, between Holyoke and the foot of the rapids.
Harbor at Plymouth.

MISSISSIPPI.
Channel at the mouth of Pearl River leading to deep water in the Mississippi Sound, with a view to obtaining a 17-foot channel at low tide.
Pascagoula River, commencing at a point in the Mississippi Sound where the depth of water exceeds 17 feet, thence to the mouth of and up said river to the intersection of Dog River, and thence up Dog River 3 miles, with a view to obtaining a channel of 17 feet at low tide along the line of survey.
Horn Island Pass, and the passage leading from said pass to the anchorage inside Horn Island, with a view to obtaining in said pass and passage leading therefrom a channel of 20 feet at low tide.
Big Sunflower River, with a view to improving the same by locks and dams as high as Clarksdale.

MINNESOTA.
Big Stone Lake, with a view to the construction of reservoirs, in accordance with the report of Maj. W. A. Jones, of the Engineer Corps of the United States Army, dated January 16, 1895.
Red Lake River, with a view of improving Red Lake River from Thief River Falls to the Red Lake, in accordance with the report of Maj. W. A. Jones, of the Engineer Corps of the United States Army, dated February 26, 1895.

MICHIGAN.
Kalamazoo River from Saugatuck to New Richmond.
Harbor of Frankfort, with a view of obtaining an 18-foot depth of water.
Harbor of Holland (Black Lake), with a view of obtaining a 16-foot depth of water.
Harbor of Monroe, with a view of obtaining a 14-foot depth of water.
Harbor of refuge at Ontonagon, affording 18-foot depth of water.
Harbor at Menominee, Michigan and Wisconsin, with a view of obtaining a 20-foot depth of water.
Harbor at Charlevoix, with a view of obtaining 16-foot depth of water.
Rouge River, from Wabash Bridge crossing to Maples Road, with a view of obtaining 16-foot depth of water, expense thereof to be paid from money on hand for improvement of Rouge River.
South Haven.
Ludington Harbor.
Saginaw River.

NEW JERSEY.
Mantua Creek.
Salem River, from its mouth to Salem City.
Rahway River, from its mouth to Main Street Bridge.
Elizabeth River.
Absecon Inlet, with a view of maintaining 10 feet of water over the bar.

NEW YORK.
Bay Ridge, Gowanus Creek, Red Hook, and Buttermilk channels, with a view to making one continuous channel 30 feet in depth and of equal width.
Oak Orchard Harbor.

NORTH CAROLINA.
Cape Lookout harbor of refuge.
For a jetty near Bogue Inlet, to remove sand bar.

OREGON.
Clatskanie River, to town of Clatskanie.
Tillamook Bay, bar and entrance.
Nehalem River, from modified plan, to be paid for out of money on hand.

OHIO.
Starve Island Reef, near South Bass Island, in Lake Erie, with a view to obtaining a navigable channel 25 feet in depth over said reef.
Ohio River, Marietta to its mouth.

PENNSYLVANIA.
Schuylkill River.
Erie Harbor.
Allegheny River, to determine what remaining portion of said river can be made navigable, and the number, location, and cost of the necessary dams therefor.

RHODE ISLAND.
Sakonnet Point.
Easterly breakwater to shore, Point Judith, at Point Judith harbor of refuge.

TEXAS.
Sabine Lake.

TENNESSEE.

Emory River, from its mouth to the town of Harriman.

VERMONT.

Missisquoi River, Swanton to lake.

WISCONSIN.

Harbor at Kenosha, with a view to obtaining a channel 21 feet deep and basin 20 feet deep.

Harbor at Racine, with a view to obtaining a channel 21 feet deep.

Harbor at Milwaukee, with a view to obtaining a channel 21 feet deep.

Harbor at Ahnapee.

La Crosse Harbor.

Sheboygan, with a view of obtaining 21 feet.

MONTANA.

Kootenai River, for removal of obstructions above Jennings.

WASHINGTON.

Lewis River, from Columbia River to La Center.

Pend Oreille River, from its source at Lake Pend Oreille, Idaho, to the town of Metalline, Wash.

Bellingham Bay, from deep water to the mouth of Whatcom Creek, at New Whatcom.

Okanagon River.

Quillayute Harbor and River.

During the reading of the bill,

Mr. DINGLEY said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. It is important that the House should hear the bill read, in order to know what modifications have been made.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. Gentlemen desiring to converse will please retire to the cloakroom.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill as read be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE). The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered, and that the bill as read be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HOOKER. A second has already been ordered, and my request is that the bill as read be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the bill as read may be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOOKER. Now, Mr. Speaker, I renew my request, which I made some time ago, to enlarge the time for debate upon this measure.

A MEMBER. I object.

Mr. HOOKER. I ask that general debate be continued until 4 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule forty minutes would be allowed for debate. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time for debate be extended until 4 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. HEPBURN. I think that would only be an extension of about thirty minutes or less.

Mr. HOOKER. It would be more than that.

Mr. HEPBURN. There ought to be more debate than that upon this bill, which carries or authorizes \$63,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will suggest that the time might be extended until 5 o'clock.

Mr. HOOKER. I make that modification of my request.

Mr. HEPBURN. It will be remembered that the gentleman told us this morning that there had been amendments made to this bill this morning. Nobody knows what those amendments are. There ought to be some opportunity for explanation, and we ought not to commit ourselves to this extraordinary expenditure of \$63,000,000 with only forty minutes for debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time for debate be extended until 5 o'clock this evening. Is there objection?

Mr. HEPBURN. I ask that the time may be extended until 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks that it be extended to 5 o'clock.

Mr. HOOKER. That is my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That was the request—that the debate be extended until 5 o'clock.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Is it understood that the bill will then be open to amendments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No, sir. This is a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Then I object.

Mr. McMILLIN. I would state to the gentleman from California that the effect of his objection is to cut off debate, and does not put him in any better condition for amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule forty minutes is allowed for debate, twenty minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOOKER] and twenty minutes by those opposed to the bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. Who is to be recognized in opposition?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri will be recognized to control the time in opposition to the bill.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. OWENS. The Chair called to know whether there was objection or not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair asked if there was objection to the request of the gentleman from New York to extend the time for debate until 5 o'clock, and the gentleman from California objected.

Mr. OWENS. Objection was made?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection has been made.

Mr. OWENS. I did not know that.

Mr. HOOKER. I yield five minutes—

Mr. WHEELER. I ask unanimous consent that the debate be extended until 4 o'clock. Gentlemen will not object to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. HOOKER. I yield five minutes to my colleague on the committee [Mr. BURTON of Ohio].

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading features of this bill is the number of projects that are put under continuing contracts. That is to my mind the most commendable feature of the bill, and therefore has my hearty approval. In the preservation of our public works that system will be adopted in all the biennial appropriations under the river and harbor act—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The House will be in order.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, if there is to be no opportunity to offer amendments to this bill, I have no objection to the debate continuing until 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California withdraws his objection to extending the time for debate on this bill until 5 o'clock. Is there further objection?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The withdrawal of the objection is too late. Debate has proceeded under the rule.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks not, if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] will yield for that purpose.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Certainly; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio objects.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the leading feature of this bill is the number of projects placed under the continuing-contract system. This is at the same time its most commendable feature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The House will be in order.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, if there is to be no opportunity to offer amendments to this bill, I have no objection to the debate continuing until 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California withdraws his objection to extending the time for debate on this bill until 5 o'clock. Is there further objection?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The withdrawal of the objection is too late; debate has proceeded under the rule.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks not, if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] will yield for that purpose.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Certainly; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio objects.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. In the prosecution of our public works, so sure as we pursue the best methods, this plan will be adopted in all. I hope the time is not far distant when this biennial river and harbor act will include only provisions for repair and maintenance and for the payment of the first installment on projects, appropriations for which thereafter will be made annually as the work progresses. In the first place, this is the most economical system. It requires little discrimination to see that for every project a plant must be provided and certain expenses incurred, whether the whole of the work is to be done or only an insignificant fraction of it.

Notwithstanding the fact that the new method has not yet been tried under the most favorable circumstances, we are not without experience as to its results. It appears that public works placed under this system in 1890 and 1892 have been finished at a diminished cost, varying in amount, but averaging 30 per cent. A communication from the Chief of Engineers dated March 25, 1896, addressed to Hon. W. B. HOOKER, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, contains the following references to specific projects:

Harbor at Charleston, S. C.—The saving by the continuous system of appropriations was \$545,500, being for the portion covered by the contract at the rate of 33 per cent.

Harbor at Savannah, Ga.—The total saving which can be determined as resulting in Savannah Harbor from the system of continuing contracts has been, in round numbers, \$900,000, or about 25 per cent of the entire cost of the improvement.

Mississippi River from the Head of the Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River.—It is estimated that the saving, by lowering the prices 30 per cent under the continuing contracts equals \$1,000,000.

Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River to Minneapolis, Minn.—The great advantage and economy of work under this system of continuous appropriations have been most manifest. The cost of work both by day labor, in which the Government part has been materially reduced, and under contracts with private parties has been materially reduced. Under conditions of uncertainty as to amount of future appropriations or time of availability it is impossible to make definite arrangements for procuring labor or material long in advance or in sufficient quantities to justify contractors in making adequate arrangements and low prices. The saving to the United States as a result of the continuing appropriations has been, for the portion of the Mississippi between the mouth of the Missouri and Minneapolis, not less than 15 per cent, or approximately \$500,000 in the four years' work. For the stretch from the mouth of the Ohio to the mouth of the Missouri the saving was fully as much, making the saving for the Mississippi between the mouth of the Ohio and Minneapolis under the four years of continuing appropriations about \$1,000,000. The future percentage of saving which may be expected to result from a continuance of the system of continuous appropriations would be even greater, as the work is more thoroughly organized.

Missouri River from its mouth to Sioux City, Iowa.—Comparing the results obtained under the two systems, it is seen that the work as carried on under continuous and undiverted appropriations can be executed from 25 to 50 per cent less than when executed under the system of annual and uncertain appropriations.

Ship channel connecting waters of the Great Lakes between Chicago, Duluth, and Buffalo.—It is believed that in this work of improvement the saving under the continuous-contract system has not been less than \$500,000, or about 15 per cent of the original estimate.

Humboldt Harbor and Bay, California.—Considering the amount of work already done and the amount estimated to complete the work, it is calculated that there is a saving under the continuing-contract system of \$982,292, or about 30 per cent.

A letter from the late General Casey, former Chief of Engineers, dated March 30, 1892, contains the following:

At the Hay Lake Channel the work, estimated to cost \$2,659,115, will be completed upon the execution of the existing contracts, and fully \$900,000 within the estimate, a saving of one-third, or 33 per cent.

Also:

Philadelphia Harbor.—The price under the continuing contract is only 33 per cent of the average price which during the past ten years has been paid on the Delaware for similar dredging under annual contracts.

In addition to the direct results from actual saving in cost, equally important advantages arise from the earlier utilization of the completed project and the diminished injury from deterioration or decay resulting from tardy completion of the work by sections. Under the traditional policy for the construction of buildings and for river and harbor improvements, piecemeal appropriations are doled out in a halting and dilatory manner, and often before the capstone is placed upon a structure the foundation begins to rot; and before a breakwater or pier is finished, the end at which it was commenced is so decayed that the waves of the first storm threaten to wash it away.

