

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 31, 1900.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last, when, on request of Mr. CLAY, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

VESSEL SHIP CAROLINE.

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

SHIP CONCORD.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented the petition of George Keenan, of Rochester, N. Y., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the general deficiency appropriation bill providing for the payment of overtime claims of letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Syracuse, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens and in any of the newly acquired island possessions of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of the Trades and Labor Assembly, American Federation of Labor of Syracuse, of the United Garment Workers of New York City, and of the Central Federation of Labor of Troy, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics upon the public works of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BARD presented a petition of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Napa, Cal., and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Berryessa, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FOSTER presented petitions of 257 citizens of Guy, of the Ministerial Alliance of Tacoma, and of the Independent Order of Good Templars of Dayton, all in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the congregation of the Baptist Church of West Springfield, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Chesaning, Mich., and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bay City, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUARLES presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Fortnightly Club, the congregation of the Congregational Church, the Nineteenth Century Club, and the congregations of the First Baptist, the First Presbyterian, the Universalist, the First Methodist, and St. Mary's churches, all of La Crosse, in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McBRIDE presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of La Grande, of the Baptist Congregation of Albany, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Klamath, all in the State of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army

canteens, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented a petition of 52 citizens of Waltham, N. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called pure food and drug bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented a petition signed by 132 citizens of Rosendale, Ulster County, N. Y., praying for the public ownership of railways, telegraphs, and telephones, and for the passage of Senate bill No. 1770, relative to the acquisition, purchase, construction, and condemnation by the United States of railroads lying within the United States, the respective States, and the District of Columbia engaged in interstate commerce, etc., and remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill No. 1439, to amend the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a document the hearings taken before the Interstate Commerce Committee on Senate bill 1770, in regard to Government ownership of railroads.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. CHANDLER. Properly speaking, that should be reported from the committee; but, of course, I am perfectly willing that the Senator from South Dakota shall submit the motion.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will state that but 50 copies of these hearings have been printed for the use of the committee, and I ask that this number be printed so as to give us an additional supply.

Mr. CHANDLER. My only point is that all of the testimony should be included in the order to print.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I simply offer the motion to print that which has already been printed by the committee. We have had 50 copies printed for the use of the committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the order may include additional testimony, if there be any, taken by the committee on that subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator accept the modification?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I accept the modification.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senate agree to the request of the Senator from South Dakota as modified? The Chair hears no objection, and the request is agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4830) to correct the military record of Ira J. Paxton, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1992) for the payment of Porter, Harrison & Fishback for legal services, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1658) for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow, and the heirs at law of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3020) for the relief of Rev. William T. McElroy, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. KYLE, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4906) providing for leaves of absence to certain employees of the Government, reported it without amendment.

Mr. MALLORY. I am requested by my colleague [Mr. TALLAFERRO] to report the following bills for him from the Committee on Pensions without amendment, with written reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 4992) granting an increase of pension to Susan B. Batin; and

A bill (H. R. 3252) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Somerville Lion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. BURROWS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3288) to correct the military record of Daniel J. Coonan, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DEBOE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6151) granting a pension to Zylpha J. Kelly, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 860) for the relief of Thomas J. Powell, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the

joint resolution (S. R. 73) for the relief of Thomas Hoyne, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3343) granting an increase of pension to Keziah Fausler; and

A bill (S. 2037) granting a pension to George F. Burrage.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2810) granting a pension to Esther Dyer Hammond, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4859) granting an increase of pension to Emily A. Wentworth, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER. I report from the Committee on Commerce an amendment intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill. I ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations without printing.

The amendment was read, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

For salaries and expenses of a commission of five persons, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to study the commercial and industrial conditions of China, Japan, and other Asiatic countries, \$75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available.

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on Claims, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 1409) for the relief of Robert A. Ragan; and

A bill (H. R. 2357) for the relief of A. T. Hensley, survivor of Fulton and Hensley, doing business under the name of Lavaca Wharf Company.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3805) for the relief of Sylvester S. Van Sichel, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PENROSE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by myself on the 27th instant, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, to report it with an amendment.

Mr. HALE. Let the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 90, after line 5, insert:

That the sum of \$300,000 be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Philadelphia museums for the purpose of completing the collection from foreign markets of samples of merchandise of the character in favor and demand therein, and of illustrating the manner in which merchandise for such markets should be prepared and packed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1871) for the relief of E. B. Crozier, executrix of the last will of Dr. C. W. Crozier, of Tennessee, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4681) to prevent a false branding or marking of food and dairy products as to the State or Territory in which they are made or produced, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4826) for the relief of Col. Charles B. Dougherty and other members of the Ninth Regiment of Pennsylvania Infantry, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3565) to establish a quartermaster's depot at Omaha, Nebr., and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

THOMAS HUNTINGTON.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4858) for the relief of Thomas Huntington, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 4858) entitled "For the relief of Thomas Huntington," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

GEORGE S. AYRE.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4116) for the relief of George S. Ayre, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 4116) entitled "A bill for the relief of George S. Ayre," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying

papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

ROBERT W. DUNBAR.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4011) for the relief of Robert W. Dunbar, and also the following resolution, submitted by Mr. PERKINS on the 5th of April, 1900, reported favorably on the resolution; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 4011) entitled "A bill for the relief of Robert W. Dunbar," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

MINERAL PRODUCTIONS OF MONTANA.

Mr. STEWART. From the Committee on Mines and Mining I report a paper on the mineral productions of Montana, prepared by Eugene B. Braden, assayer in charge United States assay office, Helena, Mont. I move that the paper be printed as a document. The motion was agreed to.

PORTS OF CALAIS AND EASTPORT, ME.

Mr. CLAY. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11283) to establish Calais, in the State of Maine, as a support of entry, and to extend the privileges of the act approved June 10, 1880, to the ports of Eastport and Calais, in the State of Maine, to report it without amendment, and by request of the committee I ask for its present consideration.

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

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

STATUES OF BENTON AND BLAIR.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. COCKRELL on the 22d instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound of the proceedings in Congress upon the acceptance of the statues of the late Thomas H. Benton and Francis P. Blair, presented by the State of Missouri, 16,500 copies, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 1,500 shall be for the use and distribution by the governor of Missouri; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to have printed an engraving of said statues to accompany said proceedings, said engravings to be paid for out of the appropriation for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE BLAND.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. COCKRELL on the 22d instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 6,000 additional copies of the eulogies upon the late Richard P. Bland, a Representative from the State of Missouri; of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

REPORTS ON COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION OF 1893.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 copies of the Special Expert Reports prepared under the direction of the Committee of Awards of the Columbian Exposition, held in Chicago in 1893, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

ROBERT SMALLS.

Mr. TELLER. I am directed by the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6230) for the relief of Robert Smalls, to report it without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

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

The preamble recites that Robert Smalls, on the 13th day of May, 1862, captured the steamer *Planter*, with all the armament and ammunition for Fort Ripley, at the city of Charleston, taking her out and turning her over to the Federal blockading squadron off Charleston; and again, on the 1st day of December, 1863, while loaded with provisions for the Federal troops on Morris Island, and while a terrific fire was opened on her from Secessionville (she being deserted by her captain, Nicholson, Smalls being on board as a pilot), took charge of the steamer *Planter* and brought her through safe, for which act he was made captain by Gen. Q. A. Gillmore.

The bill proposes to pay to Robert Smalls, or his heirs at law, \$5,000, deducting only the amount paid to Smalls under the act of May 13, 1862.

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

HEIRS OF LEON FRANK AND OTHERS.

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on Claims, to whom were referred the following bills:

A bill (S. 976) to relieve the heirs of Leon Frank, deceased, and to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction, and to remove the bar of statute of limitations;

A bill (S. 1025) for the relief of Alice Utz, heir and legatee of Joshua Wiley, and to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction, and to remove the bar of statute of limitations;

A bill (S. 1138) for the relief of Gertrude A. Leftwich, widow of John W. Leftwich;

A bill (S. 1531) for the relief of the estate of Charles Armelin, deceased;

A bill (S. 1583) for the relief of the heirs of A. Lawrence Foster;

A bill (S. 2239) for the relief of Mary J. Barrow;

A bill (S. 2240) for the relief of Mary E. Barrow;

A bill (S. 2718) for the relief of the estate of John G. Archer;

A bill (S. 3883) for the relief of the heirs of C. C. Moore, deceased;

A bill (S. 3884) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Edwin E. Saunders, deceased;

A bill (S. 4278) for the relief of Antonia Q. Lovell and others;

A bill (S. 4317) for the relief of W. S. Atwood;

A bill (S. 4637) for the relief of Davidson County, in the State of Tennessee;

A bill (S. 4795) for the relief of F. A. Jones, administrator of R. S. Jones, deceased; and

A bill (S. 4835) for the relief of George Seymour and others, Reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the claims represented by the following bills, to wit: S. 976, 1025, 1138, 1531, 1583, 2239, 2240, 2718, 3883, 3884, 4278, 4317, 4637, 4795, and 4835, for the relief of the heirs of Leon Frank; for the relief of Alice Utz, legatee of Joshua Wiley; for the relief of Gertrude A. Leftwich, widow of John W. Leftwich; for the relief of the estate of Charles Armelin; for the relief of the heirs of A. Lawrence Foster; for the relief of Mary J. Barrow; for the relief of Mary E. Barrow; for the relief of the estate of John G. Archer; for the relief of the heirs of C. C. Moore; for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Edwin E. Saunders; for the relief of Antonia Q. Lovell and others; for the relief of W. S. Atwood; for the relief of Davidson County, in the State of Tennessee; for the relief of F. A. Jones, administrator of R. S. Jones, deceased, and for the relief of George Seymour and others, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same are hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said Court of Claims shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. VEST. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9679) to authorize the construction of a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Paul, Minn., to report it back favorably and to ask that the Senate bill on the Calendar (S. 4817) to authorize the construction of a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Paul, Minn., be indefinitely postponed. The Senators from Minnesota are very anxious to have this bill considered, and it is a matter of great business importance. I ask that it be disposed of now.

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

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the bill may be laid aside for the present. I shall object to its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. The Senator from Missouri asks that the House bill be placed on the Calendar to take the place of Senate bill 4817 and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAPITAL TRACTION AND ANACOSTIA RAILROADS.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask leave to call up a motion for the purpose of withdrawing it. A few days ago I entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed the bill (H. R. 2826) authorizing and requiring certain extensions to be made to the lines of the Capital Traction Company of the District of Columbia. I did that at the request of some eminent citizens; but I understand the truth to be that a majority of the people on F street desire the railroad track to be built, and as time has been given as long as those who opposed the bill desired to have the motion pending. I ask leave now to withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois withdraws the motion he entered to reconsider the vote by which the bill he has named was passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 4908) for the relief of the legal representatives of Neafie & Levy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4909) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust and pay certain claims of

the State of Pennsylvania; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4910) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Stout; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEAR (by request) introduced a bill (S. 4911) for the relief of the heirs of Tilghman Weaver, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

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

A bill (S. 4912) for the relief of Mrs. Louisa M. Bennett, Miss Kate P. Bennett, Mrs. Mary Louisa Ogden, and Calvin S. Bennett;

A bill (S. 4913) for the relief of Peter B. Compton; and

A bill (S. 4914) for the relief of Evelyn Clark.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 4915) to provide for the determination of the relations of the Chickasaw freedmen to the Chickasaw Nation and the rights of such freedmen in the lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 128) authorizing the President to appoint one woman commissioner to represent the United States and the National Society of the Daughters of the Revolution at the unveiling of the statue of Lafayette at the exposition in Paris, France, in 1900; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am under the impression that action has been taken in this matter, and that the lady in question is on her way across the Atlantic.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has.

Mr. HAWLEY. Is that true?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the law now.

Mr. HAWLEY. This bill may be indefinitely postponed, then.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There are two societies of the Daughters of the Revolution, and one has been provided with a representative at Paris on the occasion of the unveiling of the Lafayette statue. This joint resolution provides for a representative of the other society.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 129) authorizing the President to appoint George W. Kirkman to be a captain in the Twenty-third Regiment of the United States Infantry and a major in the Forty-ninth Regiment of Infantry, United States Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4778) to amend the Navy personnel bill, approved March 3, 1899, as to certain officers in the Navy, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

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

Mr. FAIRBANKS submitted an amendment directing the issue of a duplicate of a lost check, drawn by William H. Comegys, major and paymaster, United States Army, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL GALLERIES OF ART.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Public Printer shall print and bind 5,000 copies of Senate Document 209, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, one-half in cloth and one-half in paper covers, the same to be delivered to the Superintendent of Public Documents for sale under the provisions of section 61, of an act approved January 12, 1895, providing for the public printing, binding, and distribution of public documents. The Public Printer is also authorized to print and bind extra editions of not less than 1,000 copies at a time of said document on requisition of the Superintendent of Documents, when required for sale.

Mr. HOAR. I move also that a number of the volumes mentioned in the resolution just passed be printed for the use of the Senate, not to exceed in cost \$500. I understand they cost about 40 cents apiece; so that will furnish about 1,500 for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts will please restate his motion.

Mr. HOAR. The copies of the document referred to in the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], which has been agreed to, are ready, I understand, to be stricken off, but they will not be printed probably until some time late in the vacation. I make a separate motion that a number

not to exceed \$500 in cost shall be printed for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE SENATOR-ELECT HAYWARD.

Mr. THURSTON submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed 6,000 additional copies of the eulogies upon the late Monroe L. Hayward, Senator-elect from the State of Nebraska, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

ENOS H. KIRK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the morning business is closed.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4118) granting an increase of pension to Enos H. Kirk.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Enos H. Kirk, late first lieutenant of Company E, Eightieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 11212, being the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11212) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to ask the Senator if he will allow me to call up a bill, which I think the public interest requires should be passed, and it will be a saving of money to this Government. The bill provides—

Mr. ALLISON. I trust the Senator will not press that request.

Mr. DANIEL. I hope the Senator will allow me to state the case.

Mr. ALLISON. I will state that it is important that the sundry civil bill shall be completed to-day. I think it will not take a great while.

Mr. DANIEL. I hope the Senator will allow me to state the case before he decides. I have not yet stated what the bill is. It is a bill to provide the means to the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the Hawaiian debt, according to the terms of the treaty, or the terms of annexation of those islands. It has been called up several times in the Senate, and objection has been made to its consideration by Senators, but it has been explained to those Senators, and they have withdrawn their objection. On the 15th of June the obligation of the United States to pay interest on the Hawaiian bonds matures, and the interest thereafter must be provided for by us. The matter ought to be provided for before that time.

Mr. ALLISON. I call the attention of the Senate and of the Senator to the situation of the public business. I take it for granted that it is the general wish of the Senate that we shall adjourn at an early day. If so, it is important that the appropriation bills shall be disposed of in the Senate in order that they may be returned to the House for consideration there. The sundry civil appropriation bill, the general deficiency appropriation bill, which will not take a great while, and the Military Academy bill are the only three appropriation bills remaining undisposed of by the Senate. After they shall have been completed, there will be several days of opportunity for bills of this character.

Mr. DANIEL. The bill to which I refer will also have to be considered by the House.

Mr. ALLISON. It can easily be considered by the House. So I trust the Senator will not press that matter this morning. I agree that the bill referred to by him may be an important one.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. When the sundry civil bill was last under consideration, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate inserted the provision for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire to be heard briefly on that motion.

Immediately before the adjournment of the Senate on Tuesday last I entered a motion to reconsider the vote whereby a provision was incorporated in the sundry civil bill appropriating \$5,000,000 for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition. I did so after the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had made a point of

order against a proposed amendment submitted by myself appropriating \$75,000 for the payment of the expenses of a commissioner to study the commercial and industrial conditions of China, Japan, and other Asiatic countries—a measure which passed the Senate some time ago—coming from the Committee on Commerce after mature consideration, and which had had some consideration in the other House, a favorable report having there been made on the bill.

This morning I desire very briefly (because I am very anxious that this bill shall pass) to call attention to the delightful piece of fiction that we have in our Manual, known as Rule XVI of this body. Had not the suggestion been made to me that the present able and courteous and always fair Presiding Officer of the Senate (the President pro tempore in the chair) had written that rule, I should have been tempted to believe that it was the product of some humorist like Eli Perkins or some idealist such as Jules Verne. It is a rule that is subject to all kinds of interpretations that lets matter into or excludes matter from appropriation bills, according to the humor or the caprice of this body. It is a rule that I believe is not understood by any member of this body, and probably never will be understood, and for this reason it ought in the near future to be revised, so as to make it subject to some kind of uniform interpretation.

In connection with the point of order made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], I will not go back to the old appropriation bills of this body to show, notwithstanding the fact that that rule says general legislation shall not be incorporated in appropriation bills, that we do a very considerable part of the legislation of Congress on appropriation bills. It is sufficient for my purpose to turn over the pages of the present appropriation bill and show that a great deal of general legislation is found in this measure.

On page 18 there is a provision for "Relief light vessel for the Twelfth and Thirteenth light-house districts;" on page 19, the "Desdemona Sands, mouth of Columbia River, Oregon," are taken care of to the amount of \$24,000. On the same page the "Slip Point light-house and fog signal, Washington," managed to get an appropriation of \$12,500, under a provision that is general legislation and nothing else.

On page 20 I find "Joint light-house and fog-signal stations in Alaskan waters" are given \$150,000—a provision that is general legislation and nothing else. On page 53, "For establishing a fish-hatching and fish-culture station" at "some suitable point in Idaho," \$100,000 is appropriated; and I am glad they are going to have one there because we have one in New Hampshire; but it is general legislation on an appropriation bill. On page 65 we take care of the "Office of recorder of deeds, District of Columbia," increasing the salary of the recorder. On page 66 we establish and maintain a quarantine service in the Territory of Hawaii, and appropriate \$100,000 for it. On page 67 there is quite a good deal of legislation regarding the Territory of Hawaii. On the same page we make a provision for the settlement of certain State claims—a very comprehensive provision, which is general legislation. On page 115 a provision is incorporated in reference to Arlington Cemetery—a wise provision, but it is general legislation beyond question.

On page 105 we have general legislation regarding the South Pass, Mississippi River, and we have a small sized river and harbor bill on this bill, which must be general legislation, if it is anything. We provide, on page 117, for pay of one superintendent and, I think, some other officers at Antietam. On page 120 we provide for the publication of additional editions of the Records of the Rebellion, and also for an investigation of claims against the United States for private property taken. On page 149 we provide for the payment of the salaries of a clerk and reporter of the United States district court for the Territory of Hawaii. On page 134 we have a provision regarding the Fort Sherman Military Reservation, in Kootenai County, Idaho, restoring it to the Interior Department.

These are only a few of the provisions of this bill by which general legislation is incorporated in an appropriation bill. If I had been here for the purpose of enforcing this very imperfectly understood Rule XVI, I should have been kept busy raising points of order, most of which I think would have been sustained by the Chair, because those provisions are beyond question obnoxious to that rule. But I have not felt it my duty, Mr. President, to proceed on the assumption that it was my special province to enforce this rule. The Committee on Appropriations, in their wisdom, violated the rule every time they put one of those provisions in this bill, and we have deferred to the judgment and good sense of that great committee, believing that they saw some sufficient reason for reporting these amendments and others to which I might allude.

On Tuesday last the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] reported an amendment from the Committee on Appropriations providing for an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for a celebration which is to take place in the future, subject, I believe, to a popular vote of Missouri, for which the large amount of \$5,000,000 is

appropriated. I knew perfectly well that the amendment was obnoxious to the rule, but I did not feel at liberty to raise the point of order, believing that the Committee on Appropriations were very likely acting wisely in the matter.

I knew, when the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] a day or two ago moved to increase the appropriation of \$100,000 to \$350,000 for measuring the streams and investigating artesian wells in certain parts of the country, that the amendment was in violation of Rule XVI, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations likewise knew it was in violation of that rule, but neither he nor I made a point of order against it.

Now, Mr. President, after all this matter had been incorporated into this bill, and these large appropriations had been made, it occurred to me that the commercial bodies of this country and the business men who have been petitioning and urging Congress to pass a bill appropriating \$75,000 to pay the expense of a commission of five persons to study the industrial and commercial conditions of oriental countries with a view to enlarging the trade of the United States might well be heard. Desiring to carry out their wishes in that direction, after the Senate had already allowed numerous amendments in violation of Rule XVI to be incorporated in the bill, I submitted an amendment providing for the expenses of such commission, when lo and behold, the Senator from Iowa, with unusual alertness, made a point of order. He made the point of order in these words:

I make any point of order that I can make upon this amendment.

It was evident that the Senator from Iowa did not understand the rule, but he thought there might be a point of order somewhere occultly secreted in that rule that the Presiding Officer could invoke for the purpose of preventing the consideration of my amendment. The Senator did say:

I understand this to be new legislation.

We all knew that, just as we knew that forty other provisions in this bill are new legislation. So the point of order was made, and my amendment was ruled out. I ventured to say:

I observe that an appropriation of \$5,000,000 was made a moment ago without a point of order being raised against it.

The Senator from Iowa said:

I observed the same thing.

So the Senator from Iowa was not laboring under any delusion when he allowed the amendment appropriating \$5,000,000 to go in the bill. He knew it was new legislation. It was not because he had not observed it; it was not because it got in by inadvertence, because the Senator from Iowa had "observed the same thing." I confess I am a little at a loss to understand why the provisions of this rule should have been invoked against my amendment, which proposed to appropriate \$75,000 for an object which certainly is of as much consequence to this country as any exposition can possibly be, while (the Senator "observing" it) an amendment which appropriated \$5,000,000, contrary to the rule, was allowed to go in without protest from him. I did think that I had not been treated fairly in regard to this matter; and I think so now. For that reason I entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the provision for the appropriation of \$5,000,000 for the proposed exposition in the city of St. Louis had been agreed to.

But, Mr. President, I am always good-natured and always want to do the fair thing in matters of legislation. I do not really think that, as this great committee allowed this amendment to be reported, and the Senator from Iowa, with his wonderful watchfulness, immediately afterwards allowed it to go in having "observed it"—I do not think I ought to insist upon this motion; and for the reasons that I have stated I desire now to withdraw the motion which I made to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I desire to inquire if the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire is withdrawn, whether this amendment can now be objected to with a view of having it acted upon in the Senate?

Mr. GALLINGER. Undoubtedly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Separate votes can be demanded in the Senate on any amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MORGAN. I give notice now that I shall ask for a separate vote on this amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Having withdrawn my motion to reconsider the vote whereby the appropriation of \$5,000,000 was incorporated in the bill, which the Senator from Iowa "observed," I desire to offer an amendment to this bill, acting under instructions from the Committee on Commerce at its meeting this morning, to which I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa, in the hope that he will not feel it incumbent upon him to make the point of order, if a point of order will lie against the amendment. I submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After line 2, on page 152, it is proposed to insert the following:

For salaries and expenses of a commission of five persons, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to study the commercial and industrial conditions of China, Japan, and other Asiatic countries, \$75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available.

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

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire having taken occasion to lecture me personally as to my conduct in this Chamber, I take the liberty of saying a few words respecting the statements made by that Senator regarding this bill.

The Senator says that this bill is full of legislative provisions, and in order to demonstrate that fact he cites a good many paragraphs in the bill which, with the exception of one or two, or perhaps three, if he will take the trouble to study the Book of Estimates he will find that every one of them is estimated for.

As to the light-house amendments, which he characterizes as legislative provisions, every one of them, so far as I know, is in order and is for the purpose of carrying out this great Light-House Service of ours, which is as much a public service and as much within the rules of this body, as to the maintenance of the public service under existing law, as are the appropriations for the White House or for the Treasury Department or any other Department of this Government. They are provisions that have uniformly been put upon this bill where they have been estimated for and where we have had the reports of the Light-House Board as to their imperative necessity.

As to the provisions relative to Hawaii, they are all inserted in pursuance of existing law. They have never been estimated for; but whether estimated for or not, it is the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to take note of the fact that those laws require appropriations. All the appropriations for the quarantine service and as to various public offices in Hawaii are in pursuance of a statute passed by Congress.

It is true that there are one or two small clauses in the nature of amendments, where the decision of the Comptroller has interfered with the payment of compensation supposed to be authorized by law, and an amendment is required in order that these people might receive the compensation they have been in the habit of receiving hitherto.

As to the river and harbor amendments on this bill, I will say that the Committee on Appropriations have a respect for and, so far as possible, desire to observe the recommendations of other committees of this body, and especially of the Committee on Commerce. I will state to the Senator from New Hampshire that, as I understand these appropriations, they come within rules of this body. As respects the Mississippi River, there are in this bill a large number of appropriations to carry out existing contracts. As I understand Rule XVI, and as it has been interpreted to me by very high authority, those amendments are in order.

It is true that the amendments respecting the settlement of the claims of Virginia, South Carolina, Nevada, California, and Oregon, because of some of the provisions contained in them, were out of order. I endeavored to explain to the Senate that the situation and condition respecting the two States of Virginia and South Carolina were such that I believe there ought to be unanimous consent of the Senate to deal with those subjects at this session.

So, Mr. President, whatever may be the shortcomings—and there are many—of the Committee on Appropriations, it has been their purpose and endeavor, so far as possible, to comply with the rules of the Senate respecting legislation upon appropriation bills.

In relation to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, he did not state that he moved the amendment in pursuance of the request of any committee, and I did not happen to know that the amendment was in substance a bill which had been considered in this body and agreed to, because any bill that is considered in this body, for which an appropriation is required, should have proper consideration.

I knew and know now that there are amendments lying in various ways in our pathway that will swell this bill beyond what I think is wise and desirable at this session.

As to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] relating to the exposition to be held in 1903 at St. Louis—

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, if he will turn to page 6751 of the RECORD he will notice that I said:

And that was unquestionably new legislation. This is a matter which has passed the Senate, has been reported favorably in the other branch of Congress, and ought to have some standing before the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. I did not hear those words. If the Senator made that statement, I did not hear it, and I have not had time to read the RECORD this morning to note that fact. I thank him for the correction.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. Do I understand the Senator to say that if a bill has passed this body and is recommended by a committee he considers that it is relevant to this bill as an amendment?

Mr. ALLISON. I did not say that. I said it was entitled to full consideration, and if an appropriation was needed it would be a matter to be considered.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator mean to say that he would not consider it amenable to a point of order?

Mr. ALLISON. I did not say that.

Mr. HALE. It is general legislation.

Mr. ALLISON. Of course that does not make general legislation in order. I was endeavoring to reply to the somewhat drastic and, I think, unnecessary criticism of the Senator from New Hampshire as respects the conduct of myself in particular and the Committee on Appropriations, and that is why I make these suggestions.

Every Senator on this floor has a right to make points of order if he chooses. The Senator from New Hampshire was sitting in his seat when this amendment was proposed by the Senator from Missouri, and he made no objection. If it was subject to the point of order, he had a right to make it as well as any other Senator upon the floor. But if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri is examined carefully it will be discovered, I think, that there is an appropriation of \$10,000 in it and not an appropriation of \$5,000,000. It is true there is a proposal which may amount to a promise on the part of Congress that at some future day an appropriation shall be made. The Committee on Appropriations considered the amendment and a large majority of the committee favored it, and therefore, under the circumstances, being a member of the committee, I did not consider that it was my duty to raise the point of order upon it. The Senator may have thought it was.

Mr. President, respecting the amendment now proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire, I ask that it may lie over for the present and I will look at it, and later in the day I may consider that it is a proper amendment. The matter having been considered by the Committee on Commerce and having passed the Senate, I do not personally feel called upon to criticize it especially at this time.

Mr. GALLINGER rose.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Before the matter goes over, I should like to say one word upon it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not want to interfere with the Senator from New Hampshire, however.

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I think we ought to be pretty cautious about the matter of the appointment of commissions for every purpose in the world. I have heretofore on various occasions expressed my opinion about commissions. Commissions are necessary perhaps in some instances, but they have come to be pressed upon Congress very much as these expositions have. Promoters of expositions throughout the country, when one has been closed, immediately study where another can be started. It has become a regular business. It is worked up by the promoters until some new exposition is decided upon by them, and then all the local interest and all the local feeling which may cluster around an exposition to be held in a particular place are worked up by the promoters, and then comes an application to Congress for large or small appropriations of money, as the case may be. If they are small in the first instance, they are enlarged afterwards; and when that exposition is over with, another site is selected by the promoters, and the same process of working up public sentiment and an appeal to Congress and Senators not to object to it is gone through with.

It is so with a good many of these commissions. Senators have been pursued since this Congress assembled by people who desire positions on this commission to China, not only to favor the creation of such a commission, but to recommend them to be placed on the commission. I for one have become very tired of such solicitation. I do not know how much the Committee on Commerce may have considered the matter; I do not know to what extent they may think it desirable; but for myself, I think we could get along one year more without a commission to investigate the condition of trade with China. I think our people know a good deal about those conditions without any investigation. I know how easy it is to go to manufacturers and to manufacturers' associations and to get indorsements for anything of this sort.

Mr. President, this appropriation bill has already reached very large proportions, and, as the chairman of the committee has said, if the amendments which are lying back and are to be presented are to be agreed to, because somebody has been importuned in the matter or because there may possibly be some slight advantage to trade or commerce to be derived from the adoption of such amendments, this bill will be swollen to a very much larger extent. I want an opportunity when the bill comes into the Senate—and I am very glad the Senator from Alabama gave the

notice he did—to record my vote against this proposition to expend under any circumstances \$5,000,000 for an exposition in this country. I think we ought to proceed with some idea of economy. I know that is rather an old-fashioned notion, but I am an old-fashioned man; and for one I do not feel like giving my support to this commission nor to the proposition in favor of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut talks about promoters. I desire to call his attention to the fact that the original promoter of this proposition is the present President of the United States. In his last two messages to Congress he has urged the creation of a commission such as is contemplated in the bill that has passed the Senate and in the amendment which I have just submitted. I presume there are gentlemen willing and very likely anxious to serve on this commission. There are men in New Hampshire willing to serve in the Senate of the United States or in the House of Representatives or in almost any other capacity that they can secure, and I think they are just as much entitled to have an ambition in that direction as the Senator from Connecticut or the Senators from New Hampshire have to a seat in this body. I do not think a valid objection will lie against a man because he desires to serve his country on an industrial commission any more than in any other capacity.

Mr. President, I did not mean to be discourteous or to transgress proper parliamentary procedure in the strictures I made upon the Committee on Appropriations or the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Senator from Iowa. I did call attention to a considerable number of amendments in this bill which I thought were general legislation, and I have no doubt that the Senator from Iowa is correct in saying that some of them have been estimated for. I glanced over this bill, and I can see at least six amendments which I did not name which were not estimated for and which are undoubtedly general legislation. I will not take the time to call attention to them. I will simply content myself by saying that I trust the Senator from Iowa will see the propriety of allowing this amendment to go into the bill, and I venture further to suggest that if he should make the point of order against it, I trust the presiding officer of the Senate will very carefully examine Rule XVI, with a view of fully satisfying himself that it is obnoxious to that rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to call the attention of Senators to this point: Senators occasionally say that an amendment offered changes existing law. It is not the Senate rule that an amendment shall not change existing law. That is the House rule, and in the House any amendment which changes existing law is out of order. That is not true under the Senate rules. The Senate rule is that "no amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill." That no general legislation can not be cured by an act or resolution of the Senate passed at the same session, nor can it be cured by the action of a committee reporting favorably an amendment and sending it to the Appropriations Committee. It is absolute in its terms—"no amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill."

One of the most difficult things in the world for a presiding officer is to determine what is and what is not general legislation. The Chair can simply say to the Senate that he certainly will be impartial in his rulings. He can not say to the Senate that he will not be mistaken.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, it seems to me we have created commissions enough. We have commissions on every subject, commissions for almost every purpose, until we have multiplied offices almost indefinitely. I believe that this Congress will show a doubling up almost of the number of new offices created over that of any other session of Congress that has ever met, with extravagant appropriations in every branch of the public service. This commission, above all others, is not necessary, provided we will do that which every other nation does in this connection—that is, appoint the consuls of the United States from the ranks of people capable of gathering the information we desire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from South Dakota permit me?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I yield to a question.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; just to a question. Can the Senator point to a single commission created by Congress at the present session? And is the Senator not aware of the fact that England has sent two commissions to China, France one, and Germany one for the very purpose contemplated in this amendment?

Mr. PETTIGREW. This very bill continues or re-creates the Industrial Commission, which I think answers that question pretty thoroughly. And as for commissions appointed by the President, they are almost endless in number and cover a very large scope. Vast sums of money have been expended in connection with these commissions, in my opinion with little good to the public service. The Industrial Commission, according to the evidence and according to what we have heard in the last few days, has degenerated into a political machine, of no value whatever, absolutely

destroyed for any purpose except it may be to advance the interests of some political party.

As I said before, if we want this information and will appoint men capable of gathering it as consuls to the ports of Asia, instead of appointing politicians to go there to serve four years and return home, giving their places to another set of politicians, it will be unnecessary to appoint a commission to visit Asia.

It seems to me we ought to call a halt; that this commission is unnecessary, and that the only purpose which can be promoted by the adoption of the amendment is to furnish places for five more people. I do not believe any other purpose can be accomplished. If we appoint consuls to those ports in China and Japan and all over Asia and keep them there continuously and have them continually gathering this information—that is what a consul is for; he is simply a trade agent—it will be unnecessary to appoint a commission. A junketing trip for five men can do no good for the commerce of this country. Five men who go over there as a commission, spending three or four months in the country or perhaps a year, can learn nothing of its trade relations, can gain no facts that are of value to the trade of this country; but our consuls can be of vast advantage; they can be of great benefit; and if we will fill those places with men capable of securing information we will have accomplished a great purpose. This amendment will accomplish nothing except to afford a fine trip for five men and furnish so much patronage for Senators or for the Administration. It will accomplish no other result.

Mr. GALLINGER. As this matter has gone over, I do not care to discuss it further than to say—

Mr. ALLISON. As it has been discussed now for some time, I suggest that we consider it now.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will speak to the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I will not make the point of order. Let the matter proceed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I simply desire to make a remark, and that is, that according to my observation the consular service of the United States compares favorably with that of any other country in the world. In fact, complaint has been made in Great Britain and in Germany against their consular service; that their consuls are not so intelligent or progressive as the consuls of the United States, and that the reports made by our consuls are infinitely superior to those made by the consuls of the other great countries of the world. So I do not think the criticism which the Senator from South Dakota has made upon our consular service is well grounded.

Of course the Senator has a right to oppose the creation of this commission, but it is the only commission which at the present session of Congress it has been suggested shall be created. I do not think the fact that the President has appointed some commissions on his own responsibility militates against this proposed commission.

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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8366) to amend section 953 of the Revised Statutes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10301) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 15, upon which the committee of conference were unable to agree, and agrees to the same.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10450) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 9 and 58, and agrees to the same with amendments; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; further disagrees to the amendments Nos. 50, 51, 52, and 53, upon which the committee of conference were unable to agree; asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FOSS, Mr. DAYTON, and Mr. CUMMINGS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 255) to ratify an agreement with the Indians of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation in Idaho, and making appropriations to carry the same into effect, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. STEPHENS of Texas managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed with amendments the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for

a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

A bill (H. R. 1965) granting an increase of pension to John Loneragan;

A bill (H. R. 2392) granting a pension to Daniel Davis;

A bill (H. R. 2752) granting an increase of pension to Edmund P. Tierney;

A bill (H. R. 6424) granting a pension to Charles S. Devine;

A bill (H. R. 9308) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Shaw;

A bill (H. R. 9835) to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia;

A bill (H. R. 10261) granting a pension to Josiah H. Buckingham;

A bill (H. R. 10616) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Mead; and

A bill (H. R. 10743) granting a pension to Augusta Ullman.

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

A bill (S. 28) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James H. Waters;

A bill (S. 61) granting a pension to George Bunce;

A bill (S. 78) granting a pension to Samuel W. Childs;

A bill (S. 103) granting an increase of pension to Charles Critzer;

A bill (S. 163) granting an increase of pension to Dwight D. Wilber;

A bill (S. 169) granting a pension to George E. Tuttle;

A bill (S. 258) granting an increase of pension to Coryden Bevans;

A bill (S. 306) granting an increase of pension to Warren L. Eaton;

A bill (S. 314) granting a pension to Rosa L. Couch;

A bill (S. 410) granting an increase of pension to Harriet V. Gridley;

A bill (S. 539) granting an increase of pension to Fielding L. Rutherford;

A bill (S. 716) granting a pension to Susan Buck;

A bill (S. 756) granting a pension to Lydia F. Wiley;

A bill (S. 825) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Coons;

A bill (S. 847) granting an increase of pension to James B. Logan;

A bill (S. 1207) granting an increase of pension to Levi Chandler;

A bill (S. 1274) granting an increase of pension to Augustus C. Pyle;

A bill (S. 1364) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Blockson;

A bill (S. 1441) granting an increase of pension to James G. Hartzell;

A bill (S. 1460) granting a pension to Charles A. Hutchings;

A bill (S. 1533) granting a pension to David Carroll;

A bill (S. 1548) granting an increase of pension to James Byrne;

A bill (S. 1551) granting a pension to John G. B. Masters;

A bill (S. 1552) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Dent;

A bill (S. 1553) granting an increase of pension to Samantha Barnes;

A bill (S. 1569) granting a pension to Phebe E. C. Priestly;

A bill (S. 1608) granting a pension to Eleanor R. Sullivan;

A bill (S. 1734) granting a pension to Mary S. Belding;

A bill (S. 1758) granting an increase of pension to Farnham J. Eastman;

A bill (S. 1776) granting a pension to John Carr;

A bill (S. 1823) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Shup;

A bill (S. 1831) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Lewis;

A bill (S. 1901) granting a pension to Elvira Hunter;

A bill (S. 1907) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Paulding Meade;

A bill (S. 1919) granting an increase of pension Consolacion Victoria Kirkland;

A bill (S. 2008) granting a pension to Flavel H. Van Eaton;

A bill (S. 2020) granting a pension to Sarah E. Fortier;

A bill (S. 2101) granting an increase of pension to George E. Scott;

A bill (S. 2142) for the relief of Anna Whitney Tarbell;

A bill (S. 2203) granting an increase of pension to William Taylor;

A bill (S. 2215) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Koonce;

A bill (S. 2276) granting an increase of pension to George W. Ragland;

A bill (S. 2280) granting a pension to Horatio N. Cornell;

A bill (S. 2286) granting an increase of pension to John W. Craig;

A bill (S. 2296) granting an increase of pension to John J. Sears;

A bill (S. 2451) granting a pension to Jennie P. Stover;
 A bill (S. 2483) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Beard;
 A bill (S. 2539) granting an increase of pension to Milton H. Daniels;
 A bill (S. 2530) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Hobart;
 A bill (S. 2651) granting a pension to Henry Hill;
 A bill (S. 2795) granting an increase of pension to Christina Noll;
 A bill (S. 2900) granting a pension to Hannah G. Huff;
 A bill (S. 2961) granting an increase of pension to Michael Lochard;
 A bill (S. 2962) granting an increase of pension to William Blades;
 A bill (S. 2977) granting an increase of pension to Jacob P. Fletcher;
 A bill (S. 2993) granting an increase of pension to Edward Madden;
 A bill (S. 3047) granting an increase of pension to William Mullevy;
 A bill (S. 3058) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Meylert;
 A bill (S. 3082) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Wolfley;
 A bill (S. 3154) granting an increase of pension to Kate Cadwell;
 A bill (S. 3183) granting a pension to George W. Newell;
 A bill (S. 3234) granting an increase of pension to Mary Yowell;
 A bill (S. 3268) granting an increase of pension to Elisha F. Barton;
 A bill (S. 3277) granting an increase of pension to Solon Cooper;
 A bill (S. 3289) granting a pension to Isabella Underwood;
 A bill (S. 3293) granting an increase of pension to Helen Harlow;
 A bill (S. 3294) granting a pension to Louesa Moulton;
 A bill (S. 3300) granting an increase of pension to Luke H. Monson;
 A bill (S. 3314) granting a pension to Mary I. Bradbury;
 A bill (S. 3329) granting an increase of pension to Kate B. Warren;
 A bill (S. 3337) granting an increase of pension to Buren R. Sherman;
 A bill (S. 3418) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Adelaide Ball;
 A bill (S. 3467) granting a pension to Hellen Lang;
 A bill (S. 3527) granting a pension to Edwin M. Farnham;
 A bill (S. 3549) granting an increase of pension to William A. Keyes;
 A bill (S. 3634) granting a pension to Mary P. Hunter;
 A bill (S. 3708) granting a pension to John H. Harrison;
 A bill (S. 3788) granting an increase of pension to James Williams;
 A bill (S. 3899) granting a pension to James Cook;
 A bill (S. 3900) granting a pension to Sarah Clark;
 A bill (S. 4006) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Tucker;
 A bill (S. 4007) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Dunn;
 A bill (S. 4040) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Gage;
 A bill (S. 4077) granting a pension to Frances Horton Force;
 A bill (S. 4087) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Mansur;
 A bill (S. 4215) granting a pension to Belle Bean;
 A bill (S. 4421) granting an increase of pension to Albert Brown;
 and
 A bill (S. 4716) granting an increase of pension to Robert G. Dyhrenfurth.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 3055) to ratify an agreement between the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes and the Seminole tribe of Indians;
 A bill (S. 3490) in relation to admissions to and dismissions from the Reform School of the District of Columbia;
 A bill (H. R. 4367) granting an increase of pension to Mary La Tourrette Stotsenburg;
 A bill (H. R. 6243) to amend the charter of the Capital Traction Company of the District of Columbia;
 A bill (H. R. 6250) for the relief of the Colorado Cooperative Company, to permit second homesteads in certain cases, and for other purposes;
 A bill (H. R. 7663) to establish a board of charities for the District of Columbia;
 A bill (H. R. 7813) granting a pension to Lyda Strang;
 A bill (H. R. 8498) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the reassessment of water-main taxes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1898;

A bill (H. R. 9083) to authorize the Commissioner of General Land Office to dispose of the Choctaw orphan Indian lands in Mississippi, and to make appropriation for executing act of Congress approved June 28, 1898;

A bill (H. R. 9884) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North;

A bill (H. R. 10301) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901;

A bill (H. R. 10812) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain described lands in San Juan County, Colo., as a legal subdivision or lot, and authorizing the mayor of Silverton to enter said land for cemetery purposes;

A bill (H. R. 10997) to amend section 4414, Title LII, Revised Statutes of the United States;

A bill (H. R. 11281) permitting building a dam across New River;

A bill (H. R. 11816) requiring the disbursing clerk of the Census Office to file additional bond, and for other purposes;

A joint resolution (S. R. 121) for the appointment of first lieutenants of volunteers in the Signal Corps of the Army;

A joint resolution (S. R. 127) to fill a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 238) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the annual report upon the improvement and care of public buildings and grounds.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the naval appropriation bill, in order that conferees for a further conference may be appointed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, May 29, 1900.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the bill H. R. 10450, "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes," and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "Ocean surveys: For special ocean surveys and the publication thereof, and for the purchase of nautical books, charts, and sailing directions, and freight and express charges on the same, \$30,000."

Further insists on its disagreement to the Senate amendments numbered 50, 51, 52, and 53, recedes from its disagreement to amendment numbered 58, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after "Provided," in line 10 of the Senate amendment, and in lieu thereof insert: "That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to procure by contract armor of the best quality for any or all vessels above referred to, provided such contracts can be made at a price which in his judgment is reasonable and equitable; but in case he is unable to make contracts for armor under the above conditions, he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to procure a sight for and to erect thereon a factory for the manufacture of armor, and the sum of \$1,000,000 is hereby appropriated toward the erection of said factory." And asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. Foss, Mr. DAYTON, and Mr. CUMMINGS be the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 58, and that the Senate further insist upon its amendments numbered 50, 51, 52, and 53, upon which the committee of conference were unable to agree, and agree to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I desire to ask some questions before the motion is agreed to. I want to know what is now in disagreement that we are insisting upon?

Mr. HALE. The same subjects-matter that were in disagreement before the conference—the provisions in relation to ocean surveys, in relation to the course of the students at Annapolis, and armor plate.

Mr. PETTIGREW. As the Senate has agreed that we shall pay \$445 a ton for all armor plate and \$545 a ton for enough to equip the three ships now being built, and the House insists upon the building of a plant unless the Secretary can buy armor plate at a reasonable price—

Mr. HALE. Yes; that is it exactly.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Does the Senator think the Senate should continue to insist upon its position?

Mr. HALE. I do not think the Senate is ready to recede and give the matter up. I do not think the Senate to-day, at any rate, will agree that the whole matter shall be left in the discretion of the Secretary, and the whole matter of armor plant discretionary with the Secretary. The proposition of the Senate was to fix a price, which is named, and that if the Secretary can not get a contract at that price, then he shall go on and build an armor-plate factory. The House provision leaves it all entirely discretionary with the Secretary.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It seems to me when we fix the price so excessively and enormously high that there is a profit of seven millions in it, it is hardly to be expected that the armor-plate

manufacturers will decline to accept that gratuity or that donation.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator vote for the House proposition, to leave the whole thing discretionary with the Secretary?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I think I would. I do not think he can possibly do worse than we have done.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator from South Dakota allow me to suggest to him that it is possible, if we agree to the House proposition, there will be a profit of more than seven millions?

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will permit me, it leaves the whole thing in the discretion of the Secretary, and he can pay seven hundred or a thousand dollars a ton under the proposed amendment of the House. After we have discussed the subject here ad nauseam for five years, and the Senate has repeatedly fixed the price at \$300, and then the other day, by a narrow margin of 2 votes, an agreement was made that the price should be \$445, and in the event that we could not get it at that price then we would build an armor plant, the House turns around and says, "Let us throw all that away; the Secretary knows more about it than the Senate or anybody else; we will let him fix the price according to his discretion and give him carte blanche to pay what he pleases."

Mr. PETTIGREW. It seems to me we have done about as bad as we can.

Mr. TILLMAN. Four hundred and forty-five dollars is not so bad as \$545 or \$645 or \$1,000, and that is what this proposition means.

Mr. PETTIGREW. So far as that is concerned, it is \$545 we are discussing. The armor plate, according to the testimony submitted from the Committee on Naval Affairs, will not cost more than \$250, and they are selling it for that. Now, we put in this bill the price of \$545. That is the item we are discussing, not \$445, because the \$445 item is for vessels to be built in the distant future, and that can be attended to at the next session of Congress. All we have done is to fix the price at \$545, which is \$300 more than it costs to make the armor plate, and for 9,000 tons that will be \$2,700,000 profit.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will allow me to correct him, the House sent the bill over here with no provision in it at all for armor except for the three battle ships now on the stocks nearing completion. The House at that time did not agree to anything on this scheme of additional armor, but the Senate, as I said, by a narrow majority, inserted a provision authorizing \$445, and in the event that they could not get it at that price then the Secretary was ordered to build an armor factory. The House now proposes that we shall strike that out and leave the Secretary footloose to do as he pleases and get the armor at the best price he can, and if not satisfactory, in his judgment, he can build an armor factory.

Mr. NELSON. May I ask the Senator from Maine a question?

Mr. HALE. Certainly. I should like to have a vote on my motion.

Mr. NELSON. I understand from the reading of this report that you have agreed to such an amendment.

Mr. TILLMAN. No.

Mr. NELSON. You have agreed to—

Mr. TILLMAN. Not about armor at all.

Mr. HALE. That is precisely the point in controversy to which the Senate conferees do not agree. The Senate maintains its position of \$445 or an armor plant. If I were to talk an hour I could not make it any plainer.

Mr. NELSON. I thought you had agreed to that.

Mr. TILLMAN. No, sir.

Mr. HALE. I should be glad to have a vote on my proposition.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine a question before the vote is taken. Did the House agree to the Senate amendment about the dry dock at Charleston?

Mr. HALE. That has already been settled—agreed to by both Houses. The Senator called it up the other day and we had a vote upon it, and the Senate settled it and the House accepted it. So that passes from consideration.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to interrogate the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. This matter is becoming perilous. It would be a frightful catastrophe if the Government should be again confronted, in this ambitious scheme to build up an American Navy, with an exhibition of utter inability upon the part of Congress to provide for the furnishing of armor plate. I had intended to offer an amendment to this report on the floor of the Senate, but I am informed that it would not be in order.

I should like, however, to ask the chairman of the committee whether he thinks there would be any chance of the acceptability of a suggestion that we should agree to the Vandiver amendment, which has been already indorsed by the Senate by a considerable majority, with a simple amendment striking out the word "including" and inserting the words "exclusive of;" so that the Government would pay the royalty to Krupp or to any other person hereafter, if any other process be invented or established which may be considered desirable, making, therefore, the limit of

the price of armor plate \$445, the Government paying the royalty, if any be due, or if any can be exacted?

Mr. HALE. Let me get at that. It is substantially a new proposition. Let me see what the Senator has in his mind. That the Senate proposition of \$445 absolute, which has been passed, shall be modified so that in addition to that the Government shall deal with the question of royalty and pay it.

Mr. PENROSE. If any be due.

Mr. HALE. If any is due.

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. HALE. I do not know. That, in a sense, is a new proposition. The conferees have not considered that proposition. At some future time I can not tell what may be done in conference. At present it is not, of course, as has been intimated to the Senator, in order, because the Senate conferees felt that they had made a square fight on their proposition of \$445 or an armor plant, and that they could not agree to the House proposition, which was widely and diametrically opposed to it. It is no such suggestion as that made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, but a direct proposition leaving it entirely with the Secretary and leaving the discretion of building an armor plant with the Secretary. The Senate conferees felt that they could not agree to that, and therefore report an absolute disagreement.