Not only is this the most economical plan, it is at the same time, it is not too much to say, more courageous and honest. Under the old system of biennial appropriations partial appropriations were made for the beginnings of expensive public works when the facts as to the total amount required were not well known to the House and without the careful consideration, which would have been given, had there been discussion upon the desirability of appropriating the full amount necessary. The result was that many projects were undertaken without sufficient knowledge of their merits; but after the work was once commenced, the argument was used that the Government should not abandon the project to which we had committed ourselves by partial appropriations, because the amount already expended would be lost and we should be subjected to the reproach of having abandoned enterprises once begun.

Under the new system, the inevitable result will be to give more careful consideration to a project before it is commenced and then, if adopted, to prosecute it to completion in the most prompt and economical manner.

The argument is also made that this bill is extravagant. This argument comes with very poor grace when we consider that this House a few days ago, almost without a dissenting voice, appropriated in one bill over thirty millions for our naval establishment. This is the one appropriation made by the General Government, the immediate result of which is to increase the wealth and commercial development of our country. Indeed, it not only provides better channels and harbors for commerce, but even in case of war provides improvements for waterways quite as essential for our safety as battle ships and cruisers. The sums expended are not extravagant, but, on the contrary, very small, when we take into account the enormous extent of our seacoast along the Gulf and the two great oceans, and the unequalled mileage of our rivers, to which we must add the marvelous traffic on the Great Inland Lakes, the most surprising of all.

In order to maintain our place among the nations we must increase our exports. The sharp competition which has been brought to bear in supplying our home markets has not yet been exerted in securing foreign trade. This is largely due to the fact that we have a home market the greatest in the world, and by the further fact that, until within the last twenty years, we with little effort, a practical monopoly in supplying foreign

markets with staple products. Until recent years we largely supplied the markets of the world with cotton, the fabric most used for clothing; with the wheat which furnishes bread; also with tobacco, the luxury used by the greatest number. But in recent years active competitors have arisen in the furnishing of each of these staples in either hemisphere and on both sides of the equator. In order to regain and maintain the great advantage which we formerly possessed, nothing can be of so great an assistance as the improvement of our great harbors and the development of a better system of inland transportation by improving navigable rivers.

Neither is the objection that appropriations for rivers and harbors have sometimes been wasted a valid one. Beyond the inevitable loss or waste belonging to every system of expenditure maintained on a large scale, and in an era when inventions are yearly revolutionizing methods of construction, there have not been injudicious expenditures in the river and harbor bills. The waste has not been as great as in other branches of the public service. Many of the most expensive ships built for our Navy, constructed according to the best models of the time, are now rusting away at wharves, utterly useless to-day, though costing millions. The navy of Great Britain, designed in accordance with the most perfect development of the art of shipbuilding, numbers in the admiralty list useless hulks which cost millions of pounds.

The accusation of extravagance in these expenditures for rivers and harbors is effectually disproved by a comparison with the methods of other nations of more developed resources. England and France illustrate two widely different lines of policy in the provision made for aids to commerce and transportation. In Great Britain these improvements are for the most part undertaken by private corporations or agencies other than the Imperial Government. These enterprises have been undertaken upon an enormous scale. Undoubtedly more capital is invested there in harbors, docks, and inland waterways than in any other country. In recent years the Tyne, at and below Newcastle, has been deepened and other improvements made at a cost of \$20,000,000. On the Mersey and the Clyde much larger sums have been expended. The Manchester Canal, 35½ miles in length, has recently been completed at a cost of \$75,000,000. In other private canal companies \$150,000,000 is invested. This method of improvement by private corporations or local authorities is not suited to our methods, or, especially in the case of inland waterways, to the greater extent of territory involved in each improvement.

It is true that plausible arguments have been made for the adoption of a system in this country under which a fraction—say one-third or one-fourth—of the expense of river and harbor improvements should be paid by local authorities or collected from the locality regarded as especially benefited and the balance by the General Government. It is maintained by the advocates of this plan, that this division would secure a more equitable adjustment of the burden of the expense and assure good faith and the exercise of the best judgment in the adoption of projects for improvement. The objections are that all these projects have come to be regarded as distinctly national in their character and not to be undertaken unless proper subjects of expenditure from the national Treasury; that the necessity of including different localities and States in a single improvement would require a concert of action by numerous and perhaps varying interests, almost impossible to obtain; and further, that less deserving projects would be presented, with offers to furnish the portion to be paid by local taxation, and these would obtain recognition to the exclusion of more valuable projects for which less pecuniary support could be furnished. The tendency of legislation on this subject from the time when Madison, in 1817, declared he found no warrant in the Constitution for expenditures for internal improvements has been for the General Government to undertake these improvements and provide for the payment of the whole expense in case the direct and principal result is to aid commerce, but to require of local authorities a share of the expense when, as in the case of the levees along the Mississippi River, particular localities receive, in protection to property or otherwise, a benefit distinct from that obtained from improved facilities for navigation.

In assistance rendered by the Government to harbors and to inland navigation, the nation with which comparison can most aptly be made is France. In the United States the total of appropriations made for rivers and harbors since the formation of the Government, including amounts appropriated for continuing contracts under the sundry civil bill, is \$273,638,515. France, in the period from 1814 to 1894, inclusive, for which carefully prepared statistics are available, has made expenditures for the betterment of inland waterways and for ports, appearing on the budget in two forms—first, "travaux extraordinaires," improvements and additions intended to be permanent, which when complete will not require to be renewed; second, "travaux ordinaires," expenses of annual occurrence, for care and maintenance, in which are sometimes included branches and permanent improvements of minor importance.

Under the first, or permanent class, there has been expended by France in the eighty-one years mentioned approximately \$500,000,000, of which the sum of \$300,000,000 has been for rivers and canals, inland navigation, and \$200,000,000 for ports and harbors.

Under the second head of "Care and maintenance," which, equally with the former, should be counted in order to make an accurate comparison, there has been expended in the same time, approximately, \$135,000,000 for inland navigation and \$70,000,000 for ports and harbors, making a total for both classes of expenditure, in round numbers, of \$435,000,000 for inland navigation and \$270,000,000 for harbors; in all, \$705,000,000. It will thus appear that the amount expended by France has been more than two and one-half times as great as that expended in this country, yet a single State in this Union has a greater area than all of France. Equally significant is a comparison of individual projects and localities. Upon the River Seine alone, for a distance of less than 250 miles, between Paris and Havre, there has been expended 61,000,000 of francs, or about \$12,000,000, an amount nearly equal to the total amount appropriated by this Government for the improvement of the Ohio and all its branches, excluding the Cumberland and Tennessee. Yet these rivers have a length of 4,406 miles of navigable water, and in the valley of the Ohio, including the Monongahela, Allegheny, Muskingum, Great and Little Kanawha, Kentucky, Green, and other tributaries, there is an empire as rich in its resources as any equal body of land in the world.

Even more impressive is the contrast when we compare expenditures for harbors. The port of Boston, the second ocean port of the United States, has received in appropriations, from the beginning, from the General Government, \$2,804,000. The port of New York, for the divers improvements included in the harbor and neighboring channels, comprising all expenses from and including Sandy Hook on the one side to and including the Harlem River on the other, has received \$3,449,911. The cities of Buffalo and Chicago, located upon the Great Lakes, and second and third among American ports in amount of tonnage entering and clearing, have received in appropriations, respectively, \$2,861,480.41 and \$2,272,400 (including Calumet). The city of Cleveland, the leading shipowning and shipbuilding port of the Great Lakes, has received \$1,647,994.84. Yet on the single port of Havre, not the greatest port of France, there was expended from 1814 to 1891, the last year for which official figures for separate harbors are available, a sum slightly in excess of \$32,000,000; on the harbor of Marseilles, \$19,000,000; on that of Dunkirk, \$20,000,000. Yet each of these ports, with the exception of Marseilles, has, in tonnage, a traffic less than the least of the American ports mentioned. More in detail, the expenditures for improvements in France for the period mentioned, 1814 to 1894, inclusive, expressed in French money, have been as follows:

For inland navigation—		
Rivers:		Francs.
Extraordinaires	635,051,827	
Ordinaires	404,513,274	
Total for rivers		1,039,565,101
Canals:		
Extraordinaires	839,201,789	
Ordinaires	271,188,244	
Total for canals		1,110,390,033
Total for inland navigation		2,149,955,134
For ports and harbors (maritime):—		
Extraordinaires	992,738,007	
Ordinaires	347,460,428	
Total for ports and harbors		1,340,198,035
Grand total		3,490,144,169

Of this amount 111,043,235 francs was for light-houses, beacons, buoys, etc., the management of which in this country is under the Treasury Department, although these amounts are properly chargeable to appropriations for purposes of navigation. But, on the other hand, in addition to the expenditures above, something over 140,000,000 francs was expended for reparation of improvements and the acquisition of canals, etc. The latter was charged to the military establishment, though really expended for navigation. For maintenance and dredging, etc., in the years 1836 to 1876, inclusive, there was expended for rivers as follows:

	Francs.
The Garonne	22,084,669
The Rhine	25,335,358
The Loire	30,460,122
The Rhone	32,137,674

The exact expenditure on the harbors named, to and including 1891, was as follows:

	Francs.
Havre	163,324,988
Dunkirk	104,000,000
Marseilles	94,959,951

The public men and economists of France are practically unanimous in the opinion that these expenditures have been of the greatest benefit to the whole country, and that the amount required should be supplied by national taxation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

On motion of Mr. HOOKER, unanimous consent was given for general leave to extend in the RECORD remarks made upon this bill.

[Mr. WASHINGTON addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is now time that the gentleman in charge of the opposition, Mr. DOCKERY, should occupy some of his time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] is recognized to control the time in opposition to the motion.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of just and proper appropriations for the improvement of the great rivers and waterways of the country; but I am not in favor of a policy which, in order to secure that desirable result, compels us to appropriate for unimportant creeks and streams. Mr. Speaker, I would not favor the passage of this bill, even though I approved every line of it, under a suspension of the rules, which forbids the right of amendment and limits all debate to forty minutes.

I know the suggestion has been made—and possibly it explains the appearance of this bill to-day, clamoring for passage under suspension of the rules—that it is not safe to trust this body, because of the apprehension that the bill, if considered in the ordinary way, would be largely increased in its items and aggregate.

It may be that this is a correct view of the situation; I do not positively assert that it is not. But I insist, Mr. Speaker, that any bill imposing upon the people of the United States direct appropriations exceeding \$10,000,000 and liabilities in other forms in excess of \$51,000,000 should be considered by the representatives of the people under the five-minute rule, which permits debate and amendment. The bill as reported to the House carries in direct appropriations \$10,330,560. The chairman of the committee advises me that the committee has added by way of amendments \$97,000 additional, thus swelling the total of direct appropriation to \$10,427,560. The bill also authorizes contracts amounting to \$51,721,210.91, making a grand total of liabilities upon the Treasury of \$62,148,770.91. This becomes, therefore, the largest river and harbor bill known to our constitutional history.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must hurry on, because other gentlemen wish to be heard. I desire, however, to refer for just a moment to the history of the contract system. It had its origin in the Fiftieth Congress, when an appropriation was made for the construction of the building for the Library of Congress and contracts authorized to be made in excess of the amount appropriated. I am advised by a gentleman who is well informed that this was the first appearance of the contract system upon our statutes. The precedent thus established was followed by the Fifty-first and Fifty-second Congresses. The Fifty-first Congress authorized five contracts for river and harbor improvements, and, in addition to an appropriation of \$2,340,000, fixed the limit of the cost of such improvements at \$13,282,980, making the total of appropriations and liabilities for the Congress \$15,622,980. The Fifty-second Congress followed with the authorization of thirteen contracts, in which authority was given to impose upon the Government contract liabilities amounting to \$31,760,521; so that the total of appropriations and of contracts authorized by the Fifty-first and Fifty-second Congresses under this system was \$47,383,501. The Fifty-third Congress declined to authorize any new contracts for the improvement of rivers and harbors.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. I will, if the gentleman will be brief.