What will be done in subsequent conferences I do not know; but I think the Senator had better put his amendment in some form so that it may be considered at some future time.

Mr. PENROSE. I hope the conferees will give careful consideration to my suggestion, because it is in line with the action which the Senate has already taken, and will doubtless satisfy the Senator from South Carolina and those Senators who claim that no royalty is properly due upon this improved process and none is necessary to be paid.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania imagines that I am ever going, by my vote here, to consent to make a present of \$7,000,000 to this armor trust, he is very much mistaken. The difference between what we have decided in the Senate over and over again to be a fair price for armor and the price demanded by the Carnegie people and the Bethlehem people involved in this contract for 32,000 tons, over and above what the Secretary of the Navy and the Naval Committee have declared to be the true cost of and a good profit on armor, is \$7,000,000. Now, if the Senator thinks that I will ever consent to that, he is simply mistaken; that is all.

Mr. PENROSE. If the statement of the Senator from South Carolina were correct, I would not blame him for not agreeing to the proposition.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I do not know but that it is better for this matter to go back to conference, and I hope the conferees on the part of the Senate will consider this proposition that we build an armor plant and do it at once. Why should we be held up by these manufacturers? It is admitted that they are in collusion; that they are a trust; that they have combined for the purpose of dividing what? The work, not competing as to the price, but that whatever profit there is shall be shared between them. It is admitted that the profit on the first contract they got from the Government paid for their plant. So we have paid for the plants, and now the two companies whose plants we have paid for combine to plunder the Government, and we wrangle over that proposition.

It seems to me under the circumstances, in view of the fact that there is no competition, the day has come when we should build a plant and own it ourselves. We would save the cost of that plant almost every time we built a ship, even if we did not make a single armor plate, because with the threat that we would make it ourselves, if we did not want to make it ourselves there would be competition and a price fair and legitimate and honest could be made, and the Government after all saving the cost of its plant over and over again. We would not of necessity be compelled to make the armor plate. But there is no remedy if we do not build a plant. Therefore I hope the conferees will insist that the House shall make this concession to them, and that, without waiting for the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, we shall build a plant, and built it at once.

Mr. HALE. I hope Senators will let this merely formal matter go through and get out of the way of the Senator from Iowa. When the conference which is now to be appointed reports it will then be a fair subject for discussion, but I hope Senators will not take any more time now, as it is only a formal matter. I ask that my motion be agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I feel that I ought to say that I never shall be willing to vote to give an unlimited discretion to the Secretary of the Navy to put armor on the ships. It will be a \$17,000,000 contract. I understand the difference of opinion is on the question whether we shall limit the price of armor or allow the Secretary to pay any sum he chooses to pay.

Now I say, Mr. President, if that is to be the end of all this fight about armor and our endeavor to secure a reasonable price for

armor out of two great combined concerns, and if we are to wind it up by giving authority to the Secretary of the Navy to pay \$600 a ton if he sees fit to do so, it will be a most impotent and cowardly conclusion.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to make one remark before the subject passes from the consideration of the Senate. After all this controversy I think we ought to see the final liberation of the United States from this combine; and it being impossible to do otherwise, I would say, let the House have their way, and let the Secretary have his discretion until an armor plant can be built, and let us put in this bill a mandatory provision to commence work immediately. Then we will have the end of it at some time, but we never will live to see this controversy ended unless we build an armor plant.

That is not the House proposition, but I suggest to the conferees that they insist upon a provision for the building of an armor plant in the way I have suggested, and then we will see the end of it at some time.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will inform the Senator from Nevada that that is just what the combine will never agree to. They dread an armor factory worse than the devil does holy water, because they see in that a release from their monopoly.

Mr. CULLOM. Suppose they do not agree to it; let us go ahead anyhow.

Mr. TILLMAN. In the House there was only 15 majority on the last vote, with about 100 absentees; but if the House shall insist that we shall stand and deliver to these people and allow them to continue to rob the Government, we can have the bill fail, and that is the only way I can see by which we can get around it. I am ready to have the bill fail and have no appropriations for the Navy rather than submit to this monopoly.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not know whether the House amendment is the best possible provision. It may well be asked whether this business can be best transacted by one person instead of by 357 armor experts in the House and some 90 experts on this side of the Capitol, particularly when that one man is subject to the concentration of public attention and the publicity of the whole transaction, which would make any man distinguished enough to hold a Cabinet position do what was right for the Government and fair to the business interests contracting with him. I ask unanimous consent, however, to submit an amendment which I realize is out of order, but I will ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. TILLMAN. How can the Senator ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment to a conference report?

Mr. PENROSE. I admit that it is not in order, but for the information of the Senate I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed and lie on the table. I do not press it.

Mr. TILLMAN. If it is a mere matter of opinion of the Senator from Pennsylvania and expresses his views, I have no objection to its being printed.

Mr. PENROSE. I am aware that it is out of order.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that it be read. It is a statement by the Senator from Pennsylvania as to how he thinks this controversy might be adjusted.

Mr. TELLER. As a question of order the Senator has no right to offer an amendment, but he asks to have his suggestion printed, and that is another thing.

Mr. PENROSE. That is it.

Mr. TELLER. He can put it in in that way.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is all it is.

Mr. PENROSE. It is only a suggestion. This is an amendment to the Vandiver amendment, offered in the House and adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The Secretary read as follows:

On line 25, page 67, strike out the word "any" and insert the word "all."

On line 4, page 68, strike out the word "including" and insert the words "exclusive of."

On line 16, page 68, after the word "pounds" insert the words "exclusive of royalties."

On line 18, page 68, after the word "site" insert the words "in the District of Columbia."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference, and Mr. HALE, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. TILLMAN were appointed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

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

A bill (H. R. 1965) granting an increase of pension to John Lonergan;

A bill (H. R. 2392) granting a pension to Daniel Davis;

A bill (H. R. 2752) granting an increase of pension to Edmund P. Tierney;

A bill (H. R. 6424) granting a pension to Charles S. Devine;

A bill (H. R. 9308) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Shaw;

A bill (H. R. 10361) granting a pension to Josiah H. Buckingham;

A bill (H. R. 10616) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Mead; and

A bill (H. R. 10743) granting a pension to Augusta Ullman.

The bill (H. R. 9835) to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA.

Mr. CARTER. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate for the purpose of a motion, the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 3419.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. CARTER. I move that the bill with the accompanying amendments of the House be printed, and that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, and ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. SHOUP, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. BATE were appointed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 29th instant approved and signed the act (S. 2883) to change the character of Cape Cod light, Massachusetts.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

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

A bill (S. 351) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. White;

A bill (S. 1593) granting an increase of pension to Clara H. Inch;

A bill (S. 1975) granting a pension to Annie D. M. Wood;

A bill (S. 2938) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Longmire;

A bill (S. 2941) granting an increase of pension to Robert Gamble; and

A bill (S. 3662) granting an increase of pension to Louise D. Smith.

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

A bill (H. R. 269) granting a pension to Rosa G. Thompson, formerly Rosa G. Edwards;

A bill (H. R. 315) granting an increase of pension to Moses H. Taber;

A bill (H. R. 437) granting a pension to Mary E. Reynolds;

A bill (H. R. 504) granting an increase of pension to William T. Lowry;

A bill (H. R. 1204) granting a pension to Martha McSwain;

A bill (H. R. 1288) granting a pension to Cornelius W. Roberts;

A bill (H. R. 1734) granting a pension to Mary A. Whitmore;

A bill (H. R. 1803) granting a pension to Julia E. G. Lewis;

A bill (H. R. 1990) granting a pension to Julia A. Heath;

A bill (H. R. 2362) granting a pension to Bethuel H. Brasted;

A bill (H. R. 2398) granting a pension to Andrew Jackson;

A bill (H. R. 2849) granting a pension to Mary A. Hanson;

A bill (H. R. 3089) granting an increase of pension to Kate M. Pond;

A bill (H. R. 3767) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hartley;

A bill (H. R. 3861) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Milard;

A bill (H. R. 4069) granting a pension to Julia A. Kinkead;

A bill (H. R. 4650) granting a pension to Sarah Parrish;

A bill (H. R. 4679) granting a pension to Micager Philpot;

A bill (H. R. 4800) granting a pension to Joseph Crawford;

A bill (H. R. 4879) granting an increase of pension to D. Cyrus Holdridge;

A bill (H. R. 4986) granting an increase of pension to William P. Aylesworth;

A bill (H. R. 5007) granting an increase of pension to Smith Miner;

A bill (H. R. 5117) granting a pension to Roland Burnett;

A bill (H. R. 5120) granting an increase of pension to John S. Coggeshall;
 A bill (H. R. 5150) granting a pension to William Love;
 A bill (H. R. 5208) granting a pension to Mary E. Dickey;
 A bill (H. R. 5444) granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Brush;
 A bill (H. R. 5644) granting an increase of pension to Charles Alfred De Arnaud;
 A bill (H. R. 5648) granting a pension to Mary B. Allen;
 A bill (H. R. 5894) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Townsend;
 A bill (H. R. 5944) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Everly;
 A bill (H. R. 6096) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Kirkendall;
 A bill (H. R. 6407) granting an increase of pension to Michael S. Brockett;
 A bill (H. R. 6776) granting a pension to Annie Chamberlain;
 A bill (H. R. 6854) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Kellogg;
 A bill (H. R. 6902) granting a pension to Lydia A. Tryon;
 A bill (H. R. 6947) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo C. Rembaugh;
 A bill (H. R. 7012) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Stephenson;
 A bill (H. R. 7158) granting an increase of pension to Levi S. Parrott;
 A bill (H. R. 7159) granting an increase of pension to Wesley C. Sawyer;
 A bill (H. R. 7179) granting a pension to Clarence S. Hall;
 A bill (H. R. 7190) granting an increase of pension to George O. Cole;
 A bill (H. R. 7327) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Paine;
 A bill (H. R. 7328) granting an increase of pension to John Nicklin;
 A bill (H. R. 7329) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Swenson;
 A bill (H. R. 7553) granting an increase of pension to Fannie M. O'Linn;
 A bill (H. R. 7600) granting an increase of pension to Charles Claussen;
 A bill (H. R. 7621) granting a pension to William H. Chapman;
 A bill (H. R. 7714) granting a pension to Sarah M. Leslie;
 A bill (H. R. 8141) granting a pension to Sarah J. Peddycoart;
 A bill (H. R. 8207) granting a pension to Joseph Quinn;
 A bill (H. R. 8218) granting a pension to Mary E. Lacey;
 A bill (H. R. 8254) granting an increase of pension to Marie L. Apgar;
 A bill (H. R. 8540) granting a pension to Lydia J. De Silva;
 A bill (H. R. 8689) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Hoyt;
 A bill (H. R. 8735) granting an increase of pension to Annie B. Sharrard;
 A bill (H. R. 9010) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Westfield;
 A bill (H. R. 9043) granting an increase of pension to David S. Snyder;
 A bill (H. R. 9108) granting a pension to Maria H. Hixon;
 A bill (H. R. 9176) granting a pension to Emily Haines Harrison;
 A bill (H. R. 9378) granting a pension to Irving Johnson;
 A bill (H. R. 9503) granting an increase of pension to Phebe A. La Mott;
 A bill (H. R. 9555) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Briggeman;
 A bill (H. R. 9719) granting a pension to Amos W. Felker;
 A bill (H. R. 9783) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Dennis;
 A bill (H. R. 9839) granting an increase of pension to Emily H. Wood;
 A bill (H. R. 10029) granting a pension to Elizabeth Springer;
 A bill (H. R. 10062) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Crotsenburg;
 A bill (H. R. 10235) granting an increase of pension to George Friend;
 A bill (H. R. 10381) granting an increase of pension to Gideon W. T. Ridlon;
 A bill (H. R. 10524) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Riden;
 A bill (H. R. 10607) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Disbrow;
 A bill (H. R. 10618) granting an increase of pension to Martin O'Connor;
 A bill (H. R. 10742) granting a pension to Wilburn W. Testerman;

A bill (H. R. 10749) granting a pension to Henry L. White;
 A bill (H. R. 10750) granting a pension to James H. Rainey;
 A bill (H. R. 10758) granting a pension to Sallie B. Wilson;
 A bill (H. R. 10761) granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Cram;
 A bill (H. R. 10778) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Winkler;
 A bill (H. R. 10815) granting a pension to Lucius K. Smalling;
 A bill (H. R. 10834) granting an increase of pension to Michael Dempsey;
 A bill (H. R. 10847) granting an increase of pension to Betsey A. Summers;
 A bill (H. R. 10856) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Robinson;
 A bill (H. R. 10872) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Buehler;
 A bill (H. R. 10873) granting an increase of pension to Ida J. Peixotto;
 A bill (H. R. 10912) granting an increase of pension to John Whitmore;
 A bill (H. R. 11010) granting an increase of pension to James H. Eastman; and
 A bill (H. R. 11145) granting a pension to William C. Chandler.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11212) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

Mr. PENROSE. I offer an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. What has become of the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was laid by for the present.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understood the chairman of the committee to ask that it be disposed of now.

Mr. PENROSE. I have just offered an amendment which has not yet been read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire offered an amendment which the Chair understood was laid aside.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the amendment now pending, I understand.

Mr. ALLISON. That is the amendment pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, while we are discussing the propriety or the impropriety of appointing this commission and other commissions of the kind it seems to me not inappropriate that the attention of the Senate should be called to some legislation we have had heretofore.

In 1898 the Senate made an appropriation for an exposition at Paris, a proposition to call the attention of the world to the commercial advantages of the United States and to advance the commercial interests of the United States. We made a number of appropriations to carry out that purpose, and we had certain restrictions in the appropriations, to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate now. Among others there is this:

It shall be the duty of the Commissioner-General to report to the President, for transmission to Congress at the beginning of each regular session, a detailed statement of the expenditures incurred hereunder during the twelve months preceding; and the Commissioner-General is hereby required, within four months after the close of said exposition, to make full report of the results thereof, as herein required, etc.

Now, it was the duty of the Commissioner-General, at the beginning of this session of Congress, under that law, to make a detailed statement of his expenditures during the twelve months preceding. I hold in my hand a paper transmitted by the President of the United States to the Senate, a message signed by the President of the United States, which is as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a copy of a letter from Mr. Ferdinand W. Peck, Commissioner-General of the United States to the Paris Exposition of 1900, dated November 17, 1899, submitting a detailed statement of the expenditures incurred under authority of law.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, Washington, April 2, 1900.

This transmits a letter from Mr. Peck, in which he says in the beginning:

In accordance with the act of Congress providing for the participation of the United States in the Paris Exposition of 1900, I submit herewith for transmission to Congress "A detailed statement of the expenditures incurred" under said act during the last twelve months.

On the next page but one appears the statement. This "detailed statement" consists of eleven items, and I wish to call the attention of the Senate to it:

Statement of expenditures made from appropriation for Paris Exposition of 1900 from November 15, 1898, to November 1, 1899, as submitted by Frederick Brackett, secretary and disbursing officer.

Salaries of experts.....	\$72,045.14
Salaries of clerks.....	34,929.11
Officers' salaries.....	17,765.08
Salaries of employees.....	2,732.27
Traveling expenses.....	36,245.15
Buildings.....	38,647.91
Rent, Chicago, Paris, and New York.....	13,436.95
Furniture.....	7,252.69
Stationery and printing.....	5,403.75
Telegraph and cable.....	1,775.00
Miscellaneous.....	12,400.46
Total.....	240,633.51

Here is a proposed detailed statement of expenditures, amounting to \$240,633.51, which consists of eleven items. When this report came to the Senate I felt that it was not a compliance with the law and I offered a resolution requiring this man, who was authorized by Congress to disburse public funds, to make a more detailed statement, and I have the response to that resolution. The resolution I offered was as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the Senate for its information the detailed statement of expenditures of the Commissioner-General of the United States to the Paris Exposition of 1900, as provided for under the act of 1898 creating the office of "Commissioner-General to the Paris Exposition, and for other purposes."

Resolved further, That said detailed statement should, in the opinion of the Senate, state the number and names, places of residence, and salary paid to experts, clerks, officers, and employees, and should in like manner set out the details of other expenditures.

In reply to that the President sends a statement which brings the expenditures up to December 31, 1899. The expenditures under the first report were down to November 1, 1899. Now, the expenditures reported up to December 31, 1899, which runs two months longer than they had gone before, amount to \$396,700.22. There seems, then, to have been expended in that two months \$156,067.29. There was a balance over when this appropriation was first made of \$1,286,000.24 that went to this exposition under the law. In the sundry civil act of July 1, 1898, there was appropriated for the international exposition \$200,000; in the sundry civil act of March 3, 1899, for the international exposition, \$750,000; in the sundry civil act of March 3, 1899, for buildings, \$20,000, and by the same act for jurors, \$60,000, and by the same act for the Lafayette monument, \$50,000. Then, in this year, as Senators will see, the amount is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1,200,000.

Now, the report made by this officer, who was required to make a detailed statement of his expenditures, amounts to less than \$400,000, accounted for up to the 1st of January last, and yet in the last urgent deficiency bill the Committee on Appropriations of this body brought in a deficiency of \$169,500, and it was put in the bill and passed here. Where was the remainder of the million and a quarter of dollars that had been appropriated and which does not seem to have been accounted for by this official report coming to the Senate?

Mr. TELLER. I wish the Senator to state what would be the sum total of the appropriations.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The total amount of appropriations up to this time is \$1,448,786.24, but that includes the \$169,500 which was embraced in the urgent deficiency bill which we passed only two or three weeks ago. Leaving that out, there was about a million and a quarter dollars that had been appropriated; and on the 1st of January this detailed statement required by the law shows only an expenditure of less than \$400,000. I ask the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations where is the balance of the \$800,000? Where is the necessity for an urgent deficiency appropriation of \$169,500?

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the Senate has gotten into a practice of allowing things to go at loose ends. There was a paragraph in the Post published in this city only a day or two ago to which I will call the attention of the Senate. How much truth there is in it I do not know, but this purports to be a telegram coming from Paris under date of May 29. It says:

The official career in Paris of Mr. Ferdinand W. Peck, Commissioner-General of the United States to the world's fair, is not a shining success. There has been friction in the commission for some time. The official family is not a happy one, but is split into cliques, and this condition has resulted in crimination and recrimination.

Stories of extravagance in the national building, of unwarranted traveling expenses, and excessive salary allowances have been rife for some time, and the scandalous charge is openly made that employees have profited from the sale of privileges in connection with the American exhibit. Complaints on the part of exhibitors have been very numerous.

HOW HE PRACTICES ECONOMY.

Commissioner Peck has recently been curtailing the salary list, because the Government at Washington demanded full details of expenditures. He has also refused to pay some bills, which he claims are exorbitant, but which have been urgently pressed.

From the Washington Post of May 29 I clipped the following:

Briefly summarized, the main charge is that certain officials of the American department of the Paris Exposition are allotting space to the highest bidders, and are applying this extra money to their personal use. The complaint is made in these words:

"The French Government gives the space free of cost to foreign exhib-

itors, but some of the representatives of our Government, having supervision of United States sections, make the exhibitor pay whatever can be extorted from him (\$150 and upward) before he is allowed to exhibit. As there are 7,000 exhibitors and over, the field for operation is enormous. Some of the exhibitors refuse to be held up, while others submit for fear of being compelled to remove their exhibits.

It seems that the Senate did not act a day too soon in adopting a resolution requiring that this officer shall make a detailed statement, as he had been required by the law to do when the very first appropriation was made for this purpose, and which had been, it seems to me, absolutely disregarded by this officer.

We know what a detailed statement is, Mr. President. When we require the officers of this body to make a statement of the money that comes into their hands, they are expected to put every cent down, to what purpose it went, where it was used and how, giving the name of the individual who had the benefit of it and the date and the place. The items sometimes do not amount to 25 cents. Pages of the report are taken up in making these detailed statements. And yet when Mr. Ferdinand W. Peck comes to comply with the requirements of this statute and to make a detailed statement of his expenditures, telling us where he placed \$240,000, he says: "Salaries of experts, \$72,045.14."

When his attention is called to it by the State Department and he is made somewhat nervous and restless about it, he sends in another report, and I am not surprised that there should be talk in Paris about unnecessary extravagance and wasteful expenditures and an immense expense account. The first item given in this more detailed statement, coming down to the 1st of January, two months later than the other, is as follows:

Ferdinand W. Peck; title or official capacity, Commissioner-General; initial date of compensation, July 23, 1898; salary, \$8,000 a year; total salary paid, \$11,031.24; total expense for travel, \$3,724.73, making a total of \$14,755.97.

The next officer is the Assistant Commissioner-General, who has drawn \$7,972.83 of salary and \$4,079.46 for traveling expenses.

It seems to me, Mr. President, these expenditures may be all right. This traveling may have been done. It may have cost this great commissioner as much as \$3,000 to make a trip from Paris out to the seacoast and back, or he may have had to come to the United States on several occasions; but it seems to me a man could have done a deal of traveling at any reasonable expense, such as an officer of a republic ought to incur, for this amount of \$3,724.73 in a year's time.

I hope Senators will look at this detailed statement. There are some of these names that are striking. I have no idea what they stand for. I do not know what they mean. The next officer after the one I read is Mr. Frederick W. Brackett. He is the disbursing officer. He has drawn a salary of \$6,163, and traveling expenses of \$1,938.75.

Next after him appears the name of Mr. Paul Blackmar. He is "director of affairs," whatever that may be. He is in Chicago. What particular affairs he is directing in Chicago I have no idea, and there seems to be no report coming from the Government to show what particular affairs he may be directing. The next man is F. J. V. Skiff, director of mines. Where he is domiciled does not appear.

Mr. TELLER. In Paris.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I suppose perhaps he is. Then F. E. Drake, who is director of machinery and electricity, who has drawn \$4,475.66 total salary paid and \$3,587.75 traveling expenses. The traveling expenses are nearly as much as the salary, which is \$3,600 a year. I suppose he is at Paris. It does not indicate where he is located. The next is Mr. A. S. Capehart, who is a director. I do not know what he is a director of. It does not say.

Then we have a consulting architect at Paris, and a director of exhibits, who, I presume, is at Paris. Mr. Charles Richards Dodge is the next who comes along. He is director of agriculture, and he is domiciled at Washington. He may have very important services to render in connection with the Paris Exposition to be a resident of Washington as a director of agriculture; I do not know; but it seems to me that there should be some sort of official reports to show something about what these gentlemen do. There is not very much agriculture to be directed in Washington, in my opinion, and I doubt whether the services of this gentleman have amounted to as much as his salary, which is \$3,578, comes to. He has incurred traveling expenses to the amount of \$1,015.07, from which I infer that he has not confined his time exclusively to Washington.

Mr. TELLER. May I interrupt the Senator to ask him if that report shows what these people get as annual salaries in each case?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yes, sir; in each case, and the date of appointment.

Mr. TELLER. From the Commissioner down?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. From the Commissioner down; each one.

Mr. TELLER. I wish the Senator would give it to us once more.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The Commissioner gets \$8,000 a year.

The date of his appointment is July 22, 1898. The total salary he had received up to the 31st of December last was \$11,031.24, and his traveling expenses at the same time were \$3,724.73. The date of this man's appointment is put down here in compliance with the resolution. It seems that the requirement of law that there should be a detailed statement made of these expenditures was not sufficient to bring a statement of this kind from the Government until it was directly ordered by the Senate. When that was done, we learn by the papers that the result is that Mr. Peck, the Commissioner, has recently been curtailing the salary list because the Government at Washington demanded full details of the expenditures.

Mr. ALLEN. Are the salaries fixed by statute?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. No; they are not.

Mr. ALLEN. How are they fixed?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. They are fixed by Mr. Peck there.

Mr. ALLEN. At just whatever he pleases?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Just whatever he pleases. And in the report he made first, in reporting the details of the expenditures, he reported clerk hire, for instance, \$72,000, without giving the name of any clerk or the number of clerks, without giving the expenses of a single human being, without saying what amount of salary was paid to any individual; and yet he sent it to the President of the United States and the President transmitted it to Congress, calling it a detailed statement of these expenditures.

Mr. President, it is time that things of that sort should cease. Now, while I am talking about this, it brings another matter to my mind, which I will interject right here.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator let me, right here, refer to one matter?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I am afraid that the Paris Exposition in its management is a bad performance. I do not know that it is so, but I am afraid of it. However, as the Senator has referred to the urgent deficiency bill, reported by the Committee on Appropriations and passed in the Senate and in the House, so that it became a law, I want to explain to him that the large part of that deficiency was for additional buildings, which the papers and the statement which the committee had to take showed were necessary to the success of the exposition.

One hundred and sixty-nine thousand five hundred dollars, of which amount not exceeding \$96,500 may be expended for buildings and appurtenances, including fire protection, pier landings, approaches, and other construction.