Mr. HOPKINS. Has not experience shown that the contract system of doing public work is a measure of economy to the General Government?

Mr. DOCKERY. Undoubtedly, as to any given work, it is more businesslike and more economical to apply the contract system. But it is obvious, from the figures I have submitted, that whenever we enter upon the policy of giving the note or obligation of the Government instead of the cash it results in the imposition of increased liabilities.

Mr. HOPKINS. Right there, allow me another question.

Mr. DOCKERY. In a moment. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, in these two Congresses the liabilities were \$47,383,501. The precedent established by the Fiftieth Congress is to be followed in this Congress by authorizing thirty-two new contracts, the limit of cost being \$51,721,210.91. I will now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOPKINS. Is it not a fact that in this appropriation bill no contract is provided for except as to works for which appropriations have heretofore been made?

Mr. DOCKERY. I am not advised on that point; but if the gentleman so states, I assume that he is correct.

Mr. HOPKINS. And the contracts authorized by the present bill run, some of them, for six years, do they not?

Mr. DOCKERY. I think they do.

Mr. HOPKINS. So that when the gentleman says that these

expenditures will amount to something more than \$50,000,000, it makes the annual appropriation less than \$10,000,000.

Mr. DOCKERY. It is conceded that the contract system, in so far as a given work is concerned, is more economical; but the result of the system is manifest in this bill. While it is true that members secure small appropriations because of the present condition of the Treasury, yet it is also true that under this system the revenues of the future are mortgaged; so that while in individual cases the contract system operates in the interest of economy, yet the net result as shown by the aggregate is an enormous increase of the liabilities of the Government.

Mr. HOPKINS. I deny in toto the gentleman's conclusions, and state broadly and unqualifiedly that the result of this system is economy not only in the particular cases, but in the general result.

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not know how the gentleman reaches his conclusions.

Mr. HOPKINS. On facts.

Mr. DOCKERY. I know that more than eighteen hundred years ago there were "doubting Thomases"; and it is said that there were those then who would not believe "though one rose from the dead."

Mr. MERCER. How do you know? [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MERCER] should exhibit such a lack of familiarity with the Sacred Book.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are facts; they are figures taken from the official records, showing that this bill carries more than sixty-two millions of obligations which must be met by the taxpayers of the country, and yet it is to be crowded through the House under a suspension of the rules, without the right of amendment and with but twenty minutes' debate on either side. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the passage of this bill because of its exorbitant demands upon the Treasury. Its passage under a suspension of the rules is without precedent as to this bill in recent years and should invite the condemnation of the country.

Mr. SPEAKER, what time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has ten minutes remaining.

[Mr. WHEELER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we have exhausted about half of our time, I ask the gentleman from Missouri to occupy a portion of his.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has ten minutes, the gentleman from New York twelve, remaining.

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield nine minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

[Mr. HEPBURN addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. HOOKER. I yield five minutes of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS].

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, before attempting to make some reply to the extraordinary harangue with which we have been honored by our distinguished friend [Mr. HEPBURN], I desire to say that I have served on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors ever since my entrance into Congress. No river and harbor appropriation bill has been framed during the last ten years in whose construction I did not actively participate. I want to say here now, in all frankness and candor, that the bill which the committee have presented to the House on this occasion is by all odds the most carefully drawn, the most scientific in its construction, and will redound most to the benefit of the country of any bill which has ever passed since I have been in Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, my friend Mr. HEPBURN always indulges in great poetic license when he assails the Mississippi River. I wish to call him down upon his statement that two-thirds of all the money which has been appropriated for that river has been expended in the construction of levees. I say to him now that eleven millions of the twenty-six millions have gone into the construction of levees along the banks of that river. I wish also to say to him that during the same time the riparian owners, of their own means, have expended the enormous sum of \$14,000,000, so that the work has gone along by a system of cooperation between the Federal Government and the riparian owners. I wish also to remind the gentleman of a fact which he well knows—for he has made a great study of this question, having fought it whenever it was presented for consideration—that the Board of Army Engineers appointed in 1879 to consider this question reported that it was absolutely essential, if there was to be any navigation of that stream during its flood period, that these levees should be constructed; that without confining the flood there could be no commerce upon the river, there could be no navigation, no places for the boats to land, no commerce for them to engage in if they could land. So that constructing the levees has had the specific purpose of enabling those who would use that river to navigate it and transact their business upon it in its periods of greatest flood.

So far as concerns the lower water navigation of the river, I wish to say that the work has not progressed as rapidly as we had expected, because the contraction and revetment works have turned out to be more expensive than the engineers at their inception expected that they would be; but during the last few years there has been a most tremendous development of what is known as the hydraulic dredge, which was invented in 1854, but which was never practically utilized on any public works until between 1890 and 1892. But it has now reached that point of magnificent performance where we have a dredge now constructed which on a test a few weeks ago removed the enormous and unprecedented amount of 6,700 cubic yards per hour. The commission is providing a fleet of just such dredges for the purpose of dredging these sand bars and affording navigation during the low period of the river, and this bill especially requires that so much of the money as shall be necessary shall be expended in the way of obtaining a channel 9 feet deep from St. Louis to the Gulf, not less than 250 feet wide.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question there?

Mr. CATCHINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEPBURN. Is not this very dredging an abandonment of every scheme which has heretofore been formed and a return to the old methods before the Commission was created?

Mr. CATCHINGS. No, sir; the gentleman does not know what he is talking about. [Applause.] There has never been a dredge boat along the Lower Mississippi River, and removing sand bars until within the last few years by dredging would have been an impossibility. There never was the possibility of dredging a sand bar on the lower river until this hydraulic system was discovered, and if my friend knew anything of this subject, about which he declaims so vigorously, he would know that what I say is absolutely true.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of all the Western States have flocked before our committee and demanded that this appropriation should go on. There is nothing in this bill more meritorious or more worthy of the respect and favor of the House. We all agree with Henry Clay, who declared more than forty years ago that if there was any one thing national in its character, it was the great Mississippi River. And we also know that that other great distinguished statesman, John C. Calhoun, departed from his ordinary position in reference to the power of the Government to make internal improvements and favored this, because he said that it was just what we all know it to be—a great inland sea.

Mr. Speaker, I beg this House to pay little heed to what the gentleman from Iowa has said, as he has opposed every river and harbor bill, and never has voted for one, and never will, because of his prejudices, notwithstanding his protestations.

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield one minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McLACHLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the motion of the gentleman from New York, to suspend the rules and pass this bill, for the reason that if this course is pursued it will give no opportunity to anyone to offer any amendments to this important measure, making appropriations aggregating over \$60,000,000 of the people's money, including the continuous contracts provided for therein. I assume that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have faith in the justice and merits of the bill that it has presented here to-day, and, if I am right in this assumption, that committee can surely have no valid objection to submitting their labors and conclusions to the deliberate judgment of this House and give us a reasonable opportunity to investigate them for ourselves.

The members of this committee will not claim to be infallible, or assume that their judgment upon many features of this bill is superior to that of the whole House. This bill is far from being satisfactory to me or the people whom I represent. San Pedro Harbor, the point in my district where two great transcontinental railroads touch tide water on the Pacific coast, has received the most miserly consideration at the hands of this committee, notwithstanding the most reasonable demands that we made of it; and I now urge you to defeat this resolution to suspend the rules and pass this bill, so that I may have an opportunity to present to this House the merits of our claim for San Pedro and southern California. Having had an opportunity to do that, I must be satisfied with the result. But if this resolution prevails I will have no opportunity to present our case to the House, and must submit to the wrong perpetrated by this committee against an improvement that deserves far better consideration than it has received at the hands of the committee. There are other localities that have similar grievances against the provisions of this bill, and we simply demand an opportunity to be heard. This is reasonable; this is just.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, in the half minute remaining I only desire the attention of members while I make one suggestion. If you desire to offer amendments, the way to secure such right is to vote down the motion to suspend the rules, and then the bill will come up in the usual way in which it has always been con-

sidered in recent years, and you can offer amendments and have them considered.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question before he sits down. If the gentleman's suggestion were adopted, would he then support the bill? I ask him to answer that question.

Mr. DOCKERY. It would depend upon the condition of the bill when it had been completed. [Cries of "Ah!" and laughter.]

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is there remaining on the other side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time on the other side has been consumed, and the gentleman from New York has seven minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. HOOKER. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, against the declamation of my valued colleague from my State, I simply want to state one practical fact, being a practical man. Within ten days the traffic manager of a railway between St. Paul and St. Louis was in my room. I said to him, "Colonel, what is the practical benefit to the people of the Mississippi Valley, from a railroad standpoint, of our Mississippi River improvements?" He said, "It amounts to 50 per cent reduction of railroad transportation rates for the Mississippi Valley for a great part of the year." [Great applause.]

Mr. HOOKER. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. COLSON].

[Mr. COLSON addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to my colleague on the committee [Mr. HERMANN].

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Speaker, no policy on the part of this Congress has proven so beneficial, so profitable, and so lasting to all parts of this Union and to all its people as the policy of appropriations for liberal waterway improvements. The great problem of the present day is cheaper transportation. Deeper water means deeper draft ships, and deeper draft ships give us greater carrying capacity, and this produces cheaper freights. Ten years ago in the port of Boston no ship of a carrying capacity of 2,500 tons could enter and depart from that port. To-day a vessel carrying 10,000 tons and drawing 30 feet and 6 inches of water can enter and depart without any difficulty; and the testimony is that the reduction of freights amounts to 40 per cent. That has been the result in the last decade.

Now, there is no policy so popular among the American people as these liberal waterway appropriations. A few years ago many Representatives on this floor earned their title to reelection by their opposition to the river and harbor bill; and to-day, sir, that same opposition would result in their defeat. More money is appropriated now in a single bill than was appropriated from the foundation of this Government up to the year 1860. In the decade between 1880 and 1890 we appropriated \$108,000,000 for the improvement of the waterways of the United States; yet, liberal as we are in our appropriations for our waterways, our policy is illiberal in comparison with that pursued by foreign nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I can not, in the time remaining, expect to explain every portion of this bill, but I desire to make a few observations concerning the bill and some of the remarks that have been made by gentlemen who have preceded me. This is not the first time a river and harbor bill has been passed under a suspension of the rule. This is not the first time that my friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] has made remarks concerning the passage of a large appropriation bill under a suspension of the rules. If I recollect correctly, in the Fifty-third Congress the legislative, executive, and judicial bill, of which the gentleman from Missouri had charge, carrying about \$25,000,000, was passed under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, no. I have never had charge of a bill since I have been connected with Congress that passed under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. HOOKER. Well, you were a member of the committee that reported the bill to the House, and that bill was passed without giving an opportunity to debate it for twenty-five minutes, or even for five minutes. So much for that.

I am somewhat surprised at my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] picking up this bill, selecting a few States, calling the attention of the House to them, and saying with a great deal of assurance that the State of Maine gets over \$1,000,000 in this bill. When he made that statement he knew well enough that in the appropriation carried for the State of Maine over one and a half millions was placed upon continuous contracts, and that for those two projects only \$40,000 in actual cash was appropriated. When he spoke of the appropriation for the State of Massachusetts he knew that in that total there was one item of over a million dollars for the city of Boston, and that there was not a dollar of money in that sum appropriated. He would also have known, had he read the bill, that in the aggregate of the appropriations

for the State of New York there were upwards of \$4,000,000 placed under the continuous-contract system, one item of which was \$2,200,000 for the city of Buffalo, and that there is not one dollar of money appropriated in this bill for that project.