The committee thought that in the course of the life of the exposition there ought to be granted not exceeding \$15,000 for the exhibit of negro education and industry; a new matter, very much urged by associations and proper influences in the direction of recognizing the colored element in the exposition. The committee gave that.

Not exceeding \$15,000 may be expended for an exhibit of negro education and industry, and not exceeding \$20,000 may be used for contingent expenses of the Commissioner and audited on his certificate.

That made up the large amount of the appropriation. I reported the bill from the committee. I do not remember whether any discussion was had or any question was raised at the time; but these are the reasons why the additional sum was given by the committee in that appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut in the chair). The Senator from Arkansas will please suspend for a moment. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, being the bill (S. 2355) in relation to the suppression of insurrection in, and to the government of, the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be laid aside in order that the consideration of the pending bill may be proceeded with. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Maine for his explanation as to the \$169,000; but now what I desire to call to the attention of the Senate is this item in the appropriation bill of March 3, 1899, when there was appropriated for buildings \$200,000; and in the report made in November last the expenditure reported for buildings was \$38,647.91; which would leave over \$150,000 of the \$200,000 not expended, so far as any report made to Congress is concerned.

Mr. HALE. I suppose, like ordinary business transactions, at any given time it does not follow because no more money is needed that all the bills which had previously accrued had been paid. I presume from time to time these bills are paid; and it is ascertained at a given time, as in the case of the bill just referred to, that more money is needed for the completion of buildings,

and there are probably bills out for thousands and tens of thousands of dollars that have not been paid.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator state the amount appropriated for buildings?

Mr. HALE. Not more than \$96,500.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The amount appropriated a year ago for these buildings was \$200,000, and I presume that was considered at that time to be sufficient for the buildings for this exposition. Now, when only \$38,000 of the \$200,000 has been spent, the Commissioner comes to the Senate and gets an additional appropriation of \$96,000 for the item of buildings.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the \$200,000 appropriated for buildings appeared to be too small for the buildings that were actually constructed there, or in process of construction. It was stated to us, and I have no doubt it is true, that as to the agricultural building some \$50,000 additional was needed. That the committee, at least, was satisfied ought to be constructed for the purpose of making the proper agricultural exhibits. So that adds to the item previously made \$96,000, although there were some other small items. Those appropriations were not in lump, but they were for particular purposes. Therefore, although there was a large balance on hand when the urgent deficiency bill passed, that balance could not be used for the purpose of completing those buildings.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. But the balance appropriated for buildings certainly may be used for that purpose.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly. The buildings were not completed until very near the time for the opening of the exposition. I do not remember when the urgent deficiency appropriation bill was passed, but it was represented to us, and I have no doubt properly, that those buildings had to be completed at least a month or two before the exposition opened, which was on the 1st of May. So the fact was that only \$38,000 had been expended in November. Therefore, there was good reason why in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill we should provide for necessary additional expenses, all of which had to be met certainly by the 1st day of March.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am obliged to the Senator from Iowa, and I agree with him fully that if the committee thought it was wise to increase the amount of the appropriations for buildings it was proper to put the provision in an appropriation bill and to increase the amount. But what I am criticising is the fact that these large amounts of money are in the hands of this commissioner and that they are not accounted for according to the law as written in the appropriation bill, which was reported by the Senator from Iowa and passed. I believe the law was as wisely framed as it could be framed. I think the man who executed the law was bound to see and know his duty, and if he had been inclined to make the detailed report that the law requires him to do all the facts would have been in the hands of the Senate and be fully understood.

I am not criticising the Committee on Appropriations, and I do not want to be understood as insinuating that they did not act wisely in making additional appropriations for buildings, if there was a necessity for doing so; but what seems to me strange is, when there was more than \$150,000 which had been appropriated and had not been accounted for, that they should come here and ask for an increase of \$100,000 without stating the facts fully, so as to show where the large part of this money had gone. No business man who was having a building constructed would allow the contractor who is building it to draw on him for a large additional amount without first showing what he had done with the money which had been already put in his hands.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator know what the business of this person was before his appointment as Commissioner? Was he a business man, or what was he doing?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have no idea about that.

Mr. STEWART. If he was a business man, the course he has pursued would put him under suspicion of dishonesty; and if he is honest, it would show his ignorance.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not believe it is wise to allow a disbursement of public money by officers who do not account promptly for everything they handle. We did two years ago a thing which, while I do not understand the facts exactly, has ever since given me some trouble. I hope the Senator from Iowa can tell me whether there has ever been a published account of what use was made of the \$50,000,000 which Congress, in its generosity, placed absolutely at the disposal of the President about the time of the beginning of the war against Spain.

I saw a statement that some of the money had gone to the War Department, some to the Navy Department, and certain other sums to other Departments. The air was full of rumors of the most extravagant and unreasonable expenditures which had been made out of that \$50,000,000 for things here and there that were not worth one-half the sums paid for them; and, so far as I know, there has been no report yet made to Congress showing whether this \$50,000,000 was wisely and judiciously used or not. I believe

the President of the United States is personally an honest and upright man, and I do not believe that he has ever permitted any misappropriation of public funds, if he knew it; but when the public have trusted him by an act of Congress with the absolute use of \$50,000,000, which he was to use at his discretion and which he had unlimited power to disburse in any way he saw fit, after the war was over and after the excitement had subsided, there should be some report made by the different Departments showing where this money went and for what purposes it was used.

There are constant charges going around here. We all saw in the Post this morning a statement about the purchase of a yacht by the Government, managed through political influences in New York, that \$80,000 was paid for a yacht which had cost \$45,000 and which the Government almost immediately afterwards offered to sell for \$25,000, and that certain politicians had gotten \$25,000 for making that sale to the Government. I believe there ought to be such reports made by the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Treasury Department as would put all these slanderous statements, if they be slanderous, at rest, and show the falsity of these insinuations that are constantly being made that money is being used in this sort of way.

I refer, Mr. President, in what I have said to a paragraph, which I presume all Senators read, in the Washington Post of this morning. It is entitled "Yacht sold to Uncle Sam—Judge-elect Hazel helped to engineer the deal, with great profit." It is taken from a Buffalo special to the New York Tribune. Whether there is any truth in this story I know not. I hope there is not one word of truth in it. I call attention to it now simply as an illustration of what I mean when I say that there should have been a full and complete accounting, whether the law requires it or not, and the reports of the Government officials ought to show where every dollar of this \$50,000,000 went. The people have a right to know what becomes of the public funds, and we ought to know what has become of the money we put in the hands of the President. This special to the New York Tribune says:

[Buffalo special to the New York Tribune.]

The Buffalo Express to-morrow morning will print some letters concerning the alleged activity of John R. Hazel, candidate for United States district judge, in selling a yacht belonging to a Democratic politician to the Government during the Spanish war, for a commission of \$5,000, a work said to be his only experience with admiralty law.

It will also publish a detailed account of the interview between its reporter and Mr. Hazel, and the latter's refusal either to affirm or deny his share in the transaction. The reporter showed the letters to Mr. Hazel, and he read them in part, but declined to discuss them, though he was assured that any answer he had to make would be printed with the letters. The documents shown to Mr. Hazel were a letter from George E. Matthews, of the Express, to ex-Congressman Mahany and the latter's reply. They are as follows:

BUFFALO, N. Y., May 24, 1900.

MY DEAR MR. MAHANY: At this late day I am surprised to learn, on the best authority, that John R. Hazel denies that he told you that he had received \$5,000 for his services in selling the yacht of Mr. Conners to the Government. The statement was made by you in a public speech at the Concert Hall on September 12 last; was reported in the Express, as shown in the annexed slip; was also reported in the same words in the Buffalo Evening News and the Buffalo Evening Times, and in substantially the same words in the Buffalo Review. It was not denied at that time, though the newspapers gave Mr. Hazel the opportunity usual in such cases. On the contrary, Mr. Hazel admitted to certain people that he had made the statement to you. Those people it is not convenient for me to summon. Therefore, to justify the Express for the publication, I have to ask you to restate the circumstances in the matter, and also, if you will, to let me know whether there were any other parties to the conversation.

Very sincerely, yours,

GEORGE E. MATTHEWS.

To the Hon. ROWLAND B. MAHANY.

BUFFALO, N. Y., May 24, 1900.

MY DEAR MR. MATTHEWS: Your letter of this morning is at hand, and I am astonished to learn that Mr. Hazel has denied to anyone his conversation with me regarding the sale of the Conners yacht. Shortly after the transaction I met Mr. Hazel, on my return from Washington, at the Iroquois Hotel, and among other matters we discussed, the question of the yacht deal came up. I taxed him with having taken advantage of his political position in selling a yacht to the Government for an exorbitant price—twice what the vessel was worth. He laughed and said that I took an extreme view of the matter; that he was in business, and it was all right for him to sell the yacht if he could, and that he had not gotten as much out of it as he ought to have received, all things considered. I answered that he got enough, according to popular report, and then asked him how much he really did get.

"Well," he replied, "there are so many stories about the matter that I suppose it is just as well to set them at rest by the truth in the case. My share was \$5,000."

"What did the Government give for the yacht," I asked.

"Why, that is a matter of record at the Treasury," Mr. Hazel answered.

"The purchase price was \$80,000."

"What did Conners get," I continued.

"Sixty thousand dollars," was the answer.

"Where did the other \$15,000 go," I inquired.

Mr. Hazel laughed, and said, "Oh, come, now; I can't tell all about it," or words to that effect.

"But you do acknowledge," I said, "that you personally received \$5,000 as your share."

"Oh, yes," he said; "I was a fool not to have asked more, for I could easily have got it."

"Well," I said; "I don't take the same view of these things that you do."

"I suppose you don't; I guess we never will agree on anything," was his reply.

This is the conversation as it took place in the presence of at least one reputable witness, who will substantiate its accuracy, if necessary. I think there

were also some other gentlemen present who remember the occurrence and the conversation.

Sincerely, yours,

ROWLAND B. MAHANY.

The Hon. GEORGE E. MATTHEWS,

Editor of the Express, Buffalo, N. Y.

Attached to the letter of Mr. Matthews shown to Mr. Hazel was an excerpt from a public speech made by R. B. Mahany, for several terms and up to last year the Republican Congressman from the Thirty-second district. The speech was delivered at the public mass meeting of citizens held in Concert Hall last September. It was printed word for word in the Buffalo News, a Republican evening paper; the Buffalo Times, a Democratic evening paper, and substantially in the Buffalo Review, a Republican morning paper, the day after the meeting. The excerpt is in part as follows:

"As a member of Congress, my duty was to serve the people, not to sell yachts for Democratic bosses. [Cheers.] Speaking of the yacht question, Mr. Conners's yacht, the *Enquirer*, cost him \$45,000, I am informed. Through the influence of John R. Hazel and D. S. Alexander the yacht was sold to the Government for the enormous sum of \$80,000. Mr. Conners received \$80,000, according to a statement Mr. Hazel made to me personally, and Mr. Hazel said his rake-off was \$5,000, and he was sorry he did not ask more, for he believed he could have got it. [Laughter.] History does not record where the other \$15,000 went. The Government recently relisted the yacht for sale at the low figure of \$25,000."

Mr. TILLMAN. I should like to ask the Senator who is responsible for the purchase of that yacht?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I presume it was done by the Navy Department, and I presume it was paid for out of the \$50,000,000 about which I was talking just now.

Mr. TILLMAN. If these officers put the price at \$80,000 when they were buying the yacht, why did they put it at such a low figure when they came to sell it?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is one thing I should be glad to have explained.

This is not a singular case. There is not a man in the Senate who has not been told the name of boat after boat that has been bought under circumstances almost identical. Only yesterday I met a man in the corridors of this Capitol who told me he knew of three vessels, giving the names of one or two, which had been offered to the Navy Department for hire at a certain figure, when the Department refused to hire them, and subsequently the parties were admonished that if they would put the vessels that they wanted to hire in the hands of a gentleman who had relations with the Navy Department, he could probably manage to effect an arrangement; and that it was done at an expense twice as much as the first proposition. I do not know whether these things are true or not, but if these reports were made—

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let me finish this sentence.

If these reports were made, as I think they ought to be made, as to where this money has been spent, it would be an easy matter to disprove such charges and to furnish the proof that they are untrue, if they are untrue.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not think I ought to ask the Senator the name of his informant, but I do think he ought to ascertain and state to the Senate what the transaction was, so that there can be some opportunity to ascertain whether the facts are so or not, and so that they may either be admitted or refuted.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have given the name in one transaction.

Mr. CHANDLER. But no name has been given in this case.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. No; but I will warrant that the Senator himself has heard charges of this kind. They are made all around; we hear them constantly. I do not know whether there is any truth in them or not, but, as I have already stated, if the Departments would submit reports as to what was done with this money, and those reports were made a matter of public record, it would be easy to disprove any false charges that might be made.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will say to the Senator that the Navy Department has made a report of all its purchases, and that the record is full and complete.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Of the expenditure of all this money?

Mr. CHANDLER. Of all the purchases the Department has made of ships which were necessary; but when they came to sell some of the vessels which had been bought in an emergency the prices had to go down.

Now, if the Senator will specify any one wrong which he wants to have investigated, anything which he alleges to be wrong or anybody tells him is wrong, he knows very well that I will vote with him to have it investigated.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have no doubt of that. The Senator knows that if I knew there was anything wrong I would not wait for an assurance of that kind to turn daylight onto it. I should be glad to have it known at once.

Mr. CHANDLER. It would be better if the Senator, instead of railing and making accusations, had undertaken to specify. He says somebody has told him of some particular case, but he does not tell us who told him.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. What accusation did I make? I should be glad to have the Senator specify as to that.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator said that boats had been offered

to the Navy Department for hire and had been refused, and after some manipulation or other means, by putting the business into the hands of some persons, the Navy Department finally bought the ships. He had a purpose in telling that; he meant that that was wrong. I say he ought to either tell who his informant was or what the name of the ship was.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If I had made the statement, that would be true, but I have not made that statement. I said I had been told no longer ago than yesterday, in the corridors of this Capitol, that such a thing was true. I do not know whether it is true or not. I simply used it to illustrate the fact that there ought to be a detailed statement, made accessible to the public everywhere, of what was done with that \$50,000,000 which we put into the hands of the President for the purposes of the Spanish war.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand that such an account has been printed.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If so, my attention has never been called to it, and I should be glad to have the Senator furnish it to me.

Mr. CHANDLER. Did the Senator know the name of the man?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I did.

Mr. CHANDLER. Did he know the name of the ship?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I did.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then, the Senator ought to tell the name of the ship.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If I succeed in finding out the facts from the man who told me on yesterday—and he is a reputable man, and he stated, according to my belief, what was the truth, and told me he thought he could find out the facts—I will be sure to tell every word, with the names, the dates, and everything else relating to the transaction. Many of these things come to a man that are not true. I know that I have heard plenty of charges that I was satisfied were not true. People get exaggerated ideas about these things. But the point I make is this—and I call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to it—that if a detailed statement of the expenditure of this money had been made, and if it was easily accessible, it would be an easy matter then to disprove stories of this kind if they are untrue, and are not well founded, by going to the records.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator that there is a public document showing the number of ships bought by the Navy Department, and the prices paid, and also the names of the ships that were purchased.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is there not also a statement of the apportionment of the whole \$50,000,000?

Mr. ALLISON. I think there is so far as the Navy Department is concerned, and I think that may be true also as to the War Department, but I am not sure of it. So far as that is concerned, it is the easiest thing in the world to get that information. I do not know, and have not inquired, but I have no doubt that every item of that fifty-million-dollar expenditure can be produced at any time if it is desired.

But so far as the matter is concerned on which the Senator from Arkansas is now speaking, all the information is accessible in a printed document, the number of which I have not at hand, which shows all the ships purchased, the prices paid, by whom paid; and all the ships that were chartered are included in another document by the War Department. So that, as respects these vessels which seem to be the subject of complaint, there is full and accurate information regarding the cost and use of all of them.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am very glad to know that.

Mr. BURROWS. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. BURROWS. I hold in my hand Senate Document 110, being a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to resolution of the Senate of January 8, 1900, a statement from the Paymaster-General of the Navy, showing the allotments to the Navy Department from the \$50,000,000 appropriated by Congress under the act approved March 9, 1898, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for prior years," etc.

This document contains a complete statement in detail of every vessel purchased and every dollar expended in the Navy Department out of the \$50,000,000.

Mr. ALLISON. I think that is also true as to the War Department.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am very glad the Senator from Michigan has that document, and I hope he will put it in the RECORD complete, because I have not seen that document.

Mr. ALLISON. It is Senate Document No. 110.

Mr. BURROWS. The Senator wants to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. TILLMAN. What is the aggregate?

Mr. ALLISON. Twenty-seven million three hundred and fifty-six thousand eight hundred and sixty-three dollars and sixty-eight cents.

Mr. TILLMAN. That leaves about \$23,000,000 entirely unaccounted for. Let us have it all.

Mr. BURROWS. I will read the document:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, January 21, 1900

SIR: Replying to the resolution of the Senate, dated January 8, 1900, requesting the Secretary of the Navy to inform the Senate what portion of the \$50,000,000 appropriated by Congress under the act approved March 9, 1898, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for prior years, and for other purposes," was assigned to and expended by or under the direction of the Navy Department, I have the honor to transmit herewith a statement, prepared by the Paymaster-General of the Navy, showing the allotments to the Navy Department from the above-mentioned appropriation and the expenditures thereunder in detail. The Paymaster-General, in forwarding this statement to the Department, reports as follows:

"Of the \$50,000,000 for national defense appropriated under the act of March 9, 1898, the President allotted \$29,973,274.22 for the use of this Department. The expenditures to date aggregate \$27,356,863.63, and obligations amounting to about \$1,180,000 are still outstanding, which when paid will make the total expenditures by the Navy under this appropriation \$28,536,863.63, leaving an unobligated balance of \$1,436,410.54 to be ultimately turned back into the surplus fund of the Treasury."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am very glad to get that document. Now, I should like to have my attention called to another document, showing what has become of the balance of the \$50,000,000.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from Arkansas allow me a moment?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Every vessel bought under that emergency appropriation by the Navy Department was bought only after a board of naval officers had examined the ship and recommended the purchase, and it was bought at the price recommended by the board of naval officers who had examined the ship.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to have some Senator refer me to the other document which will account for the other \$20,000,000.

Mr. ALDRICH. I remember seeing a document which contained a statement of the expenditures made in our insular possessions, which were paid from that fund. I do not know the number of the document; but it is very easy for the Senator from Arkansas to write out a resolution, which he can do in a few minutes, asking the President of the United States for this information, and it will no doubt be very promptly furnished.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope that there have been reports made showing the expenditure of the whole of this \$50,000,000. I have within the last two or three weeks asked a number of Senators, who know more about these things than I do, if there has been such a report made; and, I think, among others, I asked the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], a gentleman to whom I usually go about things of that kind; and he told me there had been a report made as to the distribution of the \$50,000,000, as I understood him, but that he did not know of any report made here as to the expenditure; and I do not know of it.

I was simply discussing the matter of the failure of this accounting officer at Paris to account promptly and in accordance with law for the moneys in his hand, and I mentioned this thing as an instance showing the reason why there should be a complete report made here of expenditures. I hope there are reports already made which will explain where every dollar of the \$50,000,000 went, so that as to the exorbitant prices paid for vessels we can at least have a start, a beginning, in order to ascertain what was paid and so that proper inquiries may be instituted. I think there should be such a report, if it has not been made; and if it has been made, I shall endeavor to find it.

Mr. HALE. There is a report so far as the purchase of the ships for transport service in the Army and in the Navy are concerned. There is a report on file in each Department, giving a list of the ships, their size, classification, and the amount paid for them—a report made to either the House or the Senate, which has been printed, so that the documents cover that part of the case referred to by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BURROWS. If the Senator will allow me, I will call his attention to a document, No. 145, which is a letter from the Secretary of War, in response to resolution of the Senate of January 8, 1900, as to what portion of the \$50,000,000 appropriated by Congress under the urgent deficiency appropriation act approved March 8, 1898, for the purposes of national defense, was assigned to and expended by or under the direction of the War Department, which reads:

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, February 3, 1900.

SIR: In response to the resolution of the United States Senate dated January 8, 1900, requesting information as to what portion of the \$50,000,000 appropriated by Congress under the urgent deficiency act approved March 8, 1898, for the purposes of national defense, was assigned to and expended by or under the direction of the War Department, I have the honor to transmit herewith a consolidated statement showing the net amounts allotted by the President to the Secretary of War and the several bureaus of the War Department, the net sums withdrawn from the Treasury by each, and the unexpended balances remaining to the credit of the War Department.

Mr. TILLMAN. What is the amount?

Mr. BURROWS. I will look and see.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator allow me? Senate Document No. 250 is a communication from the Secretary of War relative to transport ships purchased and charter parties for the use of vessels; and Document No. 110—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to have it go into the RECORD.

Mr. ALLISON. The whole document?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The list of vessels.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If it is not very voluminous. If it is, I will not insist upon it.

The lists referred to are as follows:

A.—List of vessels built or purchased by the Quartermaster's Department since March 4, 1897, exclusive of those purchased for the Army transport service for transportation incident to the war with Spain, showing their name, class, by whom built or from whom purchased, cost, amount expended for their repair, and where each vessel is employed.

Name.	Class.	Built or purchased.	By or from whom.	Cost.	Repairs, amount expended.	Where employed.
General Hancock	Ferryboat	Built	Pusey & Jones	\$31,165.00	\$2,911.01	Governors Island, New York Harbor.
General Hunt	Steam tug	do	R. M. Spedden & Co	26,687.00		Fort McHenry, Md.
Magic	Steam launch	do	Fulton Engineering and Shipbuilding Works.	4,600.00	130.25	San Diego Barracks, Cal.
Capron	do	do	Gas Engine and Power Co. and Chas. L. Seabury Co., Consolidated.	3,225.50	235.00	Fort Dupont, Del.
Pleasanton	do	do	do	3,225.50	375.87	Washington, D. C.
M. G. Krayenbuhl	do	do	do	3,225.50	220.00	Fort Monroe, Va.
Not named	do	do	do	3,225.50	35.00	Fort Barrancas, Fla.
Do	do	do	do	3,275.00		Fort Preble, Me.
Bessie May	do	Purchased	R. A. Long	2,500.00	199.00	Fort Screven, Ga.
Martha	Steam tug	do	do	9,000.00	1,525.00	Charleston, S. C.
General Barry	do	do	W. P. & F. V. Drake, New York City	10,000.00	3,044.00	Fort Slocum, N. Y.
Lillie	Steam launch	do	Sanders & Haynes, Seattle, Wash	1,850.00	850.00	Alaska.
Duchesnay	do	do	E. J. Rathbone, agent	10,500.00		Do.
Total				112,479.00	9,525.13	

The only vessel sold by the Quartermaster's Department was the steam tug *Atlantic*, purchased October 15, 1873. She was condemned as old and worn-out and sold for \$1,500 to McAllister Brothers, New York City, November 23, 1899.

B.—List of vessels purchased by the Quartermaster's Department for the Army transport service during and since the termination of the war with Spain, showing the names of the vessels purchased, the new names given them, their class, from whom purchased, price paid for them, and cost of refitting and repairing them.