I am not surprised that the gentleman lays so much stress on the Mississippi River appropriation. That has been his hobby ever since I have been in Congress, and it was his hobby long before I came to Congress, and to-day he has not advanced a solitary new argument relative to the matter, and it is strange to me that after his objections have year after year been so completely answered he should now offer them again.

In the Forty-ninth Congress he made a similar fight against the Mississippi River appropriation, and he has continued it ever since while he has been a member of the House. If the gentleman had examined the items in this bill concerning the appropriation for the Mississippi River Commission and the Missouri River Commission he would have discovered that the language of the appropriation in this bill for the Mississippi and the Missouri rivers is almost identical with that of former provisions for those rivers. In other words, in the Fifty-second Congress we appropriated \$16,000,000 for the Mississippi River, and under this bill we appropriate only \$14,400,000. This bill carries with it in cash items \$10,432,560, and authorizes the Secretary of War to enter into contracts for the completion of works to the amount of \$51,721,210.91. So I might go through the entire bill.

The committee has been considering the items that make up this bill for three months past. We have listened to representatives of this House and of the Senate from almost every State and Territory in the Union, and of the numerous items in the bill, amounting to about five hundred in number, every one has been considered by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors as a whole, and none of them have been considered by a subcommittee. There are only about twenty-two new projects contained in this bill, and the committee state to the House that there is not a single item, not a single new project, not a single new proposition in this river and harbor bill that has not been debated and legislated upon by Congress in years past, and every item of expenditure is justified by the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOOKER. I ask for a vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOOKER] to suspend the rules and pass this bill.

The question being taken, the Speaker pro tempore declared that in the opinion of the Chair the ayes had it.

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 216, noes 40.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HEPBURN. Simply to remark that this vote shows the general evenness with which the "pork" has been distributed. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate is not in order. Upon this question the ayes are 216 and the noes are 40—

Mr. TALBERT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused, only 26 members voting in favor thereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Upon this question the ayes are 216 and the noes are 40; two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules are suspended and the bill is passed. [Applause.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I move that the House now adjourn, if there is nothing else to do.

Mr. Low addressed the Chair.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I withdraw the motion.

LEGALIZING BOND ISSUES IN NEW MEXICO.

Mr. LOW. I move to suspend the rules and pass, with the amendments as reported by the Committee on Territories, the bill (H. R. 4052) approving certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico authorizing the issue of certain bonds of said Territory.

The bill, with the amendments of the Senate as proposed to be amended by the Committee on the Territories, was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the coupon bonds and indebtedness of the Territory of New Mexico, amounting to \$75,000, authorized by section 7 of an act of the Thirty-first legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico entitled "An act authorizing the rebuilding of the Territorial capitol at Santa Fe, which was destroyed by fire May 12, 1892, and to provide the necessary means therefor and a board with authority to rebuild the same," approved February 5, 1895, and designated as capitol rebuilding bonds of the Territory of New Mexico;

Also, the bonds and indebtedness, amounting to \$15,000, authorized by section 1 of an act of the said legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico entitled "An act to provide for the maintenance of the military institute at Roswell, N. Mex.," approved February 13, 1895.

Also, the bonds and indebtedness, amounting to the sum of \$30,000, authorized by section 1 of an act of the said legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico entitled "An act to provide an addition to the insane asylum

of New Mexico for the accommodation of all the insane persons of the Territory, and for other purposes," approved May 13, 1895; and

Also, the bonds and indebtedness, amounting to the sum of \$35,000, authorized by section 1 of an act of the said legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico entitled "An act to provide for the completion of the buildings for the normal schools of New Mexico at Las Vegas and Silver City, and to provide for the necessary furnishings therefor; and for additions to the New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, at Las Cruces," approved February 27, 1895, be, and the same are hereby, approved, confirmed, and made valid; also, the certain bonds and indebtedness, \$172,500 in amount, together with the interest coupons thereto attached, of the county of Santa Fe, Territory of New Mexico, dated March 1, 1892, issued under the provisions of an act of the Territorial general assembly known as the refunding act. Such bonds having been issued in refunding and in lieu of \$150,000 of bonds, and the overdue interest thereon, of said county of Santa Fe, theretofore issued and outstanding, and hereby validated, approved, and confirmed.

Also the certain bonds and indebtedness, together with interest coupons thereto attached, of the county of Santa Fe, Territory of New Mexico, dated September 29, 1891, issued under the provisions of an act of the Territorial general assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, entitled "An act for the financial relief of counties and municipalities," approved February 26, 1891.

Such bonds having been issued in refunding and in lieu of \$150,000 of bonds, overdue interest, and a judgment rendered thereon, of said county of Santa Fe, theretofore, in the year 1880, issued and outstanding, are hereby validated, approved, and confirmed. Also the certain bonds and indebtedness, \$56,000 in amount, together with the interest coupons thereto attached, of the county of Grant, Territory of New Mexico, dated July 1, 1883, being the unretired part of an issue of \$60,000 in bonds issued by said county of Grant under the provisions of an act of the Territorial general assembly dated February 1, 1872, are hereby validated, approved, and confirmed. Also the certain bonds and indebtedness, \$50,000 in amount, together with the interest coupons thereto attached, of the city of Silver City, county of Grant, Territory of New Mexico, dated March 1, 1893, issued under the provisions of an act of the Territorial general assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, entitled "An act enabling the authorities having charge of the finances of any town or city of the Territory of New Mexico to refund any bonds or other obligations of said town or city by the issuance of similar obligations bearing a less rate of interest," approved February 11, 1891. Such bonds having been issued in refunding and in lieu of bonds and indebtedness to the amount of \$50,000 of said city of Silver City, county of Grant, theretofore issued and outstanding, are hereby validated, approved, and confirmed.

It is intended hereby to validate, approve, and confirm any and all laws, ordinances, and proceedings, and bonds relating to the matter necessary to the validation of the said Santa Fe County, Grant County, and town of Silver City bonds, but no further and for no other purpose.

The said county of Santa Fe is hereby authorized and empowered to again refund all or any portion of the indebtedness thereof by this act validated within one year from the passage of this act, in accordance with the terms and provisions of an act of the legislature of the Territory of New Mexico, being chapter 79, entitled "An act for the financial relief of counties and municipalities" (House bill No. 192), approved February 26, 1891, except that such refunded bonds shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, and shall become due twenty-five years from the date of the issue of such refunded bonds, and shall be issued for the amount of unpaid principal of the bonds of said county by this act validated, with interest thereon from the date thereof, to wit, September, 1891, and March, 1892, respectively, at the rate of 4 per cent per annum until the date when the sum shall be refunded as herein provided, less the amount of interest heretofore paid on such bonds; and when said bonds shall be so refunded they shall be subject in all other respects to all the provisions, liabilities, rights, obligations, benefits, and advantages of said act of the legislature herein referred to. In case said bonds shall not be refunded by said county of Santa Fe upon the terms and conditions in this section set forth, then the bonds validated by this act shall remain as the legal obligation of said Santa Fe County.

If said bonds shall be refunded as herein provided, the holders of the bonds herein validated shall, upon actual notice given by said county, deliver to said county the bonds herein validated, and shall receive in lieu thereof the refunded bonds provided for in this section: *Provided*, That any of said bonds which shall not be delivered for refunding to said county of Santa Fe within six months after said notice shall be given, as herein required, shall not bear a rate of interest greater than 4 per cent per annum from date of issue: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to make the Government of the United States liable or responsible for the payment of any of said bonds by this act approved, confirmed, and made valid.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act approving certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, authorizing the issue of certain bonds of said Territory, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill as proposed to be amended.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. On that motion I demand a second.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. I object.

Mr. LOW and Mr. COOPER of Texas having been appointed as tellers, the House divided on the question of seconding the motion for the previous question; and the tellers reported—ayes 92, noes 1.

So a second was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Low] is recognized for twenty minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COOPER] will be recognized for the same time, if he desires it.

Mr. LOW. As my distinguished associate on the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. OWENS], is thoroughly conversant with all the legal points of this question, as well as eminently qualified to answer any inquiries which members may desire to make, I yield to him.

Mr. OWENS. A short statement of the history of this matter will perhaps furnish the best explanation that I can give.

Some time ago the House passed a bill validating certain bonds which had been issued by different counties and municipalities in the Territory of New Mexico. Certain informalities had arisen, and some question was raised in regard to the validity of those bonds, and it was deemed proper to pass the House bill in order to remove those doubts. When the bill went to the Senate, that

body added provisions covering certain other bonds issued some years ago by the county of Santa Fe, I believe, in the Territory of New Mexico, to provide for the construction of a railroad across that county. Those bonds had been issued and turned over to the railroad company. The company put the bonds on the market and disposed of them to holders who had no further notice, I presume, of the terms under which they had been issued than the law itself prescribed. These bonds, I may say, were issued in perfect good faith by the people of that county, who received for them a full and valuable consideration. No objection was raised by the people of the county to the payment of the bonds or any part of them. For a number of years the interest accruing on the bonds (something like 10 per cent, I believe) was paid by those people. After a number of years those bonds, by agreement with the holders, were refunded at about 7 per cent.

Some years later, upon a case arising in the courts of Arizona, it was judicially held that bonds such as these had not been issued in compliance with law, or, rather, they did not fall under the terms or spirit of the law under which they were supposed to have been issued. That law provided for issuing bonds for the purpose of making internal improvements in the Territories; and the court decided that a railroad did not fall within the description of internal improvements. After that decision the county of Santa Fe refused to pay the bonds. The amendment to the bill was passed by the Senate in order to cure that defect in the issue of those bonds, and to enable the holders, who had paid par and sometimes more than par value for them, to collect their money. Now, the question presented by this bill when returned to the House was whether or not we should concur in the Senate amendments validating the bonds issued in the manner I have described.

When the question was referred to the Committee on the Territories, two other sets of bonds came before that committee—the Grant County bonds and the Silver City bonds—which had been issued under somewhat similar circumstances, if not precisely similar, the Grant County bonds amounting to \$56,000 and the Silver City bonds to \$50,000. As I have already said, the conditions under which they were issued were nearly, if not precisely, similar, and there was no question of the validity of any of the bonds and no allegation on the part of the counties and cities that they would not pay them, and no question as to their legality in any respect until this decision in the Arizona case, after which they, in turn, declined to pay the interest upon the bonds; and this question is now presented to Congress, whether or not it will oblige them to do so, or allow these counties and municipalities to escape the payments of the obligations that are conceded on all hands to be of binding moral force.

Mr. BURTON of Missouri. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. OWENS. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON of Missouri. Were the Silver City and Grant County bonds ever refunded?

Mr. OWENS. Yes, sir; they have been, as I understand.

The purpose of the House bill, I will say to the gentleman—that is, the House amendment to the Senate amendment—is that all these bonds may be refunded, and that was agreed to, I think, by the holders of the bonds and the Territorial representative of the Territory before the committee, all of them conceding that these bonds should be refunded at 4 per cent.

Mr. BURTON of Missouri. Pardon me—my question was, had the Silver City bonds and the Grant County bonds been refunded before the decision was made in the case to which the gentleman refers, in Arizona?

Mr. OWENS. That is my recollection. They had all been put on the market in good faith, with the fullest and most satisfactory assurances from all parties that they would be paid at maturity. The courts of New Mexico had passed on a number of the bonds and said they were issued in compliance with the conditions of the law and were regular in all respects, and on that assurance the people all over the country, I know not who they were, but in all parts of the country, invested their money in the bonds on the faith of the assurances given to them that they would be paid. They were regarded as a very good investment. The men who appeared before our committee, those in favor of the proposition and those against it, for arguments were heard on both sides, were unable to discover or present a single equity as to why these bonds should not be paid or why these people should not be forced to pay them.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. OWENS. Certainly.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Is there anything to show how much of interest is to be funded and how much represents the principal of the indebtedness? We find no report accompanying this matter.

Mr. OWENS. There is a lengthy statement of the committee accompanying the bill. There is nothing, I will state to the gentleman, to show, although the greater part of the interest has already been paid. There was no complaint for many years after

the issuance of the bonds about the interest being paid, and there was no question then raised as to the validity of the bonds. They did in fact keep up the payment of the interest for a number of years, and that was continued until after the decision in the Arizona case, to which I have already referred. I do not think it can involve a very large amount as far as the interest is concerned, at least it does not cover a very considerable period of time.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Is there any report from the governor or the officials of the Territory recommending this legislation?

Mr. OWENS. No; I am sorry to say that the governor of New Mexico was before the committee and endeavored to prevent the passage of this legislation.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Why is the gentleman "sorry to say" it?

Mr. OWENS. Because in doing so, when he appeared before the committee, he failed to disclose, so far as my judgment is concerned, a single fact why the people of New Mexico should be allowed to escape the just and moral obligations in which they are involved by the issuance of the bonds.

Mr. COOKE of Illinois. Let me ask the gentleman from Kentucky whether the governor, in his appearance before the committee, set up the charge that there had been fraud in connection with this matter or that these bonds had been issued improperly?

Mr. OWENS. No such charge was made, so far as I am aware. There had been some pretense, or talk, I should say, of some irregularity on the part of the officials of that county, of the extent of which the people who purchased the bonds could have no possible notice.

Mr. LACEY. Did not the governor, let me ask the gentleman, as a member of the Board of Trade of Santa Fe, sign a written recommendation that these bonds afforded a safe and reliable investment?

Mr. OWENS. Yes, sir; the whole board of trade of the city signed an indorsement in the most unequivocal terms that these bonds were just and binding obligations, and would be fully met and paid.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Has there been anywhere a suit to test the validity of the bonds and the manner of their issuance?

Mr. OWENS. There was, and the courts of New Mexico reached the determination that the bonds were regular, legal, and valid in every particular, and no question arose, as I have already stated, until after the decision in the Arizona case.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Then, again, let me ask the gentleman, does this increase the indebtedness of the Territory of New Mexico in excess of the amount allowed by the Harrison Act, passed some years ago, which restricted the indebtedness to 5 per cent, I believe it was, of the value of the assessed property?

Mr. OWENS. I am not sure of that; I think it unlikely, although in the case of Santa Fe County it will probably increase the amount of the indebtedness of that county somewhat in excess of the requirement of that act. But it strikes me, whether it does or not, that these people, after putting these bonds on the market, and after having voted two or three times to do so, should not be allowed to escape the payment of the bonds, which were purchased in good faith by investors, no charge of improper conduct being raised.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. OWENS. Certainly.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Is not the invalidity of these bonds due to the fact that they are an issue in excess of the 5 per cent limit allowed by law?

Mr. OWENS. No; not under the decision of the court. It was put on this ground, that the act provided for the issuing of these bonds for internal improvements, and the court, in the Arizona case, determined that the construction of railroads was not an internal improvement, and that the purpose of these bonds did not fall within the terms of the act under which they were issued.

Mr. COOKE of Illinois. I should like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky whether in these suits to which he has referred the defenses set up were based upon any allegation of fraud against these bonds?

Mr. OWENS. No; I think not.

Mr. COOKE of Illinois. Or that their inception was in fraud?

Mr. OWENS. I could not say. I am not familiar with all these defenses; but I know there was a determination reached by the decision of the court that the bonds were valid in every particular.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the House has determined to consider this matter at present. Should it pass this bill, I think a very dangerous precedent would be established. As a member of the committee I have had the matter under examination. I had not the slightest idea that it would be called up for consideration to-day, because it was generally known to my colleagues on the committee that I was examining into this matter, and I expected, if the convictions I now entertain were supported by the facts and the law, to file a minority report.

The facts in this case are these: Originally a bill was introduced

in Congress providing for the validation of certain bonds that were not yet issued—bonds of the Territory of New Mexico providing for the establishment of some eleemosynary and Territorial public institutions. These bonds could not be issued, because their issue would be in conflict with a law of the United States. We undertook to pass remedial legislation here for the benefit of that Territory. This bill passed the House and went to the Senate, and there some railroad bonds were attached to it by amendment. The Senate attempted to validate the bonds commonly known as the "Brice bonds." This bill came back to the House with that amendment attached to it. It was referred to the Committee on Territories, and there they undertook, by amendment, to validate nearly \$400,000 more of railroad bonds that had been issued by certain counties of New Mexico; in one instance, bonds that had been purchased by some agent or broker named Coler, and known as the "Coler bonds," which originally amounted to \$150,000, but in the refunding act you find that after having been refunded they amount to \$250,000.

The gentleman says that there is no fraud charged in the issuance of these bonds. We had the governor of New Mexico before the committee. We had a telegram sent to the committee by a mass meeting of citizens of Santa Fe, N. Mex., protesting against the legalizing of these bonds and making an allegation of fraud. An examination of the records will show that the tax rolls were padded; that property had been placed upon those rolls that was not subject to taxation; that railroad property that was then exempt from taxation under the laws of New Mexico was put upon the rolls for the purpose of giving sufficient valuation to authorize the issue of these bonds. Those rolls increased in a few years from a little over \$2,000,000 to over \$6,000,000, and directly after the issuance of these bonds, or the authorization of them, the amount decreased again to \$3,000,000. I say to you further, if it is right that these bonds should be validated—that we should assume the guardianship of the acts of that Territory—why does not the gentleman who represents that Territory here demand it. He has not been asking it. New Mexico has a representative upon this floor, and he has not demanded the passage of this bill.

Another badge of fraud, or a thing that gives semblance of it, at least, is this: You find that at one election which they held in 12 precincts only 6 precincts cast any votes, and 141 votes in that county placed the bond burden upon the people of that county. You find that when they undertook to refund these bonds some of them were refunded into gold bonds. They were originally coin bonds, or payable in the lawful money of this country. Some of them have been refunded and are payable in gold. You find, furthermore, that the law authorizing the refunding of these bonds will show in itself that there was some overriding power which put the law upon the statute books in the interest of the bondholders. To show you how severe this law is, I will state that it provides that if the tax collector fails or refuses to collect the money and make payment that he shall be sent to the penitentiary and forever debarred from holding office. They do not allow him to go to the courts. The law undertakes to tie the hands of the officers, so that they can not go to the courts and resist the payment of these debts.

Now, as far as the suit about these bonds is concerned, let me tell you something about that. There was a suit entered upon these bonds in the Territorial courts of New Mexico. That suit went to the supreme court of the Territory. A majority of the court decided in favor of the bonds, but there was a very able dissenting opinion. Parties undertook to carry, by appeal, that case to the Supreme Court of the United States. Citizens proposed to take the necessary steps to carry the suit to the Supreme Court of the United States, but the commissioners refused to allow them to do so, notwithstanding they proposed to do it without cost to the county.

The Supreme Court of the United States has never had an opportunity to pass upon this. It has passed upon the case in Arizona of Lewis against Pima County, and in that case the court held the Territory had no authority to issue these bonds. If gentlemen want these bonds restored, if the holders want these bonds validated, why do they not go to the legislative branch of New Mexico? Why not go to the lawmaking power of that Territory, instead of coming here and asking Congress to validate these bonds? Why not offer a law here stating that the legislative assembly of New Mexico shall have power to validate these bonds, if she wants to do so, instead of having us say that Congress shall order that these bonds shall be paid?

Another feature of the law under which these were issued is this: It was contemplated under the law that the counties which issued railroad bonds should have a certain amount of stock in the railroad, and also that those bonds should not be sold for less than par. We had the testimony before the committee that these bonds were sold for about 50 cents on the dollar. We had testimony before that committee, too—

Mr. OWENS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question in that connection?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Texas. I yield for a question.

Mr. OWENS. The gentleman says that the law stated that these bonds should be issued at par, and that the testimony shows that they were sold for less than par. Is it not a fact that when they were sold for 50 cents it was by private parties, after these bonds had passed from the possession of the county—after the county had turned them over, and they did not then belong to the county?

Mr. COOPER of Texas. These parties were representatives of the railroad company. The county did not receive any stock in this road. That provision can be found in the law. What its purpose was I do not know; but it stated in the law that the bonds should not be sold for less than par.

Mr. OWENS. Just one county sold them.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. The law contemplated that the county which issued them should get stock, and they did not except in one instance. I believe it was Grant County.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Was the stock ever worth anything?

Mr. COOPER of Texas. I do not know. Now, these are some of the facts in connection with this. I am willing that this Territory should pay its honest debts. I yield precedence to no man on this floor about wishing to see fairness, justice, and honesty dealt out by the States, Territories, and citizens of this country; and I would have been glad that this bill should have been deferred until this matter had been examined. I have none of the law authorities here, and I could cite a number of cases. I have not the hearings before the committee with me; and have not even the reports of the committee. And here, without warning, without notice, it seems to me, the disposition appears to be to take advantage of the situation and put upon this Territory a debt of more than \$500,000, and then they attach this amendment to an innocent bill that provides for the issuance of bonds to pay for the building of the institutions of the Territory.

Mr. Speaker, I warn members to look into this matter carefully, and I ask them not to rush into it; and if they will postpone the consideration of this matter until it can be examined, I would not hesitate or object to any action this House might then take.

I reserve the balance of my time. How much time have I?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has ten minutes remaining.

Mr. Low and Mr. KNOX rose.

Mr. LOW. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. KNOX. I thought I could be recognized in my own right.

The SPEAKER. Debate is limited to forty minutes, twenty minutes under the control of the mover and the remaining twenty minutes under the control of the member who demanded a second.

Mr. LOW. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the proposition here is a simple one, and was investigated carefully by the Committee on Territories. In my opinion, it is perfectly proper for this House to validate these bonds. Now, the proposition in Santa Fe County, N. Mex., was that if a certain railroad should be built the county would grant a certain amount of bonds. The road was constructed in good faith and the county issued the bonds. These are known as the Coler bonds. Then Mr. Coler, of New York, visited Santa Fe and made an examination as to the validity and sale of these bonds. The Board of Trade of Santa Fe issued to him at that time a circular, in which they said:

We, the undersigned, members of the Santa Fe Board of Trade, and taxpayers of Santa Fe County, respectfully represent that the issue of \$150,000 in Santa Fe County bonds, issued in 1880 to aid in the construction of the Santa Fe, New Mexico and Southern Railroad, affords a safe and reliable investment. * * *

These bonds were purchased and sold and scattered throughout the country. Now, then, some years later the county defaulted upon its interest, and suit was brought in the Territorial court. The Supreme Court upheld the validity of these bonds; and the reason this sum of \$150,000, which is—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LOW. I desire that gentlemen on the other side should occupy some of their time.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. CATRON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to suspending the rules for the purpose of passing this bill at the present time. I requested the gentleman who made this motion not to press it at this time, because I understood that some information is expected from the governor of New Mexico in regard to these bonds which ought to be laid before the House. The report of the committee states that the amendment is what has been agreed upon between the bondholders and myself. In that regard the report is slightly in error, at least it does not state the whole fact. I was opposed in the committee to making these amendments to the original bill, for the reason that I did not consider them germane to the subject of the bill. I saw, however, that the committee were inclined to place upon the bill these amendments, and then I agreed with the parties who were asking for the amendments that if the

bill was to be amended so as to validate these additional bonds it should be done by virtue of the amendment as it is presented here; that is, that that should be the condition of things in case anything should be done about those bonds; but I objected to the amendment itself because it was not germane to the original bill.