Old name.	New name.	Class.	From whom purchased.	Purchase price.	Cost of refitting and repairs.	Remarks.
Mississippi	Buford	Army transport.	Bernard N. Baker	\$350,000.00	\$67,821.50	Acquired under terms of charter.
Rita	Burnside	do	Captured	125,000.00	130,460.30	
Roumanian	Crook	do	Austin, Baldwin & Co	240,000.00	105,728.75	
Mohawk	Grant	do	Bernard N. Baker	680,000.00	323,458.69	
Arizona	Hancock	do	Northern Pacific Railway Co	600,000.00	543,518.28	
Panama	Hooker	do	Captured	41,000.00	176,423.00	
Clearwater	Ingalls	do	Clearwater Steamship Co., of London	150,000.00	99,852.31	
Bessie	Kearny	do	Galveston Steamship and Lighter Co.	12,206.00	8,200.00	
Michigan	Kilpatrick	do	Bernard N. Baker	350,000.00	115,764.88	
Manitoba	Logan	do	do	680,000.00	483,839.33	
Port Victor	McClellan	do	Irwin, McBride, Catherwood & Co	175,000.00	98,046.09	
Obdam	McPherson	do	Samuel D. Coykendall	250,000.00	116,299.70	
Berlin	Meade	do	International Navigation Co	400,000.00	374,009.52	
Chester	Sedgwick	do	do	200,000.00	265,329.48	
Massachusetts	Sheridan	do	Bernard N. Baker	680,000.00	339,169.38	
Mobile	Sherman	do	do	680,000.00	529,964.68	
Cassius	Sumner	do	United States Navy Department	160,594.00	250,000.00	Purchase price paid from appropriation for national defense.
Hartford	Terry	do	Hartford and New York Transportation Co.	150,000.00	48,827.48	Purchased Mar. 10, 1900.
Minnewaska	Thomas	do	Bernard N. Baker	680,000.00	335,385.14	
Scandia	Warren	do	Hamburg-American Line	200,000.00	133,281.04	
Bay State	Wright	do	Henry L. Higginson, trustee	100,000.00	61,632.15	
Columbia	Rosecrans	do	North American Mail Steamship Co.	147,200.00		
Missouri	Missouri	Hospital ship	Bernard N. Baker	200,000.00	230,612.95	
John Englis	Relief	do	Marine Steamship Co	450,000.00	265,591.53	
Ed Ward	Baker	Lighter	Patrick Ward	25,000.00	1,813.37	
Iron King	Canby	do	Collier Bros. Co	36,000.00	1,841.51	
Major McKinley	Gibbon	Tug	Frederick A. Verdon	13,000.00	3,357.63	
Sarah	Ord	do	Long Island Machine and Marine Co. Co.	6,300.00		
Graselli	Poe	Lighter	Gustav A. Schwarz	39,500.00	1,500.00	
Britannia	Reno	Tug	Baker-Whiteley Coal Co	40,000.00	3,434.71	
J. C. Watson	Reynolds	do	John D. Dailey	14,000.00	4,381.10	
Harry	Richardson	do	George H. Hill	6,000.00	3,756.44	
Gypsum King	Slocum	do	J. B. King Transportation Co.	150,000.00	1,311.63	
Olympia	Weitzel	do	Frederick A. Verdon	12,000.00	2,482.44	
Adonis	Williams	Lighter	James Clark Co.	26,000.00	2,500.00	
Sternberg	Baltimore	Launch	Chu Sit Hing Sternberg Too	7,821.00		
Ysidora	Boston	do	Too Coo	7,933.20		
Kwong Lee	Chicago	do	Chas. S. Robinson	7,821.00		
Yuen Hung	Columbus	do	A. Foo	6,936.00		
Lee Ping	Kansas City	Lighter	do	12,324.00		
Kwong Pak	Omaha	do	A. H. Rennie	12,588.90		
Amanda	St. Louis	Launch	Leung You	7,821.00		
Seattle	Seattle	do	Chas. S. Robinson	4,553.00		
On Lee	Washington	do	Wing Guen & Co	8,295.00		
Sam Sul	Q. M. D. No. 1	Lighter	do	4,704.00		
P. and O. lighter	Q. M. D. No. 2	do	Shewan Tomes	8,413.50		
Do	Q. M. D. No. 3	do	do	8,413.50		
Retriever	Q. M. D. No. 4	do	J. W. Brown	4,704.00		
2 wooden lighters	2 wooden lighters	do	J. Blackhead & Co	3,318.00		
Total expenditures reported by chief quartermaster:						
Habana, Cuba					22,995.16	
San Juan, Porto Rico					8,239.66	
Manila, Philippine Islands					26,285.45	
Total				8,074,455.20	5,189,093.30	

C.—List of vessels chartered for the Army transport service during and since the termination of the war with Spain, showing the names of vessels, their class, from whom chartered, date of charter, appraised value of each vessel as stated in the charter party, amount paid for services, and total cost of fitting the vessels for the service to December 31, 1899.

ATLANTIC FLEET.

Name of vessel.	Class.	From whom chartered.	Date of charter.	Valuation as stated in charter party.	Amount paid for services.	Amount paid to restore to condition on discharge.
Olivette	Steamship	Plant Investment Co.	Apr. 3, 1898	\$350,000.00	\$55,500.00	
Alfred W. Booth	Tug	Michael Moran	Apr. 15, 1898		3,282.50	
Adria	Steamship	Western Union Telegraph Co.	Apr. 21, 1898	70,000.00	23,200.00	
Comal	do	New York and Texas Steamship Co.	Apr. 29, 1898		104,425.00	
Comal (rechartered)	do	do	Nov. 29, 1898	400,000.00	67,500.00	\$170.00
Alamo	do	do	do	400,000.00	86,025.00	5,500.00
Allegheny	do	Merchants and Miners' Transportation Co.	do	350,000.00	76,300.00	3,250.00
Berkshire	do	do	do	350,000.00	76,300.00	3,400.00
D. H. Miller	do	do	do	350,000.00	71,350.00	2,821.50
Gussie	do	Southern Pacific Co.	Apr. 30, 1898	150,000.00	46,800.00	500.00
Whitney	do	do	do	150,000.00	43,750.00	500.00
Matteawan	do	Miami Steamship Co.	May 1, 1898	310,000.00	63,000.00	12,500.00
Florida	do	Plant Investment Co.	May 2, 1898		78,000.00	
Florida (rechartered)	do	do	Mar. 17, 1899	300,000.00	33,500.00	4,319.00
Sau Marcos	do	New York and Texas Steamship Co.	May 10, 1898	300,000.00	60,500.00	5,000.00
Concho	do	do	do	450,000.00	74,800.00	6,500.00
Rio Grande	do	do	do	250,000.00	54,000.00	5,000.00
Leona	do	do	do	450,000.00	55,500.00	
Vigilancia	do	New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Co.	do	500,000.00	78,600.00	3,806.20
Seguranca	do	do	do	500,000.00	85,800.00	5,788.67
Orizaba	do	do	do	400,000.00	65,000.00	5,700.60
Yucatan	do	do	do	400,000.00	71,500.00	5,519.00
Seneca	do	do	do	400,000.00	63,800.00	6,015.41
Saratoga	do	do	do	400,000.00	60,300.00	3,897.62
Santiago	do	do	do	300,000.00	52,200.00	5,411.21
City of Washington	do	do	do	400,000.00	57,600.00	4,533.43
Cherokee	do	Wm. P. Clyde & Co.	May 11, 1898	300,000.00	51,500.00	5,875.00
Iroquois	do	do	do	400,000.00	59,400.00	1,706.00
Morgan	do	Southern Pacific Co.	May 12, 1898	150,000.00	44,400.00	500.00
Aransas	do	do	do	225,000.00	45,600.00	500.00
Breakwater	do	New Orleans and Belize Royal Mail Steamship Co.	do	175,000.00	41,140.00	
Miami	do	Miami Steamship Co.	May 13, 1898	260,000.00	56,650.00	12,500.00
Anne E. Stevens	Schooner	W. S. Vanaman	do	10,000.00	8,650.00	
Barge S. O. No. 77, N. Y.	do	Standard Oil Company	May 14, 1898	25,000.00	8,500.00	
Maverick	do	do	May 16, 1898	225,000.00	54,500.00	
Stillwater	Steamship	New Orleans and Belize Royal Mail Steamship Co.	do	125,000.00	55,250.00	
Laura	Lighter	Galveston Steamship and Lighterage Co.	May 24, 1898	10,000.00	6,750.00	3,700.00
Manteo	Steamship	New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Co.	May 28, 1898	75,000.00	57,000.00	1,212.60
Captain Sam	Tug	W. Chase Spotswood	May 31, 1898	25,000.00	2,925.00	
Cumberland	Steamship	Cumberland Steamship Co.	June 1, 1898	20,000.00	10,200.00	
Kanawha	do	John A. Donald	June 3, 1898	60,000.00	21,350.00	
Comanche	do	Wm. P. Clyde & Co.	do	500,000.00	58,240.00	3,598.00
Specialist	do	Angier Line	do	195,000.00	43,500.00	1,657.00
Knickerbocker	do	Cromwell Steamship Co.	do	300,000.00	44,000.00	500.00
Louisiana	do	do	do	675,000.00	35,000.00	248.25
Hudson	do	do	do	300,000.00	35,600.00	
Clinton	do	Southern Pacific Co.	June 5, 1898	150,000.00	39,200.00	500.00
Gate City	do	Ocean Steamship Co.	June 6, 1898	300,000.00	36,500.00	8,500.00
City of Macon	do	do	do	300,000.00	40,500.00	8,500.00
Unionist	do	Angier Line	June 10, 1898	150,000.00	35,625.00	1,675.00
Catania	do	Tweddle Trading Co.	June 13, 1898	300,000.00	55,200.00	5,738.88
Nueces	do	New York and Texas Steamship Co.	do	400,000.00	61,750.00	3,500.00
Lampasas	do	do	do	400,000.00	39,650.00	9,440.55
Arkadia	do	New York and Puerto Rico Steamship Co.	June 15, 1898	150,000.00	19,750.00	1,002.00
Nimrod	Tug	H. T. Hartwell	June 25, 1898	3,500.00	1,600.00	
Ora	do	do	do	2,000.00	70.00	
Wanderer	Steamship	New Orleans and Belize Royal Mail Steamship Co.	July 5, 1898	35,000.00	14,740.00	200.00
La Grande Duchesse	do	Plant Investment Co.	do	1,000,000.00	70,800.00	10,950.65
Underwriter	Tug	Louisiana Branch Pilots' Association	July 8, 1898	43,000.00	13,700.00	
Tarpon	Steamship	Plant Investment Co.	July 10, 1898	150,000.00	21,000.00	
Gladisfen	Tug	Wm. E. Meyer	July 11, 1898		5,670.00	
Gladisfen (rechartered)	do	do	Nov. 13, 1898	30,000.00		
Uto	do	H. P. Kirkham	July 20, 1898	250,000.00	9,240.00	500.00
James A. Lawrence	do	Alfred Dutch	Aug. 10, 1898	40,000.00	4,500.00	
Vigilant	do	John Delany	Aug. 11, 1898		5,225.00	1,200.00
Lewis Pulver	do	John Nichols	do		4,200.00	
Columbia	do	James P. McAllister	Aug. 15, 1898	18,000.00	3,015.00	
Shinnecock	do	Montauk Steamboat Co.	Aug. 30, 1898	250,000.00	23,500.00	
Fanita	Steamship	James McKay	do		18,593.20	
Bratten	Tug	W. D. Munson	Nov. 11, 1898	100,000.00	2,205.00	
Gretchen	do	John E. Reyburn	do		663.33	
Chester A. Arthur	do	Starin Transportation Co.	do		2,120.00	
Curry	do	do	do		2,120.00	
De Witt Ivins	do	Moran Towing Co.	do			
Sunset	do	P. McGuire	do			
Transfer	do	do	do			
W. H. Vanderbilt	do	do	do		2,120.00	
Newkirk	do	do	do		50.00	
Baxter	do	do	do		30.00	
Total					2,882,284.03	175,580.27

PACIFIC FLEET.

City of Sydney	Steamship	Pacific Mail Steamship Co.	May 10, 1898	\$475,000.00	\$226,500.00	\$9,610.00
City of Sydney (rechartered)	do	do	Aug. 8, 1899			
Australia	do	Oceanic Steamship Co.	May 10, 1898	300,000.00	72,666.67	4,000.00
Colon	do	Pacific Mail Steamship Co.	May 27, 1898	350,000.00	77,250.00	3,156.97
China	do	do	do	900,000.00	177,000.00	8,896.61
Zealandia	do	Oceanic Steamship Co.	do			
Zealandia (rechartered)	do	do	Mar. 22, 1899	250,000.00	313,266.66	8,500.00
Do	do	do	June 3, 1899			
Ohio	do	Empire Transportation Co.	May 27, 1898	450,000.00	476,338.83	
Morgan City	do	Johnson-Loeke Mercantile Co.	June 7, 1898		98,340.00	2,519.36
Morgan City (rechartered)	do	Barneson & Chilcott	Jan. 5, 1899	275,000.00	143,400.00	
Indiana	do	Empire Transportation Co.	June 8, 1898	450,000.00	469,166.66	
Senator	do	Pacific Coast Co.	do			
Senator (rechartered)	do	do	Aug. 13, 1899	400,000.00	534,375.00	

C.—List of vessels chartered for the Army transport service during and since the termination of the war with Spain, showing the names of vessels, their class, from whom chartered, date of charter, appraised value of each vessel as stated in the charter party, amount paid for services, etc.—Continued.

PACIFIC FLEET—continued.

Name of vessel.	Class.	From whom chartered.	Date of charter.	Valuation as stated in charter party.	Amount paid for services.	Amount paid to restore to condition on discharge.
City of Para	Steamship	Pacific Mail Steamship Co	June 11, 1898	\$500,000.00	\$297,600.00	\$5,086.90
City of Para (rechartered)	do	do	July 6, 1899			
Valencia	do	Pacific Steam Whaling Co	June 19, 1898	200,000.00	256,250.00	3,640.27
Valencia (rechartered)	do	do	Feb. 21, 1899			
Do	do	do	June 17, 1899	500,000.00	470,000.00	5,808.85
Newport	do	Pacific Mail Steamship Co	June 20, 1898			
City of Puebla	do	Pacific Coast Co	June 23, 1898	450,000.00	394,800.00	11,500.00
City of Puebla (rechartered)	do	do	Aug. 18, 1899			
Peru	do	Pacific Mail Steamship Co	June 25, 1898	750,000.00	122,000.00	5,465.38
City of Rio de Janeiro	do	do	July 7, 1898			
City of Rio de Janeiro (rechartered)	do	do	Sept. 12, 1899	450,000.00	440,833.33	-----
Pennsylvania	do	Empire Transportation Co	July 7, 1898			
Tacoma	Sailing ship	Alaska Packers' Association	July 11, 1898	75,000.00	98,650.00	-----
St. Paul	Steamship	Alaska Commercial Co	July 19, 1898	375,000.00	367,400.00	7,500.00
St. Paul (rechartered)	do	do	Nov. 7, 1898			
Do	do	do	Aug. 3, 1899	100,000.00	93,225.00	-----
Centennial	do	Charles Nelson	Jan. 27, 1899			
Centennial (rechartered)	do	do	July 1, 1899	275,000.00	202,800.00	-----
Conemaugh	do	Empire Transportation Co	Feb. 14, 1899			
Roanoke	do	North American Transportation and Trading Co	Feb. 20, 1899	250,000.00	40,500.00	900.00
Portland	do	Alaska Commercial Co	Feb. 21, 1899	150,000.00	25,800.00	-----
Cleveland	do	Charles Nelson	Mar. 13, 1899	60,000.00	19,800.00	-----
Charles Nelson	do	do	Mar. 25, 1899	85,000.00	49,500.00	1,958.50
Charles Nelson (rechartered)	do	do	Sept. 23, 1899			
Leelanaw	do	Saginaw Steel Steamship Co	Apr. 14, 1899	200,000.00	142,800.00	-----
Wyefield	do	Harry J. Hart	June 12, 1899	250,000.00	130,650.00	-----
Tartar	do	do	July 4, 1899	450,000.00	230,650.00	-----
Garonne	do	Frank Waterhouse	July 21, 1899	175,000.00	114,625.00	-----
Athenian	do	Canadian Pacific Railway Co	July 22, 1899	375,000.00	129,800.00	-----
Port Albert	do	Frank Waterhouse	July 27, 1899	250,000.00	94,500.00	-----
Siam	do	Macondray & Co	Aug. 1, 1899	350,000.00	91,800.00	-----
Victoria	do	North American Mail Steamship Co	Aug. 3, 1899	250,000.00	120,400.00	-----
Columbia	do	do	Aug. 25, 1899	200,000.00	96,750.00	-----
Aztec	do	Pacific Mail Steamship Co	Aug. 28, 1899	225,000.00	100,800.00	-----
Sikh	do	do	do	250,000.00	70,200.00	3,500.00
Belgian King	do	M. J. Brandenstein & Co	Sept. 1, 1899	400,000.00	59,500.00	-----
Tacoma	do	North American Mail Steamship Co	Sept. 4, 1899	250,000.00	57,200.00	4,825.00
George W. Elder	do	Oregon Railroad and Navigation Co	do	250,000.00	31,900.00	3,473.50
Glenogle	do	Fred Dodwell	Sept. 13, 1899	300,000.00	68,800.00	6,300.00
Manauense	do	Harry J. Hart	Sept. 27, 1899	140,000.00	48,000.00	-----
Lennox	do	Northern Pacific Steamship Co	Sept. 29, 1899	300,000.00	65,800.00	-----
Victoria	do	J. J. Moore & Co	Oct. 5, 1899	175,000.00	44,000.00	-----
Olympia	do	North American Mail Steamship Co	Oct. 9, 1899	200,000.00	67,200.00	-----
City of Peking	do	Pacific Mail Steamship Co	Oct. 13, 1899	650,000.00	80,000.00	-----
Westminster	do	Harry J. Hart	Oct. 16, 1899	300,000.00	50,050.00	-----
Benmohr	do	Macondray & Co	do	500,000.00	53,900.00	-----
Port Stephens	do	Frank Waterhouse	Oct. 21, 1899	250,000.00	53,781.25	-----
Pathan	do	Macondray & Co	Oct. 23, 1899	200,000.00	49,000.00	-----
Duke of Fife	do	John Rosenfeld's Sons	Nov. 1, 1899	400,000.00	54,900.00	-----
Flintshire	do	George W. McNear	Nov. 3, 1899	350,000.00	41,300.00	-----
Dalny Vostock	do	John Rosenfeld's Sons	Nov. 6, 1899	225,000.00	33,600.00	-----
Fearless	Tug	Spreckels Tug Boat Company	July 4, 1899	-----	2,616.67	-----
Total					7,749,235.07	107,608.66
SUMMARY.						
Atlantic fleet, as per above statement					2,882,284.03	175,580.27
Expenditures reported for fitting up chartered vessels for transportation of troops not included in above statement:						
New York				81,730.77		
Tampa, Fla.				31,047.51		
Savannah, Charleston, and Tampa				80,568.32		
Mobile, Ala.				14,412.70		220,086.71
New Orleans, La.				7,533.99		
Charleston, S. C.				700.00		
Fort Monroe, Va.				65.22		
Habana, Santiago, Manzanillo, and Cienfuegos				4,028.20		
Pacific fleet, as per above statement					7,749,235.07	107,608.66
San Francisco, Cal.				1,150,478.84		
Seattle, Wash.				190,818.00		1,391,068.54
Portland, Oreg.				46,592.07		
Manila, Philippine Islands				3,177.63		
Grand total					10,631,519.10	1,894,342.18

Mr. BURROWS. In answer to the Senator from South Carolina, I will state that I find this statement in the document:

Consolidated statement showing the net allotments to, the net expenditures from, and the unexpended balances in the Treasury to the credit of so much of the \$50,000,000, appropriated under the act of March 3, 1898, as was assigned to the War Department under the title "National defense (war)."

	Net amount allotted by the President.	Net expenditure through the War Department.	Balance remaining in Treasury subject to requisition to meet uncompleted contracts.
Total	\$18,969,627.68	\$16,525,564.92	\$2,444,062.70

That is from Document 145.

Mr. TILLMAN. I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas, if he proposes to introduce any resolution of inquiry, that he ask what

has become of the ships that were bought, and whether the same board of survey which the Senator from Massachusetts mentioned as having fixed their value when they were bought had the same view of their value when they were sold. I want to see the difference between the purchase price and the upset price of selling, and I want to locate the point of view, so to speak, of the board as to why or how the price differed so. I hope the Senator—

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him for a moment more? I suggest that he insert the numbers of the documents.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let the numbers go in the RECORD. Mr. ALLISON. The document suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts is Senate Document No. 145, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, being a letter from the Secretary of War in response to the resolution of the Senate of January 8, 1900.

Document No. 110 is a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate of January 8, 1900, a statement from the Paymaster-General of the Navy,

showing the allotments to the Navy Department from the \$50,000,000 appropriated by Congress.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. This Congress or the last?

Mr. ALLISON. This Congress.

Mr. HALE. This session.

Mr. ALLISON. Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, and all made in response to resolutions.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope the Senator from Arkansas, when he prints his speech, if he does not want to put all these in the body of it, will print them as appendixes to it, and then the people who read his speech can study those statements.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I will agree that the Senator from New Hampshire shall print them as appendixes to his speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. He simply wanted the numbers of these documents to go into the RECORD, so that they may be easy of reference. He has given the numbers to the Reporter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURROWS. Will the Senator allow me to call his attention to other documents which may throw some light on this and may narrow the investigation?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. BURROWS. I hold in my hand Senate Documents Nos. 67 and 81. No. 67 is a report from the Attorney-General.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. This Congress?

Mr. BURROWS. This Congress; and No. 81 is a report of the Secretary of Agriculture, in which they report to Congress that no portion of the \$50,000,000 was assigned to either of their Departments, and therefore nothing has been expended by them.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yes; that is valuable information. I am glad to get that.

Mr. President, I simply intended to illustrate the reason why I thought there should be an accounting required of these sums of money by my reference to the \$50,000,000 and the complaints that are being made about its expenditure. I did not intend to make any charge. I know no facts upon which a charge can be made, except I do know that there are charges that outrageous prices were paid for these vessels, and I think the facts ought to be published as to the amounts paid. It seems that these reports, according to the statements of the gentlemen, show it. I had asked a number of Senators, the Senator from Iowa among others, as I just now stated, whether there had been any reports of this kind made, and was told by a number that they knew nothing of any such statements, and I knew of none; but I am glad to hear that there are such statements.

I was discussing this report of the Director of the Paris Exposition and the amounts of money paid to different individuals under his direction. It is unnecessary to go over the entire details. The total amount of expenditures reported and accounted for up to January 1 is less than \$400,000. I think there ought to be a more complete report of those expenditures, and I do believe that while the law of 1898 requiring these expenditures, if carried out and enforced, will cover the purpose, I doubt whether it is sufficient. It has not been observed up to this time, and I am afraid it will not be in the future.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. PETTIGREW. I make the point of order against the amendment that it proposes general legislation, creates new offices, and defines the duties of the occupants thereof.

Mr. GALLINGER. On that point I desire to call the attention of the Chair to section 2 of Rule XVI, with which the Chair is doubtless familiar:

All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Technically a point of order would lie against this amendment on the ground that it was referred to-day to the Committee on Appropriations instead of yesterday, but I apprehend that will not be seriously contemplated in ruling on this question.

This is a new appropriation of \$75,000 for the payment of certain salaries, and I think under that provision of Rule XVI the Chair could properly decide that it is in order.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suppose the objection which the Senator from South Dakota makes to the amendment is that it is obnoxious to the third section of Rule XVI, which provides that no amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. All of the provisions in regard to the report of a committee and estimates do not apply to that paragraph.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was quite aware of that fact, and would not contest that position, of course. If it is decided that it is

general legislation, I think it might well be decided that it is a new appropriation, and having been reported from a committee and referred to the Committee on Appropriations it can properly be admitted.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think the statement which the Chair made this morning of the effect of this rule was as completely clear and explicit as could be made. The question is, What is general legislation? I have always contended that general legislation does not simply mean legislation applicable to all the country and to all subjects, but that general legislation is anything that is not special and private legislation. The appropriation of money with a limitation upon it is not general legislation. That is special legislation applicable to the appropriation. Legislation which applies to a claim is not general legislation. That is private legislation.

Now, the question is, when you come to great subjects that are confined to one particular purpose, are those not general legislation? Suppose an amendment is proposed upon this bill to organize a new Territory. It applies to nothing but the Territory. It is not generally applicable to all the people. It is a single subject, and yet who would maintain that it is not general legislation? Almost as good a distinction as I could draw would be the body of laws that are issued at the end of every session. The private laws are in one part of the volume—those that are special and private. All the others are in the general legislation—for and selected as general legislation.

Therefore, I have always contended that although a subject-matter may be distinct and clear and applicable to but one thing, yet as it is public legislation it is general legislation. I hope that the ruling of the Chair will be in that direction; otherwise it will be claimed that the proposition for an exposition in a given town is not general legislation, but is private or special legislation, and that a proposition for the organization of a Territory or the creation of a new department is not general legislation; and I should say very clearly that that would not hold good as parliamentary law.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine if he has always held to the distinction between private or special legislation and general legislation which he now announces?

Mr. HALE. Yes; so far as I remember in any remarks I have ever submitted to the Senate; and I have sometimes talked upon this question until I thought the Senate was almost as tired of it as I am.

Mr. ALLEN. In justification of myself I will state that the doctrine which the Senator now advocates is the one which I have announced on many an occasion here, and I have been the victim on more than one occasion of a point of order made by the Senator from Maine, taking practically the reverse position from that which he now occupies.

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator will find it very difficult, if he will look up the record, to convict me of ever saying anything contrary to what I say now, because it has been perhaps almost a fad of mine that general legislation comprehends something more than all the subjects that pertain to the people.

Mr. ALLEN. I never supposed there could be any doubt about it, but there seems to have been a great deal of doubt heretofore.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I am not going to controvert his position, but I am glad that he has called attention to the fact in his argument that if we go on in this way we will really permit an exposition to be held somewhere, under the provisions of an appropriation bill. The Senator sat in the Committee on Appropriations and permitted such a provision to go in the bill and to be passed upon by the Senate, and he forgot this contention which he has always made and which he so profoundly believes in. I am glad he is so consistent.

Mr. HALE. I will only say that I can not reveal the proceedings of the Committee on Appropriations, nor can I state what was my vote in the committee on the exposition amendment. I was not here when the matter came up, so that I am not in any way guilty of consenting thereto. Nobody made any point of order. I do not say that I should have made it if I had been here. But I was not here.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in regard to the matter of the exposition, after what we have heard this morning from the Senator from Arkansas in regard to the Paris Exposition and the lack of itemized accounts, I think the Senate ought to hesitate before it appropriates \$5,000,000 for an exposition without any protection whatever of which I am aware in the expenditure of that money, without any provision as to how it shall be spent or by whom. Unless something is done to cure that defect I shall make the point of order against it when it reaches the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, if the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire is not general legislation, I do not know what can be called general legislation. If it is not, then

all of the legislation which is adopted at any session of Congress can be dumped upon an appropriation bill. I assume that the Chair will sustain the point of order.

In regard to the other suggestion made by the Senator from Massachusetts, I hope that the great dangers which have been pointed out from improvident expenditures under these general appropriations for expositions will lead the Senate to consider very carefully the proposition of the Senator from Missouri in regard to \$5,000,000, especially when it is true that the \$5,000,000 is to be expended by a private corporation and not by an officer of the Government of the United States. The Senator from Arkansas has convinced me that we have gone too far already in making appropriations of that nature, and that the Senate should halt in regard to such propositions suggested from either side of the Chamber or by the representative of any party.

Mr. COCKRELL. That expenditure, the Senator will remember, is to be made under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, who has the scrutiny of every item of it.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is to be made by the exposition company of St. Louis.

Mr. COCKRELL. But by and under the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; but under no rule.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not a dollar can be expended without his approval.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is under no law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, in the opinion of the Chair, creates a new commission. If there were a commission in existence and this were simply an appropriation for the commission, the Chair would not hold that it was general legislation; but creating a commission and making an appropriation, the Chair is obliged to hold that it is general legislation and subject to the point of order.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rise to a parliamentary question, which I understand the Chair can rule upon in his discretion or not. During my membership in this body I have never heard it raised, and that is whether a point of order can be made when the bill has been reported to the Senate.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Or an amendment agreed to as in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before responding to the inquiry, the Chair would like to consider it for a while. Clearly, if a point of order is made against a proposition as in Committee of the Whole, it can not be repeated in the Senate. The Chair is satisfied that that is correct. Upon the question whether, if no point of order is made as in Committee of the Whole, it can be made when the bill reaches the Senate, the Chair desires to reflect.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is precisely the point I desire to have determined. An examination of the rules certainly does not seem to disclose anything that would prevent the point of order being made in the Senate upon an amendment or proposition against which the point had not been made as in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will be obliged to depend upon general parliamentary law.

Mr. HALE. I am inclined to think—

Mr. PENROSE. I ask for the reading of the amendment I offered.

Mr. HALE. That point has been raised by several Senators informally in conversation. I am inclined to think the Chair will find that it is a new point. I do not remember, in my experience, that the question has been raised. Where the Committee of the Whole have reported a proposition to the Senate, and no point of order has been made upon it as in Committee of the Whole, whether a point of order can be made in the Senate or whether it is too late certainly has not come up in my time, when I have been present in the Senate. I am inclined to think the Chair will find it a new question, and I think the Chair should have an opportunity to examine the question very carefully.

Mr. RAWLINS. Is it in order to propose an amendment to the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is an amendment pending. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert the following at the end of the bill:

That the sum of \$200,000 be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Philadelphia museums for the purpose of completing the collection from foreign markets of samples of merchandise of the character in favor and demand therein, and of illustrating the manner in which merchandise for such markets should be prepared and packed.

Mr. HALE. I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire the attention of the Senate for a few moments.

Mr. HALE. I wish to make a point of order.

Mr. ALLEN. Let me speak first.

Mr. HALE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Sen-

ate for a few moments. We have consumed nearly three hours of the day in discussing the very intricate and interesting question as to what constitutes special or private and what constitutes general legislation, which to my mind is as simple as the first letter of the alphabet if we take the established authority as our guide. I have not undertaken myself to enlighten the Chair as to the ruling that should be made. Not being a parliamentarian, I have not thought it proper to offer any suggestions as to what course ought to be pursued. That has been done amply by the Senator from Maine, who is a parliamentary encyclopedia, and by the Senator from Rhode Island and by the Senator from Connecticut; and I have no doubt the Chair derived much valuable information from the discussion of those Senators and will be able during the remainder of the session to pursue the right course in his rulings on these intricate subjects.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] has brought to the attention of the Senate some of the peculiarities of the administration of our exposition affairs in the city of Paris. In my judgment it requires some explanation at the hands of those who are responsible for that exposition and its conduct. He has also brought to the attention of the Senate and the country some peculiarities about the purchase and sale of vessels by the Navy and War Departments, which likewise, to my thinking, requires an explanation on the part of those engaged in those transactions.

Interesting as has been the discussion of Rule XVI and of the matters which the Senator from Arkansas has referred to, I think the Senate of the United States, at this peculiar time and at this particular hour, ought to pause long enough to give expression to its sentiments regarding the relations existing between Great Britain and the South African Republic. We have consumed this entire winter and are now about to adjourn without having passed a resolution or given voice to an authoritative sentiment regarding the feelings of Congress or of the country toward the people who are struggling in South Africa to maintain their liberty. The press brings us the intelligence this morning that Pretoria, the capital of the South African Republic, has fallen into the hands of the British troops, and that President Kruger and his faithful followers and the burghers generally are fleeing to the mountains and the unexplored portions of Africa, once again, I presume, to establish a government for themselves.

We have present in Pretoria a diplomatic representative. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] the other day informed us that a consul is not a diplomatic officer, and it was refreshing and delightful to learn that the old rule still holds true that a consul is a commercial and not a diplomatic officer. But we have clothed the young gentleman who represents the United States at the capital of the South African Republic, consul though his title be, with diplomatic power, and he has been exercising those powers in negotiating with other governments and in negotiating between the United States and the South African Republic.

Notwithstanding this, notwithstanding we recognized by the appointment of this diplomatic officer the existence of the South African Republic months and even years ago, when that Republic, a short time ago, selected three envoys to come to this country and represent them in Washington, they had no more than set their feet upon the soil of the District of Columbia when they were informed semiofficially that their presence here was not desirable and that they would not be received officially and recognized as representatives of their Government. The greatest and most powerful republic on earth denied official recognition to the youngest if not the smallest republic. The spirit of liberty which actuated our ancestors in 1776 became dormant in official Washington, while the great heart of the masses of our countrymen went to those simple burghers in their distress and, in my judgment, sympathizes with them heartily to-day.

Through some kind of an arrangement—I know not exactly what, because I am not a diplomat and know little about such matters—these gentlemen were taken to the office of the Secretary of State, not officially, but as private citizens of a country whose political independence was then questioned by Great Britain, which, in my judgment, was using its influence with this country to prevent their recognition. They were taken into the office of the Secretary of State, and no doubt they were treated personally with marked consideration and distinction, because we all know the capacity of the Secretary of State as an entertainer. But they were denied official recognition. Their letters or credentials were never received and never acted upon, and, if I understand the situation correctly, they were never presented, in consequence of a suggestion made to them either by the Secretary of State or by others in authority.

While they were being entertained by the Secretary of State, at that same moment the British ambassador entered the office of the Secretary of State and was put in a side room to await the termination of the interview between the Secretary and these envoys. They had no sooner taken their hats and left the office of the Secretary of State when his lordship was admitted into the presence of the Secretary. But what took place between them I

suppose no man will ever know. I speak of this as a coincidence of their visit.

In less than a week from the time this Government turned down these Boer envoys and refused to recognize them as the official representatives of a sister republic, the same Secretary of State wired to Mr. Choate, at London, the following cablegram:

WASHINGTON, May 24, 1900.

The following message has been sent by Secretary Hay to Ambassador Choate in London:

"You will please convey through the appropriate channels the congratulations and best wishes of the President to her Majesty the Queen on the occasion of her birthday."

This was published in the New York Sun of May 25, and was published as a press dispatch throughout the press of the United States. When I read that dispatch I looked the paper through to see if I could not find a dispatch by Mr. Hay to President Kruger expressing some sympathy, or some hope, at least, that the South African Republic would succeed in establishing its independence of Great Britain. But, Mr. President, no such dispatch was found and we had no information that such a dispatch was sent or contemplated.

I have no objection, Mr. President, to congratulating Queen Victoria upon her birthday, not in consequence of her being at the head of the British Empire, but by reason of her being an eminent lady whose life has been worthy of emulation. But it did occur to me, and it occurs to me now, that when Mr. Hay sent this telegram to Mr. Choate congratulating the head of the British Government upon her reaching her birthday successfully, not as a citizen or subject of Great Britain, but as the sovereign power of Great Britain, he ought at least to have sent something to Kruger and his struggling followers encouraging the cause of liberty in South Africa.

I think myself it would have been fully as consistent to have sent out a dispatch to all good women of the United States who had lived to be about eighty years of age, and congratulated them upon reaching their eightieth birthday successfully, and upon what they had done in the cause of liberty in building up a noble sentiment in a great Republic like this.

I do not know, of course; I can only indulge my imagination; but I presume when that amiable gentleman Mr. Choate, our ambassador to England, got this dispatch, clothed in the proper regalia, in proper court dress, he hastened to the presence of the Queen, and there, in proper diplomatic style, he delivered the congratulations of the President of the United States that she had lived and reigned so long and so successfully over the British Empire.

Mr. President, but yesterday the press dispatches brought us a report of a speech made by Lord Salisbury in which the cloak is entirely thrown off, the mask is torn from the face of Great Britain, and he declares now that it is the purpose of the British Empire to destroy these Republics and annex them to Great Britain. They have gone so far as to change the name of the Orange Free State to the Orange River State. There is no longer any hypocrisy in the attitude of Great Britain.

Of course, Mr. President, the Republican party has tears and sympathy to extend to these Boers; but whenever in this city they were being wined and dined and feted by distinguished Republican officeholders, not a Democrat or a Populist was permitted to see them if they could be kept out of sight.

A have even heard criticism going to the extent of suggesting that his lordship the ambassador of Great Britain footed the expenses of the extensive parties that were given by our Republican friends in their adulation and their entertainment. How true that may be I do not know; I do not care. We had a right to suppose that these envoys, after spending over thirty days upon the ocean in coming to this country to present their cause, should at least have an opportunity to do so. Has the time come in the history of this Republic, before it has reached a century and a third of its existence, when those who may represent the cause of human freedom from any part of the habitable globe are to be turned incontinently from the door and refused an opportunity to lay the object of their mission before the authorities of the United States? Yet that would seem to be exactly what has been done.

Unofficial America sympathizes with the Boers in their struggle for liberty, but there seems to be a hidden cord binding official America to official Great Britain to the extent that we are impotent and powerless in official circles, when Great Britain indicates to the contrary, to extend the ordinary hospitalities and amenities of official life to the representatives of a republican government.

But what have the people of South Africa done? Are they criminals? Have they violated any of the laws of nations? Are they outlaws? No, Mr. President, they have been guilty of the crime of seeking the liberty that we ourselves enjoy, and which I pray God we may enjoy in the future as we have done in the past. They were inspired by our example. Their constitution is a remold and a remold of the Constitution of the United States.

They were inspired by the example of the great Republic. When they come to us for sympathy we turn them from our doors without a hearing.

And yet, Mr. President, we ought not to forget that if it had not been for the ancestors of these very people, if it had not been for Holland and the spirit of liberty in Holland in 1776, we quite likely would to-day have been dependencies of the British Empire instead of a powerful Government and independent of them. They came to our aid with their money, with their assistance, when we had no credit and when we could not borrow a dollar elsewhere in the world, and when British troops were overrunning every foot of our territory, when British naval vessels were in every water upon our coasts, seeking to destroy us because we aspired to an independent government such as, in my judgment, God has designed for all the people of earth. We have grown fat and powerful; we have grown aristocratic, Mr. President; and now we are so wealthy and so powerful that official America looks with scorn and contempt upon a struggling people; and when they seek to lay their complaint before those in authority, the official nose is elevated at an angle of forty-five degrees in contempt of them and their nation.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, is it in order to offer an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill?

Mr. PENROSE. There is an amendment pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). There is one amendment pending.

Mr. ALDRICH. A point of order was made against it by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask that the amendment shall be read?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; I understood a point of order was raised against it by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to know what the point of order is, if the Chair will state it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senate ready for the question on agreeing to the amendment?

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, this is a subject that has been very hotly contested both here and in the House and in the committee that had it in charge. The committee is very nearly divided. There is very strong objection to the Government beginning to embark in appropriations for matters which are not governmental. That is the chief ground of my opposition to it. That being my belief, in which I know a great many Senators share, as to the inherent evil of it, I am constrained to make every point of order that I think good.

I think this point of order is good; it is nothing but a claim made by this institution for Government help; it is general legislation, because it is the same as if we undertook to set up a new enterprise; there is no law for it; it is a departure from the general law, upon the same train of thought that I indicated some time ago, that general legislation is not simple legislation applying to the general body of law, but any act that is not private legislation is general legislation. I make that point of order against this amendment.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maine whether these qualms of conscience as to the parliamentary propriety of this amendment struck him when the St. Louis appropriation was inserted in the bill day before yesterday afternoon?

Mr. HALE. The Senator will not drive me from a considerate point of order by any slur.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I do not—

Mr. HALE. I make that point of order; and I have another point of order to make that I certainly shall make now, if I did not intend to make it before. I was not here when the St. Louis Exposition matter came up. I voted against it in the Committee on Appropriations, which I have not stated before. I was sorry to do it; I am sorry to have to do it now; but when, because I make a point of order on another matter, I am taunted by the remark that I have not done it on that, I reply that I voted against the St. Louis Exposition item in the committee, and if I had been present here I would have made a point of order against it. I make that point of order, and I make also the point of order, Mr. President, that, whether that point of order is good or not, the amendment has not been reported one day beforehand.

Mr. PENROSE. I am glad the Senator has been relieved from the grave charge of inconsistency, which, in my opinion, can be applied very fairly and justly to every member of the Committee on Appropriations who was present when that amendment was introduced and who sat silently in his seat.

Now, Mr. President, I will submit to a rule consistently applied with as good grace and with as little complaint as any member of this body. But the moment the bars are let down, and the moment a rule is violated, especially by those who are in authorized charge of a measure and who are supposed to guard carefully their own rules and regulations, it places Senators in this body in a false position with their constituents, and is unjust and unfair.

With the whole committee, as I understand it, directing the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations not to give consent to the enormous appropriation of \$5,000,000, there is not a whimper or a protest or an objection raised in the Senate; and when other gentlemen get up to offer amendments equally useful to the public, equally desired by the American people and, in my opinion, equally of importance—and I refer, Mr. President, to the amendment which you have introduced, and which I have introduced, and which are infinitesimally small in their inroads on the public Treasury compared with the enormous appropriation which we have already consented to—I can appeal to the candor and fairness of the Senate that it is unjust to you and to me and it is difficult to explain to our constituents. It is the violation of a rule permitted for an enormous amount, and then suddenly and in an unequal manner enforced by those who have consented to the violation of it.

Mr. President, I ask that this amendment be agreed to by the Senate (whether or not the House conferees will agree to it is another question), in justice to me as a Senator of this body, upon the same ground and waiving the same technicalities that were calmly and quietly permitted to be waived when the Senate, without any protest from you or from me, consented to this enormous appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 2 of Rule XVI reads as follows:

All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, etc.

Waiving the first point made by the Senator from Maine, it is sufficient for the present occupant of the chair to know that this proposition was referred to the Committee on Appropriations today, and hence, under the provision of the rule, the point of order will lie.

Mr. PENROSE. I desire to make an inquiry of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Will he have this amendment considered in time to be acted upon one way or the other before the final determination of this bill?

Mr. ALLISON. I hope to have this bill finished to-day. That is my intention.

Mr. PENROSE. I desire to give notice that I shall, when the bill is reported to the Senate, raise the point of order as to the St. Louis Exposition provision and all other matters contained in the bill that in my opinion are open to the objection which has been raised against this amendment.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment. On page 53, after line 15, I move to insert:

For establishing a fish-hatching and fish-culture station, including construction of buildings and ponds, and equipment, at some suitable point in Utah, to be selected by the United States Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the purchase of a site.

Mr. President, there are but two States, I believe, that are in any way adapted to this kind of service which are not already provided for in the law. Those two States are Idaho and Utah. The Committee on Appropriations have caused to be inserted in the bill a similar provision for Idaho. Utah is far removed from the seashore; it has not the advantages of an ocean supply of fish, and there is no State in the Union where greater benefit would be derived from this kind of service than in my State. I hope the Senator from Iowa will interpose no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I feel constrained to make the point of order on this amendment. It is not estimated for and there is no report from any committee that I know of in favor of it.

Mr. RAWLINS. I ask upon what theory the Senator can object to this amendment and insert the same legislation for Idaho?

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator has his remedy on the Idaho amendment.

Mr. HALE. The Senator can raise a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. RAWLINS. I do not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order having been made that the proposed appropriation has not been estimated by the head of a Department, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. CLARK. At the end of line 15 on page 73 I move to insert:

That hereafter persons actually residing within or in the vicinity of any forest reservation may, without charge, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, cut and remove from such reservations dead and down timber for their own use as firewood or for the improvement of their homes, mining claims, or farms.

Under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, dead and down timber may be cut and removed from forest reservations or from the public domain where, in his judgment, the same is likely to produce or spread fires; and trees exceeding 9 inches in diameter may be sold to and cut and removed by persons purchasing the same under regulations to

be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That only such trees may be so sold and felled and the removal of which shall be advantageous to the forests upon such reservations or the public domain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ALLISON. Admonished by what has been said in the Senate, I make the point of order upon this amendment that it is legislation.

Mr. CLARK. Before that point of order is insisted upon—

Mr. ALLISON. I will yield to the Senator if he wishes to be heard.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that all our present laws in regard to forest reserves have been passed upon the sundry civil appropriation bill. The law providing for the patrol of the reserves and every law that we have now in regard to forest reserves and their government is found upon the sundry civil appropriation acts of the various Congresses. It occurred to me as very proper that this amendment should be placed upon the sundry civil appropriation bill. I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered at this time, notwithstanding the point of order.

Mr. ALLISON. I am constrained to insist upon the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa makes the point of order that the amendment is new legislation.

Mr. ALLISON. General legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DANIEL. There is an amendment which has been sent to the desk which I should like to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia offers an amendment, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. Insert after line 15 on page 67:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to suspend until further action of Congress any act or proceeding against the State of Virginia under provisions of section 4 of the act approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to reimburse the governors of States and Territories for expenses incurred by them in aiding the United States to raise and organize and supply and equip the Volunteer Army of the United States in the existing war with Spain.'"

Mr. ALLISON. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes, sir; I ask unanimous consent that that amendment may be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. The question is whether unanimous consent will be given to consider it. I ask that the Chair may put that question. I shall not object myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest that that is rather a strange parliamentary procedure, but he is willing to put the question.

Mr. ALLISON. It may be strange, but I understood the Senator from Virginia to ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BAKER. I ask that it be read.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

Mr. BAKER. As we are all making points about these new matters of general legislation, I submit that this is subject to the same objection. It provides for the suspension of a general law, and therefore is general legislation.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I hope I may be permitted to explain the status in which our State is placed by the peculiar action of the Government. If the Senator from Kansas will turn to the RECORD of May 29, there he will find a more ample statement of it than I would be willing to inflict again upon the Senate.

A conference report brought this matter into a bill which was entirely foreign to the subject-matter. It was unknown to the Senators here, and unknown to the Representatives, and not mentioned by the conferees in either House. They put the Government in an attitude of taking a State by surprise, suing it without opening to it the privilege of applying those offsets and equities which could only be permitted by statute. I am sure the honorable Senator would not wish to do an injustice to the Commonwealth of Virginia or to any other Commonwealth.

It seems to me that this action is due on behalf of the Government itself, and that it ought to be moved to take such action until the matter can be properly adjudicated or settled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator insist upon his point of order?

Mr. BAKER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted, as the Chair understands the matter, is a portion of an amendment previously ruled out on a point of order. It is general legislation; and the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in on page 67, after the word "available," at the end of line 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. On page 67, after line 15, it is proposed to insert:

To pay the State of Nevada the sum of \$462,441.97 for moneys advanced in aid of the suppression of the rebellion in the civil war, as found and reported to Congress on January 23, 1900, by the Secretary of the Treasury, as provided in an act of Congress approved March 3, 1899.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I was very much disappointed, when the report of the Committee on Appropriations was presented, to find the claim of the State of Nevada coupled with a large number of other claims. It stands on a different footing from any other claim that was reported by the committee. It is for money advanced by Nevada, while it was a Territory, in aid of the suppression of the rebellion. The State assumed the debt, although it need not have done so, and it was unfortunate that it did.

It is a debt which the State has carried and paid interest upon ever since; and it is very burdensome. There is very little taxable property in the State. Nevada is poor, and this debt is materially retarding her development, because the rate of taxation is necessarily high, and people do not like to settle in the little valleys in the State since silver mining has been abandoned and the price of silver has gone down. The resources of the State are inadequate to the demands upon it. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the claim and to the manner in which it has been investigated.

On the 27th of June, 1882, an act of Congress was passed authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury, with the aid and assistance of the Secretary of War, to examine and investigate the claims of Texas, Colorado, Oregon, Nebraska, California, Kansas, and Nevada and the Territories of Washington and Idaho for moneys expended and indebtedness assumed by said States and Territories in repelling invasions and suppressing Indian hostilities in said States and Territories, and for other purposes. (22 Stats., 111.)

On the 4th of August, 1886, Congress passed an act for the benefit of the above-named States, the second section of which is as follows:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to detail three Army officers to assist him in examining and reporting upon the claims of the States and Territories named in the acts of June 27, 1882, chapter 241 of the Laws of the Forty-seventh Congress, and such officers, before entering upon said duties, shall take and subscribe an oath that they will carefully examine said claims, and that they will, to the best of their ability, make a just and impartial statement thereof as required by said act. (24 Stats., 217.)

Under the first act the claims of Kansas, Texas, and Nebraska were examined by the Treasury and War Departments and paid. The amount paid to Texas was \$1,075,793.37, of which sum \$927,177.40 was put on an urgent deficiency bill in the first session of the Fiftieth Congress (25 Stats., 71), after the bill had passed both Houses and when the Senate amendments were under consideration in the House, and was agreed to in conference; and the remainder, \$148,615.97, was paid September 30, 1890, in the deficiency bill of 1890 (30 Stats., 539).

The board of war claims examiners were engaged under the provisions of these two acts for several years, and finally made their report to the Secretary of War, who made his report in December, 1889, on the claims of California, Oregon, and Nevada to Congress, which were printed as Senate Documents Nos. 10, 11, and 17, Fifty-first Congress, first session, comprising three large volumes, and which gave in great detail the history of said claims and stated the exact amount which each State had furnished and had then actually paid.

On this adjustment by the board of war claims examiners the Senate, in March, 1891, incorporated an amendment in the general deficiency bill (H. R. 13658) to pay the amounts so found due each State, and which amendment passed the Senate. Mr. Sayers, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, objected to the amendment on the ground that the claims of California, Oregon, and Nevada had not been passed upon by the Treasury Department, although they had been much more thoroughly examined by the war claims examiners than the Treasury Department could have done, and that, too, in pursuance of a law specially passed for that purpose. The objection was merely technical.

In addition to the passage of these claims in appropriation bills, independent bills providing for their payment passed the Senate both in the Fifty-first and Fifty-third Congresses. (See Senate Report 1351, page 7, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session.)

At the last session of the Fifty-fifth Congress the claims of California, Oregon, and Nevada were again passed by the Senate in the "omnibus bill," but the California delegation in the House stated that they had not fully examined the subject, and the conferees on the part of the House objected to the payment of the claims. The conference committee, however, inserted in the omnibus bill the following provision:

That the claim of the State of Nevada for moneys advanced in aid of the suppression of the rebellion in the civil war, and the same is hereby referred to the Secretary of the Treasury to investigate and report to Congress at the next session the amount furnished by said State of Nevada, or by the Territory of Nevada and assumed by said State, in aid of the suppression of the rebellion of the civil war, with such interest on the same as said State has

actually paid, together with what amounts have been heretofore paid by the United States. (30 Stats., 1206.)

The Secretary of the Treasury, in pursuance of the above law, made the following report, printed as House Document No. 322, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session:

CLAIM OF THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the claim of the State of Nevada for moneys advanced in aid of the suppression of the rebellion in the civil war. January 20, 1900.—Referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

Washington, D. C., January 19, 1900.

SIR: Referring to the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat., page 1206), upon the subject of the claim of the State of Nevada for moneys advanced in aid of the suppression of the rebellion in the civil war, and calling for report to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury thereon, I have the honor to transmit herewith copy of statement of the case made by the Auditor for the War Department January 18, 1900.