The original bill provided for the validation of certain bonds of the Territory of New Mexico which had been authorized to be issued, but which never had been issued. They were bonds for the reconstruction of the capitol building, for certain educational institutions, for an asylum for the insane, and for a military institute. Those bonds are waiting to be issued, and for that reason we are anxious to have the bill as originally introduced passed, but at the present time I do not think the rules ought to be suspended for the purpose of passing this bill with the amendment, as other information in regard to these particular bonds is expected from the Territory of New Mexico immediately after the arrival of Governor Thornton at Santa Fe. Having said so much, and asking that the rules be not suspended in order to pass this bill at present, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. LOW. Would the gentleman on the other side [Mr. COOPER of Texas] like to occupy the rest of his time now?

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Will the gentleman please ascertain how much time he has remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LOW] has six minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COOPER] has seven.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, this seems to me to be a very important matter. I have before me an opinion written by the Supreme Court of the United States in a bond case from my own State. The opinion has been rendered very recently, and I have not had time to examine it, but I think it may have some bearing upon this bill. A number of years ago the legislature of my State caused to be issued a great number of bonds, which were bought up, as I understand, by bona fide purchasers. It was ascertained later that those bonds had been issued by a fraudulent proceeding, and the Supreme Court have held that the matter ought to have been first determined by the supreme court of the State, and that, not having been properly determined there, it can not now be taken up by the Supreme Court of the United States. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the consideration of the pending bill ought to be continued until there can be an examination into the question whether or not there was any fraud in issuing these bonds.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will allow me, these bonds were adjudicated in the Territorial court, in the supreme court of the Territory, and there is no question of fraud in the issuance of the bonds; none whatever, but under the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Arizona case, holding that the act of 1878 did not authorize the issuance of these bonds, some people there, after having paid interest on the bonds for ten and thirteen years, seem now disposed to take advantage of that decision to repudiate the debt.

Mr. HULICK. Before we vote I should like to ask one question. Was the question of fraud raised in the litigation?

Mr. PERKINS. Not at all.

Mr. HULICK. Or was it only a legal question as to the right to issue the bonds?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. SHAW. No, sir. I have only one minute. All I have to say is this, that the motion now made to suspend the rules and pass this bill clearly ignores the Supreme Court of the United States, before which the question ought to have been brought in some way, and if this course of legislation is to be followed, then, standing here as a Representative of North Carolina, I do not know how soon a bill may be introduced making valid about \$35,000,000 of fraudulent bonds in my State.

Mr. OWENS. Does not the gentleman know that there is a distinction between validating a State bond and a Territorial bond? How could Congress validate a State bond?

Mr. SHAW. I understand that, but I learn that this question was not adjudicated in the Territorial court, which court has, as I understand it, the same jurisdiction relative to Territorial matters as the supreme court of a State has over its matters.

Mr. OWENS. It has been in the Territorial court.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that this is too important a piece of legislation to be rushed through under a suspension of the rules. Not one member in twenty on this floor understands the purport of this bill. We have heard from the representative of New Mexico here [Mr. CATRON] that he does not approve of this legislation—

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman ought not to say that.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I can not yield, Mr. Speaker; I have only four minutes. The original bill simply provided for validating bonds that have not yet been issued, bonds to provide for the res-

toration of the capitol building of New Mexico, which was burned two or three years ago, and for one or two other purposes. If this bill stopped there, there would be no objection to it; but now it is proposed to validate by act of Congress other bonds issued by certain counties and cities of New Mexico to aid in the construction of railroads. The validity of those bonds has never been tested beyond some of the local Territorial courts. Now, I do not see why this House should be in a hurry to rush to the rescue of the people who hold those railroad bonds. They bought them several years ago, bearing on their face 10 per cent interest. The bonds have been refunded once, and the citizens upon whose shoulders the obligation must rest, who will have to pay these bonds if we pass this bill, are not here demanding that they shall be validated.

I have never seen a holder of railroad bonds who was not able to take care of himself. Let the holders of these bonds go into the courts and test their validity. Let them go into the courts and through the courts till they reach the Supreme Court, and then if it is decided that these bonds are valid and just and should be paid, then I for one, if occupying a seat upon this floor, will vote to make them valid. But it is unfair to the people of that Territory, it is unjust to this House, to ask us under a suspension of the rules, with only twenty minutes' debate on each side, to rush through legislation like this when the committee itself has failed to bring forward the figures and facts in detail as they should have been presented. We have nothing here but a meager report, giving not the facts, not the ordinances or laws of the Territory under which these bonds were issued, but simply stating the amendments which it is proposed shall be engrafted upon the bill to be thus put through the House volens under suspension of the rules.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman allow me to make a statement?

Mr. WASHINGTON. This side has but twenty minutes. Let the gentleman consume, if he chooses, some of the time allotted to the other side in defending this measure, which, in my judgment, can not be successfully defended here or elsewhere.

Mr. PERKINS. Because you are not informed.

Mr. WASHINGTON. The gentleman says I am not informed. Sir, the committee has never sought in a proper way to inform the House in regard to this measure. I served on the Committee on Territories for a long time with my distinguished friend, and in those days we never brought forward reports like this, covering up the facts rather than giving information. Let the House have light, and with proper light upon the facts we are willing to vote upon the question. I return the rest of my time to the gentleman who yielded it to me.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. One minute.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY].

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, some time since I received a telegram from the governor of New Mexico, protesting against the passage of this bill. Since that time he has visited the capital, but I was absent and had no opportunity to consult with him in regard to this bill. I understand, however, that he proposes to furnish some additional information bearing on the question, and it does seem to me, in view of this fact, that the suggestion of the representative from the Territory of New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] should be followed, and the further consideration of this bill postponed until that information is furnished, so that we may act intelligently on this question. This is all I care to say.

Mr. LOW. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Territories, I desire to make a few observations from a business man's standpoint. I never was a student of Coke or Blackstone, but I have been a student all my life in the buying, selling, receiving, and giving of obligations. If I put my name to a piece of paper obligating myself to pay back a sum of borrowed money, I am in honor bound to liquidate that obligation. Now, what are the facts about this case? Prior to 1880 the people of New Mexico were living in small cities and towns scattered through the Territory. They had not the means of communication between their little inland cities or towns; the business men of the Territory met together and discussed the best methods to be employed to improve and develop the country, and to invite immigration. They decided that it was advisable, if possible, to secure the building of a railroad, so they conferred with the officials of the Atchison and Topeka Railroad Company, who informed them that if they would issue bonds under the authority of the legislature, the company would take the bonds and build the railroad.

That proposition was finally carried out. Upon the application of leading citizens the legislature gave the county authority to issue bonds for the specific purpose of building this railroad through that county. The railroad company accepted the bonds and built the road, which is running through that country to-day. That railroad has developed the country, it has attracted immigrants, and the people there are enjoying all the prosperity thus resulting, but the railroad company could not pay its employees or its obligations with bonds, hence the officials of the company

went to New York City in order to float the bonds, and called on Coler & Co., one of the largest bond-brokerage establishments in the country. When those bonds were offered to them by the railroad officials the brokers looked the question over and said they would investigate it. They called in the best legal talent in the city, who examined the enactments and everything bearing upon the question and finally said to the members of the firm: "Those bonds are legally issued." Not satisfied, however, Coler & Co. sent to New Mexico to ascertain how the people felt about the bonds, and in return they received a document signed by a number of business men, members of the board of trade, etc., indorsing the bonds, stating that they would no doubt be paid, and were a good investment.

These bonds at the present time are not in the hands of the railroad company; that company sold them as other bonds are sold, and they are scattered to-day through the country. Up to a certain time the interest on the bonds was paid, and then the coupons were defaulted. Coler & Co. immediately wrote to their clients inviting them to assign to them their bonds and promising to look the matter up. Their agents went to New Mexico and fought the question through the various courts, and they won upon the defaulted coupons. Then by an arrangement the bonds were refunded; the old bonds were given up and new ones issued, bearing, I believe, 5 per cent interest. The people there were satisfied; they paid the interest year after year, until a short time ago, when for some reason there was again a default upon the bonds. That matter has been explained by my distinguished colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. OWENS]. The majority of the people in that county want to pay those bonds, but some of the citizens of that Territory, now awaiting admission to Statehood, wish to repudiate a portion of their honest debts.

Mr. Speaker, any man who was guilty of such a thing would be called absolutely dishonest and unworthy of the friendship and confidence of any business community in this country. These bankers do not hold a dollar's worth of the bonds. They are scattered, as I have already said, all over the country, but they are bound to look after the interests of their clients, as they ought to do. The governor of the Territory, together with the best legal talent they have out there, appeared before the committee in opposition to paying the bonds. We heard from them all of their testimony, and my cheek blushed with shame when I realized the fact that a man, after taking part in recommending the issuance of the bonds, should come North afterwards to plead for their repudiation.

Gentlemen, look at it simply from a business point of view; we have had testimony from both sides; it is an honest debt; let them pay it, but not one of the bonds was ever bought at less than 77½ cents on the dollar, and that was when they first came into the market.

Mr. HULICK. What was the governor's objection to paying the bonds?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LOW. I do not know. He did not want to pay them. There are a good many other people, you know, who do not want to pay their debts in this world.

Mr. HULICK. But what reason did he give for it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired; and the question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LACEY) there were—ayes 42, noes 73.

So, two-thirds not voting in favor thereof, the motion was rejected.

CHEESE, OLEOMARGARINE, ETC.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a privileged report from the Committee on Ways and Means.

I am directed by the committee to report back to the House the bills H. R. 3010 and 5680 with a substitute therefor, and recommend the passage of the substitute bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8008) defining cheese, and also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of "filled cheese."

Mr. GROSVENOR. This is what is known as the cheese bill. I give notice, Mr. Speaker, that on Wednesday morning I will endeavor to have this bill called up for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the Chair be kind enough to state what this is? We have been unable to hear a word the gentleman said.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman says that this is the "cheese bill." [Laughter.]

FORT ASSINNIBOINE MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately on the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to consider Senate bill No. 626 in the House in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The bill referred to in the resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 626) providing for the disposal of lands on abandoned portions of the Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation in Montana, and for the relief of certain settlers thereon.

Be it enacted, etc., That all lands which have been or may hereafter be excluded from the limits of the Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation in the State of Montana shall be open to the operation of the laws regulating homestead entry, except section 2301 of the Revised Statutes, and to entry under the town-site laws and the laws governing the disposal of coal lands, desert lands, and mineral lands, and shall not be subject to sale under the provisions of any act relating to the sale of abandoned military reservations: Provided, That if the entire reservation be abandoned for military purposes this act shall not apply to an area 1 mile square embracing the Government buildings at Fort Assiniboine.

SEC. 2. That all entries heretofore made in good faith under either the homestead, town-site, desert-land, or mineral-land laws of the United States upon any of the excluded portions of said Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation shall be held valid, and the Secretary of the Interior is directed to reinstate such entries under either of said laws as he may heretofore have canceled because of a construction based upon the opinion that the laws mentioned in section 1 of this act did not apply to the abandoned portions of said reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is a second required?

Mr. HULL. I would like to ask a question first. Has this been before any committee of the House?

Mr. HARTMAN. It has been reported unanimously by the Committee on the Public Lands of the House, unanimously by the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate, and it has passed the Senate.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I demand a second simply to have an explanation.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire a count?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; I am willing that a second shall be ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I can state briefly the provisions and purposes of this bill, and I do not think I shall ask or will be required to occupy more than five or ten minutes of the time of the House.

The situation is simply this: The boundaries of the Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation in Montana were designated on the 4th of March, 1880, by an Executive order. Subsequently to that—that is, on May 1, 1888—the Indian title to the land in that portion of the reservation which is used for military purposes was extinguished, leaving the military reservation created by Executive order as the only barrier to settlement of the lands under the general law. But subsequently three Executive orders were issued—that is, on May 2, 1888, September 25, 1888, and October 9, 1891—and certain lands were, at the dates named, excluded from the military reservation. On the strength of these orders, especially the order of May 1, 1888, it was presumed that these lands were open to homestead settlement. It was so presumed by the officers of the United States Government themselves, the local land officers and others, and upon that presumption something like two hundred bona fide settlers settled upon the lands with the intention of acquiring title to them under the homestead law.

They have gone upon these lands, as I say, upon the faith of their entries being accepted by the United States Land Office, and there are 138 of them, whose affidavits I hold here in my hand, who depose and say that they will be unable to purchase these lands if they are thrown open to public sale under the provisions of the act providing for the disposal of abandoned military reservations at public auction. These men have families consisting, all told, of 393 people. They have placed \$170,965 worth of improvements upon these lands. They have taken up 25,360 acres, all told, and each one of these 138 people makes affidavit that unless he is permitted to complete his title to these lands he will be compelled to forfeit his entry, his improvements, and his three or four years of labor. I will refer to one affidavit, which is a fair specimen of the others. They are substantially duplicates. Mr. Fred A. Scott makes affidavit that he is a native-born citizen, 32 years of age; that he located upon these lands, the northeast quarter of section 26, giving the town and range. He goes on and states the improvements which he has put upon the land, a log house, with fences, log stable, log granary, log cattle shed, and so forth, the total improvements amounting to \$1,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill has the unanimous report of the Committee on Public Lands. It was referred to the Secretary of the Interior, and I read to the House an extract from what the Secretary of the Interior says:

The proposed bill, so far as its language is concerned, is identical with the act of May 1, 1888, and its effect, besides validating the entries, excepts the

land in question from the operation of the acts of July 5, 1884, and of August 23, 1894. I have no objections to offer to the proposed bill, as it is not in the province of this Department to attempt to interfere with whatever disposition of the public domain the Congress may see fit to make of it.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill be not passed, these settlers, having families consisting of 393 people, all told, having the improvements upon their lands which I have stated, will be compelled to abandon all of the work which they have performed there in the last three or four years. The bill has passed the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, unless some other gentleman desires to address the House upon this question or to interrogate me, I shall move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not move the previous question.

Mr. HARTMAN. I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The SPEAKER. That motion is already before the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] is entitled to twenty minutes, if he desires that time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I simply wish to suggest that the motion is not to suspend the rules and pass the bill. The motion is to suspend the rules and pass a resolution which provides for the consideration of the bill. I have nothing to say against the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, two-thirds voting in favor thereof.

The bill (S. 626) providing for disposal of lands on abandoned portions of the Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation, in Montana, and for the relief of certain settlers thereon, was read.

Mr. DINGLEY. I should like to ask how many acres are included in this reservation?

Mr. HARTMAN. Originally there were in the reservation 560,800 acres; but under the various acts of Congress 400,160 acres have been turned over to the public domain, leaving 168,640 acres still in the reservation. That statement is contained in a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Mr. DINGLEY. All of that land would be opened up for settlement under the homestead act?

Mr. HARTMAN. Yes, the remaining amount.

Mr. DINGLEY. As the law now stands, the land is to be sold at public auction?

Mr. HARTMAN. Yes.

Mr. DINGLEY. Are they more valuable than ordinary desert or arid lands?

Mr. HARTMAN. Some of the lands are very fertile, but the greater part of them are foothill lands which one can not afford to go upon and purchase and which yet become valuable for grazing purposes.

Mr. STEELE. Is it provided that these lands are to be sold at public auction?

Mr. HARTMAN. My bill provides that all of them shall be open to homestead entry or entry under the public-land laws of the United States.

Mr. STEELE. Without reference to their value?

Mr. HARTMAN. Without reference to their value.

Mr. STEELE. Is the passage of the bill recommended by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. HARTMAN. Not by the Secretary of War, but by the Secretary of the Interior. The lands were turned over to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive proclamation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I should like to ask the gentleman from Montana if this bill has been indorsed by the Commissioner of the General Land Office?

Mr. HARTMAN. I just read from a letter of the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Interior bases his letter upon a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office. The Secretary of the Interior says:

I have no objection to offer to the proposed bill, as it is not the province of this Department to attempt to interfere with whatever disposition of the public domain the Congress may see fit to make of it.

And I want to say right here, before I forget it, that the Secretary of the Interior has decided that all of these parties who are now upon these lands are trespassers ab initio, and unless this legislation is passed they will be compelled to purchase these lands which they themselves have made valuable by their own labor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing more to offer unless some gentleman desires to ask me a question.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, there is another reason why this bill ought to pass. What is known as the McRae Act, for the disposal of military reservations, was drawn with special reference to smaller tracts, tracts that were valuable by reason of being near railroads, having military posts within them, and often towns within them. The Assiniboine tract is a large tract, far remote from settlement; and the reasons that apply to the adoption of the McRae law in regard to putting up these public lands and selling them at public auction do not apply with the same force to this reservation, it being a very large one. The tract is as wild as any

Indian reservation that has been taken in for settlement for many years. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HARTMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Pending that motion, the Chair submits the following report from the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution and bills of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker, to wit:

A joint resolution (H. Res. 159) to authorize the Secretary of War to prepare and submit estimates for the improvement of the harbor at Portland, Me.;

A bill (H. R. 2912) granting to the Atchison and Nebraska Railroad Company and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, its lessee in perpetuity, the right of way over a part of the Sac and Fox and Iowa Indian Reservation, in the States of Kansas and Nebraska;

A bill (H. R. 4632) for the relief of Frederick B. Betts, surviving partner of the firm of Betts, Nichols & Co.; and

A bill (H. R. 5736) to authorize the Light-House Board to proceed with the construction of the light-house and fog signal on North Manitou Island, Lake Michigan.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. STOKES, for ten days, on account of important business. To Mr. SPENCER, for eight days, on account of sickness in family. To Mr. DOWNING, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. STEWART of New Jersey, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. HENRY of Connecticut, for ten days, on account of business.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

By unanimous consent, on request of Mr. PICKLER, a reprint was ordered of the bill (H. R. 5549) to prevent discontinuance of pensions, to restore pensions discontinued, to establish uniform rates of pension, to facilitate the allowance of pensions in matters of proof, and for other purposes, and report.

The motion to adjourn was then agreed to.

And accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers inclosing a reply to the public resolution approved March 24, 1896, relating to a resurvey of the port of Fairport, Ohio—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims amounting to \$143,647.58—to the Committee on Appropriations, 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 cases of Hanah S. Crane, Mary Ives Crocker, Kate Mary Dillon, and James S. Boyd against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting the claim of R. M. Ridgely, postmaster at Springfield, Ill., together with accompanying documents—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. VAN VOORHIS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1708) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the appointment of receivers of national banks, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1876, as amended by an act approved August 3, 1892, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1125); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MEREDITH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7139) to

authorize the Falls Church and Potomac Railway Company of Virginia to extend its line into and within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1126); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CUMMINGS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7052) to provide for the erection of a monument to Robert Morris at Batavia, Genesee County, N. Y., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1134); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. HALTERMAN, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 5764) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Marthon. (Report No. 1124.)

By Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (S. 1495) granting a pension to Hans Johnson. (Report No. 1127.)

By Mr. LAYTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (S. 1017) granting a pension to Robert Kiracofe. (Report No. 1128.)

The bill (H. R. 6803) granting a pension to Ellen Day, step-mother of Albert L. Day. (Report No. 1129.)

By Mr. MILES, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4534) to increase the pension of Maj. Gen. Julius H. Stahel. (Report No. 1130.)

By Mr. WOOD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 3189) to increase the pension of John S. Cochenour. (Report No. 1131.)

By Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (S. 178) granting a pension to Betsey J. Webber. (Report No. 1132.)

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4901) to pension Richard Wilcoxon. (Report No. 1133.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VAN HORN: A bill (H. R. 7971) to donate two condemned cannon and balls to the Colonel Fred Schaifer Post, No. 51, Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic, of Concordia, Mo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 7972) directing that a corporation or company organized under the laws of one State shall be deemed also to be a citizen of any other State or States where it maintains an office or place of business—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 7973) to establish a railroad bridge across the Illinois River, near Grafton, Ill.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 7974) for the completion of the fish-cultural station on the St. Lawrence River at Cape Vincent, N. Y.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MOODY: A bill (H. R. 7975) to incorporate the John A. Winslow Kearsarge Survivors' Association—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUFORD: A bill (H. R. 8002) to prevent discrimination between various kinds of legal-tender money—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8003) to reduce and regulate salaries of Federal officers—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8004) to amend the charter of the Metropolitan Railroad Company of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURRELL: A bill (H. R. 8005) to aid the colored people of the South—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 8006) to amend the laws of the District of Columbia as to married women, and to make parents the natural guardians of their minor children, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILBER: A bill (H. R. 8007) to amend the act of June 27, 1890, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors and certain dependent relatives of same—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMPKINS (by request): A bill (H. R. 8009) for the construction of fish-cultural and auxiliary stations on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILES: A joint resolution (H. Res. 164) to authorize