Respectfully,

L. J. GAGE,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Washington, January 18, 1900.

SIR: In reply to your communication of March 11, 1899, requesting a report under provisions of act of March 3, 1899, paragraph "State claims" (Public, 190), upon the claim of the State of Nevada for moneys advanced in aid of the suppression of the rebellion in the civil war, I have the honor to state the following:

On December 24, 1889, the Secretary of War, acting in accordance with a resolution of the Senate of February 27, 1889, transmitted a full and complete statement showing the amount expended by the State of Nevada, with such interest on the same as the State had paid between February 10, 1865, and June 30, 1889, amounting in all to the sum of \$412,600.31. This report is found in Executive Document No. 10, first session Fifty-first Congress.

From a certified statement of Samuel P. Davis, State comptroller of Nevada, made on December 19, 1899, it appears that since the time covered by the report of the Secretary of War—i. e., from June 30, 1889, to December 31, 1899—the State of Nevada has paid the sum of \$58,401.27 as interest upon money paid by the State in aiding in suppressing the rebellion in the civil war. Accordingly, assuming this statement to be correct, the total amount expended by the State of Nevada, or by the Territory of Nevada and assumed by said State, with such interest on the same as the said State has actually paid, amounts to \$471,001.58.

Upon reports of an examination of this claim made by the State war claims examiners, the Third Auditor, and the Second Comptroller of the Treasury, under act of June 27, 1882, the sum of \$7,559.61 was allowed and paid to the State of Nevada on April 10, 1883. This amount, deducted from the total amount paid by the State of Nevada, leaves the sum of \$462,441.97 for which the State has not been reimbursed. The following is a tabulated statement of this claim:

Amount of claim of the State of Nevada, including interest up to June 30, 1889, as shown in the report of the Secretary of War (see page 10, Senate Document No. 10, Fifty-first Congress)	\$412,600.31
Amount of interest paid by Nevada from June 30, 1889, to December 31, 1899	58,401.27
Total claim	471,001.58
Amount which the State was reimbursed on April 10, 1883, under act of June 27, 1882	8,559.61
Total paid by the State for which no reimbursement has been made	462,441.97

Respectfully,

F. H. MORRIS, Auditor.

The claim of the State of Nevada has therefore had all the examination that the claims of the States of Kansas, Texas, and Nebraska had prior to their payment. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury makes it unnecessary to have any further examination of the claim. The intention of Congress in passing the law of March 3, 1899, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress the sum due the State of Nevada, was clearly to make an appropriation at the present session for said claim in the sum so found due.

On the 4th day of March, 1891, while the general deficiency bill, H. R. 13658, was under consideration in the Senate, which included the amendment for the payment of the Nevada claim, the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] who had charge of the bill made some remarks regarding this claim.

I want to call the attention of the Senator from Maine especially to this matter. I was explaining the amendment. It was feared we could not get the bill through, as it was then the last day of the session, and Senators and members of the House came to me and promised faithfully that if I would let the bill pass—I stood right here at the time the debate occurred—they would at the next session make an appropriation for the State of Nevada; that there would be no doubt about it; and the Senator from Maine made remarks that were very encouraging, upon which I took my seat and let the bill pass and postponed action on the amendment. That was nine or ten years ago, and the Senator from Maine then said:

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I desire to say only a word in reply to the Senator from Nevada. The instructions given to the committee on the part of the House do not apply to the State claims, but only to the railroad claims, so that in the conference which will immediately ensue the Senate conferees will not find the conference embarrassed by any action of the House aside from those claims. The committee of conference will be in session immediately, and I only repeat what I have said before, that it will endeavor to secure as much as possible of the action of the Senate upon this bill.

I want to say to the Senator from Nevada—I know that he is a reasonable man upon all these subjects—that the Senate is committed to these State claims by vote, by sentiment, and it is only a question of time when they will pass.

The present bill, aside from the matters which have been discussed, contains upon it an appropriation for pensions for soldiers amounting to \$28,000,000. I do not suppose there is a Senator here who, whatever may be his feeling about other matters in the bill, would desire to wreck the bill and thereby leave the soldiers without money for the payment of their pensions during the remainder of the year. Calling the attention of the Senator to this, I leave the subject now, and hope to be able to report from the conference committee in a very short time.

The claim of Nevada was incurred by the Territory of Nevada, which was admitted into the Union by an act of Congress, without application being made to come in, when the usual public buildings had not been erected for the State, when no appropriation had been made for a State prison and other buildings—it came into the Union destitute. The State has paid and is paying interest on this money, and is now very much embarrassed in consequence.

The claim has been investigated; it has been reported upon at nearly every session by committees of both Houses; it has been reported every time favorably, and once very elaborately from the Committee on Military Affairs by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], who investigated the claim thoroughly. It has been reported four or five times by various committees of the House, but failed to get concurrent action of the two Houses.

Now, I ask that this item be inserted in the bill. It stands on a different footing from the California and Oregon claims; it is a better claim of indebtedness incurred, and besides, it has passed the Treasury Department under a special act, which those claims have not. I know the California and Oregon claims are just; I have done all I could to procure their payment; but I hope that this item may be paid now, because it has been delayed so long, and because the State is sorely in need of the money. Nobody can assign any reason against the payment of the claim, and there is no question as to its validity.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I sympathize with the Senator from Nevada and with the State of Nevada as respects this claim, which has been pending now for thirty-five years or more; but, admonished by suggestions of the Senate, I am constrained to make a point of order upon this amendment that there is no estimate for it, and that it has not been passed upon by a standing committee.

Mr. STEWART. It has; it has been reported by the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well. Then I make the suggestion that there is no estimate for it, and that it is a claim which stands in the relation of a great many other State claims that are now pending in both Houses of Congress. Of course, it is well known that the Committee on Appropriations endeavors to deal with some of these claims, but can not deal with them intelligently as respects the amount. I find here that the Auditor for the War Department has made a report upon the amount of the claim, etc.

Mr. STEWART. Under a special law for that purpose.

Mr. ALLISON. It is a report of the Auditor; not an estimate of the Treasury Department.

Mr. STEWART. There is a report of the Secretary of the Treasury as to the amount, and the amendment is recommended by a standing committee.

Mr. ALLISON. The Secretary of the Treasury simply states that, in answer to a letter written by the Senator from Nevada, I believe—

Mr. STEWART. Oh, no; in pursuance of law.

Mr. ALLISON. A letter written to the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Referring to the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat., page 1233), upon the subject of the claim of the State of Nevada for moneys advanced in aid of the suppression of the rebellion in the civil war, and calling for report of Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury thereon, I have the honor to transmit herewith copy of statement of the case made by the Auditor for the War Department January 18, 1900.

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

Mr. STEWART. Sustains the point of order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. Well, I will have to appeal from the decision of the Chair, because it is not legislation and it is recommended—

Mr. ALLISON. There is no estimate for it.

Mr. STEWART. It is estimated for by the Secretary of the Treasury. He has found the amount due, and the amendment is to carry out existing law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Was it reported from a committee as an amendment to the bill and sent to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. STEWART. It was sent to the Committee on Claims, reported as an amendment to this bill, and sent to the Committee on Appropriations some time ago. It has gone through every phase that makes it in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A State claim, according to Jefferson, is not a private claim in the ordinary acceptation of the term. The Chair was not aware that the amendment had been reported from a committee as an amendment to this bill and sent to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to see that amendment. I have here some other papers. The Senator did report some amendment.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, it was passed upon by the Committee on Claims and referred, as I understand, to the Committee on Appropriations. I know the Committee on Claims authorized its being reported.

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair overrules the point of order, then. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "ayes" have it.

Mr. ALLISON. I call for a division.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I just want to say one word about this matter. If there are any claims that are just and proper, which the United States ought to pay, this is one of them. It has had all the care and attention it is possible to give a claim. Every dollar of this amount has been found by the Treasury Department to be due the State of Nevada. The State has been kept out of it for thirty-odd years. It is an expenditure that all of the States in the West were compelled to make from time to time. Most of them have been recognized and paid, and there is no reason why this should not be paid. It is as sacred an obligation, in my judgment, as the national bonds; and the conditions are such that everybody knows that the Government can pay it now as well as at any other time. The situation in Nevada demands that, if the Government is ever to pay it, the Government ought to pay it now.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I have served a good many years on the Committee on Military Affairs, and at every Congress have heard this bill discussed from beginning to end. There is no sort of question as to its justice. It is just as much due as your board bill, which you have to pay every month.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I withdraw the call for a division.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in on line 5, page 8.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be erected at Norfolk, in the State of Nebraska, on the site already purchased therefor by the Government of the United States, a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the United States courts, post-office, land office, and other Government offices in the city of Norfolk and State of Nebraska; the cost of said building, including said vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, not to exceed the sum of \$50,000, which said sum of \$75,000 is hereby appropriated for that purpose, out of any moneys in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Sec. — That so much of said appropriation as may be necessary for the preparation of sketch plans, drawings, specifications, and detailed estimates for the building by the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department shall be available immediately; and after the said sketch plans and estimates for the building shall have been prepared by the Supervising Architect and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Postmaster-General, the balance of said appropriation shall be available for the erection and completion of the building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches. The building shall be unexposed to any danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet on each side, including streets and alleys.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senate and Senators for just a moment to make a brief explanation of this proposed amendment.

The amendment was introduced and sent to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, has been recommended by them favorably, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The amendment also is designed to carry into execution two laws already in existence.

Twelve years ago Congress passed an act establishing a Federal court at the city of Norfolk and the city of Hastings in my State, in addition to the cities of Omaha and Lincoln. Two years ago, or during the Fifty-fifth Congress, Congress made an appropriation of \$10,000 to buy a site for a public building in Norfolk, which has been purchased and is now owned by the Government.

Those familiar with the geography of Nebraska will remember that the State is about 500 miles east and west, and perhaps about 213 or 214 miles north and south. The Platte River runs almost through the center of the State from east to west. There are three lines of railroads running through the State from the extreme east to the extreme west—the Elkhorn Railroad, in the northern portion of the State; the Union Pacific, along the center; and the Burlington, in the southern portion of the State.

The Federal courts, in consequence of the lack of a public building at Norfolk, are not held there now in accordance with the act of Congress. Litigants in the State of Nebraska having cases before the Federal court are compelled to travel to Omaha or to Lincoln, Omaha being on the west bank of the river and Lincoln within about 50 miles of the Missouri River, and almost in the extreme southeast corner of the State. The result is that the class of litigants who live in the northwestern portion of the State, and who are tributary for litigating purposes to the Federal court which

is held at Omaha, are compelled to travel from four to five hundred miles to reach court and take their witnesses that distance.

As a consequence, only those litigants having a great deal of money can afford to resort to the courts, and most of them do not have much money. It is a practical denial of justice to them in consequence of being unable, when they reach the Federal court at Omaha, to have their cases speedily determined, cases being frequently postponed from term to term, so that counsel fees, hotel expenses, and the expenses of witnesses practically eat up all there is in the litigation for them.

So it is better for the average litigant, having a few thousand dollars involved in a Federal court to surrender everything he has, and step out of court, than to seek to litigate his case.

Norfolk is on the Elkhorn road, in the northern portion of the State, or rather the north-central portion of the State, a little less than 200 miles from Omaha, and, as near as practicable, midway between the extreme west and the extreme east.

There are four railroads entering the city from the different points of the compass. It is the largest city in what we call the North Platte country, a city of about 5,000 people, having a great many industries, and it is the natural place for litigants to come from the northwest portion of the State to settle their difficulties before the Federal court.

I do not feel that I am warranted in taking the time of the Senate to go into this matter more in detail, but I wish to impress upon Senators the fact that my constituents in the northwestern part of the State of Nebraska for all practicable purposes are deprived of their rights by reason of being compelled to go so far to a Federal court. The amendment carries into execution the law establishing a Federal court at Norfolk, passed in 1888 or 1889. It carries into execution the law of two years ago, purchasing ground for the purpose of a public building, and it complies with Rule XVI in having been recommended favorably by a standing committee.

Mr. ALLISON. I am constrained to make the point of order on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. First, it has not been estimated for in the Book of Estimates. Secondly, it has not been recommended through an amendment from any standing committee of this body to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALLEN. It has been. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. ALLISON. I will be glad to have the Senator show me the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. I will do so. The Senator is in error about that:

In the Senate of the United States, February 7, 1900. Referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed, May 29, 1900. Reported by Mr. FAIRBANKS with amendments, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Now, with respect to the rule, I endeavored to follow out that rule as closely as I could, because I have been a victim of it several times, and I have some horror of the rule and the manner in which it is applied.

All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, except bills making appropriations for rivers and harbors, which shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce; and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless—

There is the exception—

the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the Departments.

It is moved by a standing committee, and therefore comes within the exception.

Mr. ALLISON. It may be moved formally by a committee, but there is no law anywhere authorizing the erection of this public building.

Mr. ALLEN. I would not need it if there was.

Mr. ALLISON. There is no statute authorizing it, and the uniform rule has been that until a public building had been authorized a mere amendment reported from one committee to another will not justify its insertion in an appropriation bill. If the amendment suggested by the Senator from Nebraska is in order, then provisions for all the public buildings that all the people can think of would be in order on this bill.

Mr. ALLEN. If I had the law referred to I would not need this amendment. The rule certainly can not have a narrow construction, such as is contended for by the Senator from Iowa. It would be against the policy of the rule itself. Here is a court established twelve years ago by act of Congress. There is no public building there. In the Fifty-fifth Congress an act was passed appropriating \$10,000 for the purchase of a site for a public building, declaring in that act that a public building should be erected upon that site. That money was expended, the property was purchased, and the Government owns it now.

Mr. TELLER. There is a law to establish a building there.

Mr. ALLEN. Of course there is.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator to read it.

Mr. ALLEN. It will take me some time to turn to it.

Mr. ALLISON. There is no authority of law for the erection of a public building at Norfolk.

Mr. ALLEN. It says for the purchase of a site for a public building at Norfolk. I do not know what that means unless it means that Congress has declared its purpose to erect a public building there, and I submit that the contention of the Senator from Iowa will not bear analysis. It would defeat any law on the face of the earth, I hope, in view of the liberality which the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations have shown, and in view of the peculiar conditions in my State, which constitute a practical denial of justice to a great portion of our people, that this amendment may be accepted and go through.

Mr. HALE. Has it not always been held, I will ask the Senator from Nebraska, with respect to public buildings, that no appropriations can be made until an act is passed providing for their being erected? Otherwise the whole responsibility would be changed to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALLEN. That is a good argument from the Senator from Maine, whose State has all the buildings they have asked for.

Mr. HALE. We have not had a public building in Maine for many years, and do not expect any.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not suppose there are 40 acres there on which public money has not been spent.

Mr. HALE. There are forty cases like this.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator does not want this amendment adopted?

Mr. HALE. I do not care anything about it.

Mr. ALLEN. He does not want it adopted because it takes a little money out of the Treasury.

Mr. HALE. There are forty different buildings of the same class that are coming, and we have always held, until an act is passed to provide for the public building, that it can not be in order as an amendment to an appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLEN. That is a subterfuge, with all due deference to the Senator. There never has been a rule of that kind for the last six or seven years.

Mr. HALE. I think it is a pretty good point, not a subterfuge.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not think it is. The Senator and I differ in that respect, as in a great many other respects, to my infinite delight.

Mr. ALLISON. There is no authorization of a public building.

Mr. ALLEN. Will you be kind enough to read it?

Mr. ALLISON. I will read it.

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire title, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, to sites in the cities of Hastings and Norfolk, respectively, in the State of Nebraska, on which to erect suitable buildings.

Mr. ALLEN. I wish the Senator would let me have that? I am very thankful to the Senator for furnishing me the statute. I could not turn to it readily.

Mr. HALE. I stated that there are forty or fifty cases like the one of the Senator from Nebraska; but on the strength of that statute which provides that the Secretary may go on and purchase a site for the erection of a public building, I withdraw the statement. I do not think that there is any such number, and I do not know of any other cases. Where Congress has acted—has passed a bill providing for the purchase of land on which to erect a public building—I do not think after that it needs any new law to erect a public building.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HALE. I did not know there was any statute to that effect.

Mr. ALLEN. I withdraw all the hard things I said.

Mr. HALE. I do not want the Senator to do that, because he will want something else pretty soon. I did not know there was any such statute.

Mr. ALLEN. I read from chapter 339, laws of 1899, omitting the enacting clause:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire title by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, to sites in the cities of Hastings and Norfolk, respectively, in the State of Nebraska, on which to erect suitable buildings, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office and other Government offices in said respective cities, the cost of said sites, respectively, not to exceed the sum of \$10,000.

Then it goes on with several subsequent sections, giving directions in the usual form for the carrying out of this provision, declaring expressly that these sites are to be purchased for the purpose of erecting public buildings for post-offices, court-house, and other purposes. The amendment is to carry out this law, making an appropriation of \$50,000 to erect a public building on this site. It has been recommended by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and complies strictly with the rule.

Mr. ALLISON. I differ with the Senator from Maine as respects the effect of this act, but it still appears that there is no estimate for this building. I did not pay close attention to the reading of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Nebraska, but I suppose there is in his amendment no limit to the cost of this building.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, there has been an estimate, which is higher than the amount I ask.

Mr. ALLISON. For this building?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; for this building.

Mr. ALLISON. Where?

Mr. ALLEN. I understand the Architect's estimate is for some seventy or eighty thousand dollars, but these people are willing to have a building that can be built for \$50,000.

Mr. ALLISON. I am informed by the clerk of the committee that there is no estimate for this building, and if the Senator will point out in the Book of Estimates that there is one, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know anything about that. Under the rule it does not require an estimate. It comes clearly within the first subdivision of Rule XVI. The exception is that it is made to carry out the provisions of some existing law and that it has been recommended by a standing committee. Now, subdivision 3 of that rule reads:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill, nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject-matter contained in the bill be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; and all questions of relevancy, etc.

I will read subdivision 2. That has bearing on it.

All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations—

That has been done—

and when actually proposed to the bill, no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received—

There is no proposition to increase the amount stated in the amendment—

In like manner amendments proposing new items of appropriation to river and harbor bills shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

So it comes clearly within the purview of that subdivision. There is no attempt to increase the amount recommended by the committee nor to change it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I beg leave to offer an amendment to come in on page 67, after line 15. I will state that it was reported in due form by the Committee on Claims and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert after the amendment just adopted, on page 67, the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to resettle, readjust, and pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, all claims of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, South Carolina, and the city of Baltimore for and on account of advances and expenditures made by said States and the city of Baltimore in the war of 1812 to 1815 with Great Britain, and in computing interest on said advances the Secretary of the Treasury shall apply the following rule, as applied by act of Congress to the claim of the State of Maryland, namely: Interest shall be calculated up to the time of any payment made. To this interest the payment shall be first applied, and if it exceeds the interest due the balance shall be applied to diminish the principal; if the payment fall short of the interest, the balance of interest shall not be added to the principal so as to produce interest. Second, interest shall be allowed on such sums only on which the State either paid interest or lost interest by the transfer of an interest-bearing fund, or for such length of time only as the State or city paid or lost interest aforesaid: *Provided*, That in the settlement of these claims any bonds or other evidences of debt of any of the said States or of said city of Baltimore held by the United States on any account whatever shall be credited as offsets to the United States, and the balance found due on the 1st day of January, 1898, after deducting the principal and interest on said bonds or other evidences of debt to the said 1st day of January, 1898, shall be paid to said States and city of Baltimore, and the said bonds or other evidences of debt shall be returned to the States issuing the same.

Mr. ALLISON. I venture to make the point of order that this is general legislation, although it is reported by a committee.

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

Mr. DANIEL. I beg leave to call attention to the fact that the case of Nevada was admitted under similar circumstances. This amendment has been referred to the Committee on Appropriations and was recommended by the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Chair having ruled, I suppose we will have to ask a vote on the question and test it, for it is identical with the case which has just been decided in regard to Nevada. This amendment comes from the Committee on Claims with a favorable report, and is authorized to be submitted as an amendment to the sundry civil bill, and as the Nevada amendment has been sustained I do not see how the amendment just proposed can be ruled out. We will have to appeal from the decision of the Chair again, as the Senator from Nevada did.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the Senator from South Carolina can move his as an amendment to the Nevada amendment when we get the bill into the Senate. I have no doubt about that being in order.

Mr. DANIEL. I will be very glad to have it pointed out what is the distinction. There seems to be a great difference of opinion and some confusion as to what is admissible and what is not. I should like to know what is the difference between this case and the one which preceded it.

Mr. BACON. I should like to inquire of the Chair if the ruling of the Chair is under the third clause of the sixteenth rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is general legislation.

Mr. BACON. The point to which I wish to direct the attention of the Chair is that the rule requires that whenever an amendment of that kind is proposed all questions relative to the relevancy of the amendment under the rule when raised shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question of relevancy has not been raised. If the question of relevancy were raised the Chair would be obliged to submit it to the Senate.

Mr. BACON. The Chair's ruling is based on the ground that it is general legislation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. General legislation.

Mr. BACON. I did not understand the Chair.

Mr. TILLMAN. The question of relevancy comes in, because we have just admitted the State of Nevada under identical conditions; and if you can admit one State you can admit half a dozen States. At least, that is the common-sense view that strikes me so forcibly that I shall ask the Senate to pass on this question, by appealing from the decision of the Chair as to whether or not this amendment is in order. If the Nevada amendment had been voted down—kept out—it would be a great hardship; as this is a great hardship to other States involved, especially South Carolina and Virginia, they having been sued in the Supreme Court on these claims. We ask merely an adjustment of the accounts between the United States and the States, so that we can know whether they owe us or we owe them. I contend that the question is one of relevancy simply because the Senate has decided that the Nevada amendment is in order. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not hear the question stated. I did not know that the Senator had offered his amendment the second time.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, which is in identically the same condition in a legislative way that the Nevada amendment was. In other words, it is here; it has passed the Senate; it has been reported from a standing committee as an amendment to this bill. The Nevada amendment was admitted by the Senate on a vote as not being subject to the point of order; and I contend that these other States are identically in the same condition that Nevada was, and the Senate, of course, will decide whether the Nevada amendment is to remain on and the other States are to go out.

Mr. ALDRICH. The difference between these two propositions is perfectly plain. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada was a simple proposition of an amendment appropriating, without conditions, a certain sum of money to pay an ascertained claim. That suggested by the Senator from Virginia contains legislation as to offsets and various other things, which were not in the Nevada case at all. It presents an entirely different question for the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. The fact that there are two propositions in the amendment does not make it any more general legislation than if there were one.

Mr. ALDRICH. But one is subject to the point of order and the other is not.

Mr. DANIEL. Why is the one subject to the point of order?

Mr. ALDRICH. Because it proposes general legislation.

Mr. DANIEL. It is not general legislation at all.

Mr. ALDRICH. The one is general legislation in regard to a claim, and the other is a plain proposition for an appropriation to pay an ascertained claim.

Mr. DANIEL. Permit me to say there are no more characteristics of general legislation in this proposition than in the one respecting Nevada. Four is no more general legislation than one. It does not apply to the whole country. It does not enunciate any principal of law. It simply deals with four cases instead of dealing with one case. The fact that you do not make an appropriation does not make it general legislation, and there is no philosophy, no logic, nothing but mere ipse dixit in what the honorable Senator says, with all respect to his great learning and skill. There is no suggestion of a thought in his language that imputes to this proposition general legislation. It is totally unintelligible to any mind to say that it is general legislation if you do not appropriate, and it is not general legislation if you do.

What is the distinction which the Senator makes? What principle does he rely on? What is the proposition upon which it is contended that an appropriation to pay a State debt is not general legislation, and a proposition to settle a debt of four States is general legislation?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator of course does not fail to understand the difference. It is so plain that no Senator can fail to see it. The Senator from Nevada offered an amendment to this bill which appropriated, without conditions and without terms, a certain sum of money to pay a claim ascertained by law. All the steps were taken. The Senator from Virginia puts in a proposition for a settlement, not now authorized by law, of a certain claim on the State of Virginia, and goes on to legislate by general legislation under what terms and conditions this new settlement shall be made. If the Senator fails to apprehend that, then nothing I can say or the Chair can say, I am sure, will convince him of the difference.

Mr. TILLMAN. While that may be true in regard to the Virginia case and the Pennsylvania case and the New York case, it is not true as respects the South Carolina case. South Carolina is in the amendment along with the other States, because we are on all fours with those States as regards the war of 1812. But the State of South Carolina has had its case presented to the Secretary of the Treasury and a resolution of the Senate passed, and reports have been sent here in which the facts are all brought out as to the condition of the account.

While it may be a very far-fetched and nice distinction which some of us can not see as a matter of equity, that the provision of this amendment which requires the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust accounts upon a known, fixed rule, adopted in the cases of three other States, is general legislation, as that act of Congress has already been enforced in the case of Massachusetts, Maine, and Maryland, why the Senator should object to having it enforced in the cases of Virginia and South Carolina and Pennsylvania and New York and the city of Baltimore I can not understand.