the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia, the Belt Railway Company, and the Maryland and Washington Railway Company, to equip their respective lines, or any part thereof, within the limits of the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, with pneumatic or other modern motive power, subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A joint resolution (H. Res. 165) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to turn over to the State of Georgia the building for the Government exhibit at Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A resolution (House Res. No. 236) by the Committee on Rules for the consideration of House bill No. 58, providing for the inspection of immigrants by United States consuls—to the Committee on Rules.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Naval Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7854) to compensate William Wheeler Hubbell for inventions adopted by the United States; and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 7976) to increase the pension of Mrs. Ann Gibbons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7978) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of W. A. Jackson, late of Company F, One hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7979) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Alexander C. Sheirer, late a sergeant of Company A, Forty-fourth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 7980) for the relief of Redick M. Ridgely, postmaster at Springfield, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 7981) granting a pension to Adam King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 7982) to increase the pension of Albert Head—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7983) to pension Frances E. Wickware—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 7984) granting a pension to Mary S. Stanhope—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FISCHER: A bill (H. R. 7985) for the relief of Charles C. Overton, shipping merchant, of New York City—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 7986) to correct the military record of John Case, alias John L. Case—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 7987) for the relief of Richard Porter—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 7988) granting a pension to William S. Spratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7989) granting an increase of pension to John H. Keach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 7990) for the relief of the heirs of W. G. Featherston, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7991) for the relief of John W. Church—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARSON: A bill (H. R. 7992) for the relief of Enoch Voyles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAY: A bill (H. R. 7993) granting a pension to Jane E. Peck, widow of Henry A. Fowler, late of Company H, Fifth New York Heavy Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 7994) to correct the military record of Michael O'Brien—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7995) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Neace, late a member of Company H, Twenty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteers, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 7996) granting a pension to Mrs. Esther J. Wilson, widow of Silas R. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7997) for the relief of Mrs. Mary M. Wolhart, widow of Jacob Wolhart, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: A bill (H. R. 7998) to pension John J. Overton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN HORN: A bill (H. R. 7999) for the relief of John Hobart, of Kansas City, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8000) for the relief of Fanny Healy, of Kansas City, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODMAN: A bill (H. R. 8001) for the relief of the heirs of Valorous G. Austin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Utahville, Pa., and other towns in that vicinity, to accompany House bill No. 7933, for the relief of William Lutman; also, affidavit of said William Lutman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELKNAP: Petition of Joseph F. Forbrich and 16 others, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the passage of House bill No. 5729, relative to the protection of game, birds, and fish—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOUTELLE: Memorial of the National Game, Bird, and Fish Protective Association of Bangor, Me., and letter of E. M. Blanding, vice president of the association for Maine, for the passage of House bill No. 5729, for the protection of game, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOWERS: Remonstrance of 35 citizens of Ceres, Cal., against appropriation for sectarian purposes, and petition for amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the same—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Petition of B. C. Duff and others, of Brazoria County, Tex., for an appropriation to remove obstructions in the Brazos River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CRUMP: Paper to accompany House bill No. 2339, in regard to the claim of Matilda G. Higbee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of professors of Yale College, in favor of the adoption of the metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the Twenty-second Congressional district, relative to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Paper to accompany House bill to pension Frances E. Wickware—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill to increase the pension of Albert Head—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolution of the Minneapolis Trades and Labor Council, favoring the employment of union labor only on Fergus Falls public building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOOTE: Petition of Oscar F. Maynard and other ex-soldiers and ex-sailors of the Union Army and Navy residing in the vicinity of Wilmington, N. Y., favoring the passage of a service-pension bill granting \$8 a month to honorably discharged soldiers of the late war and \$12 a month to their widows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: Petition of W. W. Mourton and 42 others, of Corry, Pa., for the removal of the statue of Marquette from Statuary Hall—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: Affidavits of George W. McCray, B. J. L. Jeup, Leander A. Fulmer, John W. Cooper, George W. Seibert, and annual message of Hon. C. S. Denny, mayor of Indianapolis, Ind., to accompany House bill No. 2949, relating to the claim of George W. McCray—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of Joseph Carpenter and other citizens of Lucas County, Iowa, asking for additional pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: Petition of Michael Flynn and others, in behalf of Patrick Corr, to correct his military record—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KULP: Petition of C. W. Young and 72 other farmers of Columbia County, Pa.; also petition of Valley Grange, No. 53, Patrons of Husbandry, of Columbia County, Pa., in support of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty, in order to equalize the benefits and burdens of the protective system—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Millers' State Association, of Wilkesbarre, Pa.; also of H. V. White & Co., of Bloomsburg, Pa., in support of House bill No. 3212, to secure a better market for grain and other agricultural products of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. H. Johnston and other citizens of Columbia County, Pa., in support of House bill No. 6851, relating to unclaimed pension money—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEONARD: Petition of citizens of Tioga County, Pa., asking for the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty, in order to equalize the benefits and burdens of the protective system—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINTON: Petition of citizens of Reading, Pa., praying

for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions adopted by the New York Mercantile Exchange, asking that a favorable report be made on House bill No. 5213, regulating the sale and manufacture of filled cheese—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance and petition of the citizens of Madison, Wis., regarding the Marquette statue—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, remonstrance and petition of F. Klemt and 36 other citizens of Detroit, Mich.; also of C. T. Grimes and 36 others, of the District of Columbia; also of A. T. Secor and 78 others, of the State of New Jersey; also of A. M. Goodby and others, of New York City, against the recognition of the statue of Marquette and urging the removal of the same—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of citizens of Detroit, Mich.; also of citizens of Edmore, Mich.; also of citizens of Chicago, Ill., praying for the passage of joint resolution No. 11, which provides that no moneys shall be appropriated for sectarian purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Frank Goss, of Vernon, Mich., regarding House bill No. 4066, to amend the postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, statement in regard to the pension claim of Mrs. Sarah A. Lyons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of citizens of Huntingdon County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Protest of B. F. Martin and other citizens of Minneapolis, Minn.; also of H. Kath and others, of Sleepy Eye, Minn., on behalf of the Retail Liquor Dealers' Association of Minnesota, against the passage of House bill No. 6668, to amend the act relating to the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia by raising the license fee—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McEWAN: Petition of the Detroit Typographical Union, No. 18, of Detroit, Mich.; also petition of Peers of Kosmos, of Pottstown, Pa., favoring House bill No. 184, providing for a commission of inquiry as to the feasibility of direct legislation—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: Petition of L. F. Stone and 26 others, of Belleville, W. Va., to pension the Home Guards that served in the United States service during the late civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), petition of R. T. Wetzel, J. M. Adams, and 36 others, citizens of Ravenswood, W. Va., against the acceptance of a statue of Père Marquette—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, evidence and papers to support House bill for increase of pension to John W. Church—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROYSE: Petition of veterans of the late war residing in the vicinity of North Judson, Ind., praying for a pension of \$8 per month to every soldier who served ninety days and was honorably discharged and \$12 per month to their widows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCRANTON: Petition of James Archibald and other civil engineers of Scranton, Pa., favoring the metric system of weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the Torrey bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of J. M. Jamison, B. Rademaker, and 123 other residents of Grand Rapids, Mich., for the removal of the statue of Père Marquette from Statuary Hall—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Koenig Medicine Company of Chicago, Ill., favoring favorable action on House bills Nos. 838, 4566, and 5560, for 1-cent letter postage, and to amend the postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SNOVER: Petition of D. N. Runnels and other citizens of Port Huron, Mich., favoring the passage of House bill No. 7262, to establish a life-saving station at Port Huron, Mich.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: Protest of Albert Zeller and 20 other citizens of New Albany, Ind., against the passage of House bill No. 4566, amending the postal laws relating to second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: Petition of Hon. J. G. Rowton and 158 others, residents of Idaho County, Idaho, for the improvement of the Clearwater River, in Idaho—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of William Farmer and 237 others, asking that settlers on ceded portion of the Cœur d'Alene Indian Reservation be permitted to make final proof on their homestead entries under the general homestead laws without paying \$1.50 per acre therefor—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILBER: Petition of American Federation of Labor, Union No. 6480, in regard to the undermanning of vessels on the Great Lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of citizens of Edmeston, Otsego County, N. Y., for the enactment of a law to compel the study of certain acts in the public schools—to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of North Blenheim and St. Johnsville, N. Y., protesting against the sale of beer to immigrants at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of North Blenheim, St. Johnsville, and Duaneburg, N. Y., protesting against the sale of beer at certain military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 7, 1896.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior recommending that there be inserted in the sundry civil appropriation bill a clause appropriating the sum of \$1,000 to enable the Secretary of the Interior to examine the desert lands selected by the States under the provisions of section 4 of the act of August 18, 1894; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

RIGHT OF WAY OVER INDIAN LANDS IN KANSAS AND NEBRASKA

Mr. ALLEN. A short time ago the Senate passed a bill (S. 941) granting to the Atchison and Nebraska Railroad Company and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, its lessee in perpetuity, the right of way over a part of the Sac and Fox and Iowa Indian Reservation, in the States of Kansas and Nebraska. The bill was sent to the House of Representatives, but a similar bill had been passed there by the time the Senate bill reached the House of Representatives, and the House bill has been passed here. The Senate bill having been returned to the Senate, I ask that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition of Federal Union, No. 6332, American Federation of Labor, of Lincoln, Nebr., praying for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented a petition of sundry citizens of Diamond Bluff, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation giving to second-class mail matter, such as religious tracts, full advantage of the act of July 16, 1894; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Waukesha, Wis., remonstrating against the appropriation of money for sectarian purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TELLER. I have a large number of petitions from branches of the American Federation of Labor, requesting the United States Senate to pass a law giving to the people of the United States free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation. The petitioners declare that they are of opinion that to do so would relieve the present monetary stringency and contribute toward bringing to us a return of national prosperity. In the case of the Federal Labor Union of Missoula, Mont., the following is added:

And further, that we will not vote for or assist in any way any candidate who is doubtful in regard to free coinage, no difference to what political party he may belong, or what our political opinions have been in the past.

I ask that the petitions be properly noted, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The petitions were referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

A petition of Central Labor Union, of Cleveland, Ohio (composed of 52 labor organizations); a petition of American Federation of Labor, of Anurndale, Ohio; a petition of American Agents' Association, of Findlay, Ohio (representing a membership of 12,000); a petition of Lathe Operators' Union No. 6635, of Toledo, Ohio; a petition of Drill-Press and Milling Machine Hands' Union No. 6505, of Toledo, Ohio; a petition of council of Hillsboro County,

Fla. (representing 4 labor organizations in Tampa); a petition of Scranton Central Labor Union, of Scranton, Pa. (representing 3,500 workmen of all branches of trade); a petition of Beef Boners' Union No. 6151, of Kansas City, Kans.; a petition of Federal Labor Union, of Missoula, Mont.; a petition of Germania Waiters' Protection Association, of New York City; a petition of local union, No. 87, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; a petition of Journeymen Tailors' Union, of Bloomington, Ill.; a petition of Waiters' Union No. 21, of Detroit, Mich.; a petition of Herbert Waiters' Union No. 11, of New York City; a petition of Federal Labor Union No. 6360, of New Orleans, La.; a petition of Brockton Central Labor Union, of Brockton, Mass. (representing 4,000 organized workers); a petition of Carriage Hardware Workers' Union No. 6419, of Columbus, Ohio; a petition of Trades and Labor Assembly, of Superior, Wis.; a petition of Trades and Labor Assembly, of Denver, Colo.; and a petition of Federal Labor Union No. 6400, of Everett, Wash.

Mr. TELLER presented sundry memorials of citizens of Colorado, remonstrating against the placing of the statue of Père Marquette in Statuary Hall; which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Denver, Colo., praying that an appropriation be made for the transmississippi international exposition to be held at Omaha, Nebr.; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of South Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation giving to second-class mail matter, such as religious tracts, full advantage of the act of July 16, 1894; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. STEWART presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Genoa, Nev., remonstrating against the placing of the statue of Père Marquette in Statuary Hall; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. SEWELL presented the memorial of Charles A. Milham and 134 other citizens of Washington, N. J., remonstrating against the placing of the statue of Père Marquette in Statuary Hall; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented a petition of the St. Augustine Presbytery of Paterson, N. J., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BRICE presented a memorial of Cincinnati Club, No. 1, Order of the Bronze Club, of Cincinnati, Ohio, remonstrating against the appropriation of money for sectarian institutions; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of Putnam Grange, No. 142, Patrons of Husbandry, of Leipsic, Ohio, praying for the passage of House bill No. 2626, providing for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Massillon, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish additional regulations concerning immigration to the United States, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce and Merchants' Exchange of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the establishment of a department of commerce and manufactures; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of J. J. Manning, assistant treasurer of the National Malleable Casting Company of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing a reform in the postal affairs of the country, and also for the restriction of second-class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Clinton County, Ohio, remonstrating against the introduction of military training in the public schools of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DANIEL presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Lynchburg, Va., remonstrating against any change being made in the present pilotage system; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the memorial of H. D. Moore and sundry other citizens of Onancock, Va., remonstrating against the placing of the statue of Père Marquette in Statuary Hall; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of Encampment No. 83, Union Veteran Legion, of Worcester, Mass., praying for the enactment of a per diem pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of Washington Camp, No. 7, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Englewood, Ill., remonstrating against the appropriation of money for sectarian purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.