It is in accordance with the law, an act of Congress which clearly defines what the limitations are and how the Secretary must adjust the account. It is just as plain as the rule of three, and I confess that while I do not like even to hint at such a thing, because I do not believe any such feeling exists here, if the Senate shall sustain the technical ruling, it will have the appearance, and I shall regret it, that these claims are barred out of this bill because we are south of Mason and Dixon's line.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. ALDRICH. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TELLER obtained the floor.

Mr. DANIEL rose.

Mr. TELLER. I understand the Senator from Virginia wants to say something. I yield to him.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, by the courtesy of the Senator from Colorado, although much disinclined to detain the Senate, I beg leave to say a few words on this subject. The positive assertions of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island do not amount to any statement of any principle and do not discriminate any line of thought. Anyone can see the difference in point of fact between a proposition to state an account and pay the balance and a proposition to pay a balance already ascertained. These are differences in the subjects-matter of the amendment and differences in the facts which concern them, but why one should be considered general legislation and another special legislation is not a question which he has at all gone into except by his indefinite assertions.

Let us state the case, Mr. President. The amount which may be due to a particular State or due by a particular State is the subject of an account. With another State the account has been stated. Now, what is the difference between the two cases? Nothing but a diversity of fact; and yet the Senator insists that it is general legislation if you provide for a settlement of an account, but not general legislation if you provide for the payment of an account.

The character of the legislation is not indicated by the subject-matter or by the method with which you deal with it. It must be very clear that if a proposition to pay one State \$100 is not general legislation a proposition to pay five States \$100 also is not general legislation. In neither case is there legislation which affects the generality of society, which concerns the whole public by a general rule of law; nor has any tangible notion been suggested by the Senator in which you can discriminate between the two cases. Under these circumstances, then, with the utmost respect for the opinion of the Chair, I shall be constrained to vote that this amendment is admissible.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I wish to say only one word more respecting the amendment. I am in sympathy, as I have said before on this floor, with the general suggestions respecting the claim of Virginia as well as respects the claim of South Carolina. The Committee on Appropriations, seeing the difficulties that surround these claims by means of positive legislation for

their settlement, proposed an amendment here which dealt with all these questions in a way whereby they could be intelligently and carefully considered by people who have the accounts before them.

Now, the Senator from Virginia brings in an amendment here which proposes not only to settle the claim of Virginia and South Carolina, but also to settle the claim of New York, which has not been before the committee or the account stated, so far as I know, and the claim of the city of Baltimore. The amendment which he proposes is not an amendment that applies to the South Carolina case at all as it exists. It is a claim which proposes an adjustment of certain matters only, whereas I understand the South Carolina claim involves not only the war of 1812, but also the Indian wars of 1837, 1838, and 1839.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator from Iowa will cut this Gordian knot by proposing or asking unanimous consent that the original amendment of the committee, which was objected to and ruled out of order, shall be restored to the bill. That will relieve us of all this unpleasant predicament in which we find ourselves by reason of the fact that one State has received recognition in this bill and other States are barred out. If the Senator will ask unanimous consent I hope nobody will object, and we will get the amendment back, and then simply provide for an accounting and adjustment, and a report which will be a basis of future legislation and future appropriation.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the Nevada claim is different from any other of these claims. All these claims have been before the Committee on Claims ever since I can remember; that is, ever since any connection I have had with that committee, which is now pretty nearly twenty-four years. They have been here again and again, and the committee have reported them. Some of them have, I think, passed the Senate, but if not they have frequently been reported favorably. As to the Nevada claim by law, we submitted that question to the Secretary of the Treasury and he reported. We authorized him to adjudicate that claim. He did so, and that was a finding which the Government of the United States ought to be bound by. As I said before, that is a claim which I regard to be just as much adjudicated exactly as I do a Government bond.

Now, Mr. President, there is some controversy that never has yet been settled by any Department of the Government as to these other claims. We have determined again and again in the committee that they were just and proper claims, and while the Government has some claims against these States—for instance, South Carolina, and therefore there is an offset—their position is just as good and they ought to be just as sacred as a Government claim.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator from Colorado will allow me—

Mr. TELLER. It is not creditable that after thirty, forty, fifty, sixty, or seventy-five years we are still settling claims that ought to have been settled years ago. Now I will hear what the Senator from South Carolina wants to say.

Mr. TILLMAN. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that as far back as 1858 there is an act of Congress under which the Secretary of the Treasury was to report what would be the amount due to certain States. In that report, which is an executive document on file in this Capitol, it is stated that in 1832 the United States owed the State of South Carolina \$78,000 and that in 1858 the interest on that sum had brought the amount up to \$302,000. There is an acknowledgment under an act of Congress, coming from the Secretary of the Treasury, that the United States owes the State of South Carolina that much money.

Now, under the resolution introduced by me at this session of Congress and passed by the Senate instructing the Secretary of the Treasury to report in regard to these matters and additional items in regard to the war of 1836, 1837, and 1838, the Seminole war, has been looked into, the matters have been adjusted, the statement has been sent here in a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, and the entire account of South Carolina is shown, paying off the \$248,000, which we owe the United States on account of Indian trust bonds. That is accounted for in this report.

Then it is shown by the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury that the United States owes the State of South Carolina now \$178,000 on account of those two wars, and that there is no more dispute about it and about its validity and its justice and its equity than there is about one of the bonds of which mention has been made here, issued by the Government for its public uses.

Mr. TELLER. I am quite well aware the Senator is correct as to the statement of the adjudication of that claim. The only trouble is that the Government of the United States has got a claim against the State of South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. But our claim is \$178,000 more than their claim, and all we ask is that we may be allowed to pay the United States all we owe and stop the suit which is now pending in the United States Supreme Court against the State to have us pay for bonds which we have already paid for and on which they owe us interest instead of we owing them.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will let me say just a word now and will take the floor after I get through I shall be glad.

I think these claims ought to have been allowed as we had provided for them in the committee, except as to the claim of Nevada, which ought to have been paid. There ought to have been an appropriation for that claim. The provision that the committee put in the appropriation bill to give to the Department a chance to cast the accounts between these two States and determine and settle the claim was satisfactory, I understand, to the Senators from those States. They are being harassed and sued under a provision that nobody, I think, here is responsible for that got into one of the appropriation bills. I never heard of it. I certainly would not have agreed to it.

Mr. ALLISON. It was not in an appropriation bill.

Mr. TELLER. It was not in an appropriation bill, but in some other bill. It came in here in some way. I never heard of it. I never would have consented to it myself, as long as we knew these matters were in dispute between these States and the General Government, that the Government should bring suit against the States. We are quite capable of settling this matter, and it ought to be settled, although we do not seem to have been capable of doing it.

It appears to me that we ought to restore at least to this bill, which I think we ought to be able to do by the unanimous consent of the Senate, this provision which submits to the Department the casting of these accounts and a final settlement, and a suspension of these suits until that can be done.

The Senator from South Dakota objected to it and raised a point of order on it, because, I suppose, his amendment was ruled out on a point of order. I never saw any reason why his amendment should not have been incorporated and become a part of it, for the State of South Dakota has a legitimate claim. Just the amount of it I do not know, but it is a legitimate claim and the Government undoubtedly owes the State of South Dakota.

I should like to suggest that we reinstate this provision in the appropriation act just as it was, by the consent of the Senate, if nobody is going to raise any point of order on it, leaving out the State of Nevada, which I think ought to be left out.

Mr. DANIEL. I beg leave to say that I would be very glad to do that.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know whether anybody will object to that or not. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that we may reinsert the provision on page 67, with the exception that "the State of Nevada" where it occurs in lines 19, 20, 23, and 23 may be stricken out.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President—

Mr. TELLER. I trust the Senator from South Dakota will agree to that.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I shall not object provided this is added at the end of it: After the word "Congress," line 25, page 68, insert:

And with the State of South Dakota for and on account of expenditures made by said State in connection with the outbreak of Sioux Indians in 1890 and 1891.

Then the provision reads:

And any compromise or settlement they may make with the said States, respectively, shall be fully reported to Congress for its future further action, stating the amounts, if any, which should be paid by the United States to any of said States and the amounts, if any, which should be paid by any of said States to the United States, etc.

I do not ask for any appropriation. I simply ask that this account may be adjusted like the rest of them.

Mr. TELLER. I ask unanimous consent that that may be added.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I shall object to that.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no doubt South Dakota has some claim on account of the Indian wars of 1890 and 1891, but neither has the Committee on Appropriations, nor, as far as I know, has any committee of this body considered the question as to the amount of those claims. Whether they are State claims or individual claims it does not appear.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I say "the State of South Dakota," not individual claims.

Mr. ALLISON. The claim of the State of South Dakota against the General Government?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Yes; I simply want an accounting, that is all.

Mr. TELLER. Has the State of South Dakota filed claims with the General Government?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLISON. Then I have no objection to its insertion.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to say further that the State of Colorado has claims, but I will not ask leave to insert them in this bill. I want to provide for the States that are in trouble, and Colorado is not in any particular trouble; it can wait. Virginia and South Carolina particularly need this legislation. I hope nobody will object.

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, I want to appeal to the indulgence of the Senate for a moment and to the Senator from Iowa that I may

give a little explanation and leave it to his discretion as to whether he will accept the proposal I will make.

Mr. TELLER. Let us see if we can get the Senate to accept what has been proposed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to see if I can not enlarge it in my State a little, and I will give the reasons. If the Senator does not want to enlarge it, of course I will let it go in as it is. The reasons I give are so pressing that Senators will at once see the importance of it, and I alluded to it the other day. There has not been a day since 1860 when South Carolina could receive any consideration in Congress. We occupied a peculiar condition, one of political disinheritation, so to speak, and if we have fallen on happier days, I think we are to be congratulated upon having gotten to a point in our history where even this outcast daughter of the Union can receive justice at the hands of the Senate.

Now, in the last month we have had notice to our governor, coming from the Comptroller of the Treasury, of a claim which he is pressing. At least he offers the State an opportunity to give it a hearing to determine whether or not the accounts shall be entered against the State of \$340,000 for the war of 1860, on account of stores seized by a colonel of a South Carolina regiment under order of the governor of the State at the arsenal in Charleston.

It can be very readily understood that if there is to be a continuation of these duns, so to speak, of these demands on our State to settle, it behooves the State to look into the matter and see what she has got to settle with.

You gentlemen have noticed within the last week the discovery in an old lot of rubbish in South Carolina of a document bearing on the claims of the State of South Carolina for Revolutionary war expenditures. They were paid by the State after the settlement of 1793. I have that document, and it is a very interesting historical relic. It shows that at the time when that book was printed, which is a brief prepared by the State's agent, there were indubitable proofs that the United States owed South Carolina in 1858 for expenditures during the Revolutionary war something over \$300,000; and if we are to have the civil war brought up and thrown into our faces, with demands that we shall pay for the stores that we seized, we ought to have a general accounting for everything between South Carolina and the United States from the foundation of the Government up to date.

Mr. TELLER. That is what we will get under this provision.

Mr. TILLMAN. No, sir; we do not. For the war of 1847 we have claims for \$32,000 for money we spent in the Mexican war. Those claims are not in this bill, and I should like to put them in, if you will permit me. I submit it to the chairman of the committee. I should like to insert a provision that the proper officers—the three officers mentioned, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Attorney-General—shall consider in regard to South Carolina the claims of the war of the Revolution, the war of 1812, the Indian war of 1836 and 1837, the Mexican war, and the civil war, and let us have a clean, straight, clear account, and settle once for all, and not have me coming here twelve months from now with another claim or an effort to get justice for my State. It is simply an accounting; that is all.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the mysteries of legislation in the Senate of the United States ought to be written up by somebody who is competent to deal with the subject. A point of order is made against an amendment and it goes out on a point of order, and subsequently—possibly the Senator making the point of order might be absent from the Chamber—a proposition is made that unanimous consent shall be given that it be restored to the bill.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator is here who made the point of order.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand so. He might not have been.

Mr. TELLER. I will say to the Senator that if he had not been present I should not have made the request.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand the Senator always deals fairly, and I would be the last man in this Chamber to make a suggestion to the contrary. But I was simply trying in my rough way to illustrate the parliamentary procedure of this body; that is all. It does not come under the inhibition of the commandment which forbids us to worship things under the earth, or above the earth, or on the earth. We might, I think, worship our parliamentary procedure with entire respect to that commandment.

Mr. President, I rise simply to say that I shall not be an objector to the extent of permitting the provision in the bill as it came from the Committee on Appropriations to be restored by unanimous consent if it is thought wise to do it, but I shall object to enlarging that provision by including the various points that the Senator from South Carolina has called attention to, that his State—

Mr. TILLMAN. I have not made that as a motion. I simply called attention to certain historical facts.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, that is what I said. I shall object to enlarging this provision by inserting those old claims of South Carolina (whether they are valid or not I do not

know) or inserting any claims in behalf of South Dakota, which it seems do not stand on all fours with these other claims.

New Hampshire has a claim against the General Government for the large sum of \$400,000. It has been reported by the committee of this body and has had at least recognition to the extent of being on the Calendar of the Senate for some time. I apprehend that neither Senator from New Hampshire will ask to have this old claim projected here to-day to get it on this appropriation bill. Possibly at a later date the suggestion may be made that it ought to go on some other appropriation bill—the deficiency bill—but I think we ought to pause in this matter to-day. If we restore the provisions that the Committee on Appropriations put on this bill in violation of the rule that has been talked about so much here to-day, I think we ought to stop right there. If this unanimous consent includes the enlargement of the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations, I shall have to object.

Mr. TELLER. Do I understand the Senator to object?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not object to the original proposition.

Mr. TELLER. I understand that the Senator from South Carolina does not propose an enlargement of it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have not offered any motion. I simply called attention to certain facts which I will discuss with the Senator later on when I press this other claim.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the amendment on page 67 of the bill for the settlement of certain State claims be restored to the bill.

Mr. TELLER. Omitting Nevada.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Omitting Nevada.

Mr. TELLER. And adding this:

And with the State of South Dakota for and on account of expenses.

Do I understand the Senator from New Hampshire to object?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do object to any enlargement of the original proposition.

Mr. TELLER. I did not understand the Senator to mean that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. ALDRICH. I certainly hope the Senate will not vote down the decision of the Presiding Officer on this question, especially in view of the fact stated by the Senator from Iowa that two of these claims have never been presented according to law, and have never been reported upon, and never have been reported from any committee.

Mr. DANIEL. Every one of those has been reported.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Iowa says that the State claims of the State of New York and the claim of the city of Baltimore have not been reported upon.

Mr. ALLISON. As to details.

Mr. ALDRICH. As to details.

Mr. ALLISON. Of course, the amendment has been reported.

Mr. DANIEL. I beg leave to state that there is a detailed statement, which was before the committee from the Secretary of the Treasury, as to each one of those claims and the interest calculated, and that it was called for as to the particular one in which I am interested as far back as 1858. In Executive Document No. 17, Fifty-first Congress, second session, there is a detailed statement and estimate as to each of those claims.

Mr. CAFFERY. May I ask the Senator to state in response to what that statement was furnished.

Mr. DANIEL. In reply to a resolution.

Mr. ALDRICH. What document is the Senator reading from?

Mr. DANIEL. Executive Document No. 17.

Mr. ALDRICH. Of the present Congress?

Mr. DANIEL. No, sir; of the Fifty-first Congress, second session.

Mr. ALDRICH. This is not the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. DANIEL. I know it is not. It is a mere matter of so many years' interest.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is a mere matter of four or five Congresses, when the rule applies to this Congress and the present question and the present time.

Mr. DANIEL. I did not state that it came in under any rule. I was merely answering the statement of fact, as I understood it, made by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALDRICH. The rule requires that it shall be done now, and what was done eight or ten years ago in regard to some other question has no application here.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, while I am in full sympathy with the Senators from Virginia and South Carolina, and while I regret exceedingly that the Senator from South Dakota felt it his duty to raise the point of order, yet it is not clear to me that this amendment should be offered now, including the States of Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, the city of Baltimore, with the State of California and the State of Oregon left out.

Mr. STEWART. They are not left out.

Mr. PERKINS. They are not included in this amendment.

Mr. TELLER. They are in the one here.

Mr. PERKINS. Not in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. TILLMAN. That has gone overboard, and we are putting back in the bill the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. The Senator is mistaken. As I understand it, the Senator from Virginia appeals from the decision of the Chair. The Chair is undoubtedly right according to our rules. But I would do almost anything to help out our friends from Virginia and South Carolina if it is possible to do so under our rules. Their cases are exceptional and different from any others that are now presented. A suit is pending by the United States Government against those respective States, and as a solution of this difficult problem I would suggest to the Senator from Virginia that he ask unanimous consent that his own State of Virginia and the State of South Carolina be alone included. If not, California certainly can not be excluded, and I think Oregon is entitled to be included.

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator will allow me, the proposition made by the Senator from Colorado is the proposition of the committee, omitting Nevada.

Mr. PERKINS. But the Senator from South Dakota would not consent to that. Therefore it is now another proposition.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I beg leave to state in answer to the honorable Senator from California that I would have been very glad to have asked a settlement of the Virginia case alone, but I did not think that it was proper in a bill which referred to matters of the same character and which had been associated together for years in this body to simply ask for the settlement of a claim that affected my own State. I did, however, after offering the other amendment, have an amendment sent to the Committee on Appropriations that the committee might have the whole matter before it, one which simply referred to the State of Virginia, that it, according to its discretion and judgment, and the Senate, according to its discretion and judgment, might do as it saw fit.

Mr. PERKINS. Senate Report No. 544, part 2, of the Fifty-fifth Congress, fully sets forth the claims of the State of California, and they have been reported favorably again and again by the Committee on Claims. They are here in this document, but I realized that we were laboring under many disadvantages, and as your committee were considering this whole subject by referring it to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney-General, or the Secretary of War to examine into and adjudicate the claims, that appeared to be a proper solution of the whole matter.

I really hope that my friend from South Dakota will permit the Indian war claims of South Dakota to go over with those of California and Oregon and other States that have similar claims.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I am becoming a little confused about this bill. I find the title of it is "A bill making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901;" that is to say, it is for sundry civil expenses next year, beginning July 1. To be sure, it says "and for other purposes," but I am afraid we are loading on the bill more "for other purposes" than it contains for the next fiscal year. I think that if all these various propositions are to be put upon any bill they ought to be put upon the deficiency bill; and I suggest to the Senator from Iowa to ask unanimous consent to have everything dropped out of this bill that is a deficiency, and then when we come to the deficiency bill we can stay all summer, if it is necessary, and pay all the old debts of the Government.

The Senator from South Carolina says it is time that all these claims should be swept away. There is no time like the eve of a Presidential election to make these appropriations, and we will just have a clean sweep if the Senator from Iowa will stand by us on the deficiency bill, and never leave Washington until we have paid all the old debts of the Government.

Mr. HALE. Let me say to the Senator—

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. My remarks are perhaps somewhat affected by the fact that I have the misfortune of being in charge of the deficiency bill and I do not want to see it added to. Let me say to the Senator this is by no means a deficiency. A deficiency bill is simply to cure deficiencies in the current appropriations of the year in order to maintain the Government and to carry it on. If it is found that appropriations have not been made amply in any branch of the Government, a deficiency is to cure those defects and to give enough to run it until the first day of the next July.

That is what a deficiency is, technically. If anybody invokes technicalities, as the Senator has certainly done, my point that this is not a deficiency is good. The fact is, it is neither a deficiency nor a sundry civil appropriation. It is a claim. It ought not to go on either bill. The Senator's statement about sundry civil expenses and my statement about deficiencies, both of which are correct, show clearly and absolutely that these claims ought not to be on either bill. That is not what either bill is for.

We did, two years ago, take up this whole question, and we sent all these claims and everything to the Committee on Claims. It was the understanding that at each session that committee would report an omnibus bill containing the good claims, and it did so once certainly, and, I think, twice. Which was it?

Mr. TELLER. Once.

Mr. HALE. It did so once, and we passed the bill, and it was a happy solution. That committee is still existent, and it is a strong, vigorous committee. It has the confidence of the Senate. It has put its bill through once, and it ought to have reported a bill this year putting all these claims on the bill.

Mr. TELLER. There is a bill reported this year.

Mr. HALE. Instead of the Senator from South Carolina, with his vehemence and his determination to get his State claims through, and the Senator from Virginia—

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from South Carolina, if the Senator will permit me, is not disturbing the United States. It is the United States disturbing South Carolina, and I, as her representative here, simply ask that you allow South Carolina to show that you owe us instead of we owing you.

Mr. HALE. The Government has sometimes disturbed South Carolina when the Senator has not consented to it; but that has to be done once in a while in the march and course of historical events.

Mr. TILLMAN. We usually try to pay our honest debts, whatever other sins we are guilty of, and we are ready to do it now.

Mr. HALE. It should not come from the Committee on Appropriations, and I am glad the Senator has made this point. This claim ought not to be on the sundry civil bill, and with equal and greater force it ought not to be on the deficiency bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. Now I will read page 229 of the statute of 1857.

Mr. CHANDLER. I believe I have the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. TILLMAN. With the Senator's permission—I know he will kindly consent—just to show that we are not the first Senators who have done this thing, and will not be the last, I want to read the statute.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. These are sections in "An act making appropriations for certain civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending the 30th of June, 1858." Look at the language in that appropriation bill, and see if you do not recognize it:

SEC. 12. *And be it further enacted*, That the proper accounting officers of the Treasury be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to reexamine the account between the United States and the State of Maryland, as the same was from time to time adjusted under the act passed on the 13th of May, 1826, entitled "An act authorizing the payment of interest due to the State of Maryland," and on such reexamination to assume the sum expended by the State of Maryland for the use and benefit of the United States, and the sums refunded and repaid by the United States to the said State, and the time of such payment as being correctly stated in the account as the same has heretofore been passed at the Treasury Department; but in the calculation of interest due under the act aforesaid the following rules shall be observed, to wit:

Interest shall be calculated up to the time of any payment made. To this interest the payment shall be first applied, and if it exceed the interest due, the balance shall be applied to diminish the principal; if the payment fall short of the interest, the balance of interest shall not be added to the principal so as to produce interest. Second, interest shall be allowed the State of Maryland on such sums only on which the said State either paid interest or lost interest by the transfer of an interest-bearing fund.

SEC. 13. *And be it further enacted*, That if, upon such reexamination of the account and application of the above rules, any money shall be found to be due to the State of Maryland, the same shall be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Approved, March 3, 1857.

I will call the attention of the Senator from Maine to the fact that under this very rule his State and the State of Massachusetts have recovered from the United States \$668,000.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will allow me, that is precisely an enforcement of the point which I made. These things have been heretofore upon appropriation bills, but the Senate and the House got so tired of it that two years ago they declared that all these matters should be taken out of appropriation bills. I did not know that the provision to which the Senator has referred was in an appropriation act.

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes; in the sundry civil act.

Mr. HALE. I did not know whether it was or not.

Mr. TILLMAN. I say so on my own responsibility, because I have examined it.

Mr. HALE. I know Maine was not provided for on an appropriation bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. No; but I say under the rule established in that case in 1858 the States of Maine and Massachusetts have recovered from the Government \$668,000.

Mr. HALE. No; Maine recovered on a general bill, not on an appropriation bill. My point was that this thing had become an insufferable nuisance to everybody. We could not get through an appropriation bill without the Senator from Iowa being badgered day after day, not on subjects of great national importance, not on appropriations for running the Government, but on claims of States and counties and towns and individuals, men and women,

children and babes, with all sorts of things to be thrust on appropriation bills.

That is my point, that so intolerable had become this frantic pressure every time an appropriation bill was brought in, and especially in the last days of a session, when we do not spend time on the real subjects of the bill, but on these importunate claims that are thrust upon us; and if you oppose one of them, you are met with ferocity on the other side as though you were making a personal point against the Senator offering it. That had become so intolerable that two years ago we decided that all these things should go, not to the Committee on Appropriations and not into the sundry civil bill, to which the Senator from New Hampshire objects, and not into the deficiency appropriation bill, to which I object, but that the Committee on Claims should report all these bills, and then we would consider them in a proper way on an omnibus claims bill coming from the Committee on Claims; and there is where they ought to be now.

The Chair. I have no doubt, having in mind what has been the purpose of the Senate and what has been the course in the last two years, has ruled that this is a subject of general legislation that should not go on an appropriation bill, but should go to one of the committees which consider subjects of general legislation. It would be a strange thing to me if the Senate should overrule the Chair.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine is correct in stating that, strictly speaking, these claims should not go upon the deficiency appropriation bill. My point was that they certainly ought not to go upon the sundry civil bill for the coming year. If they go anywhere, they should go on the deficiency bill. The Senator from Maine knows that it has been the custom not only to make appropriations on the deficiency bill for deficiencies for the current year, but also for deficiencies for prior years; and if, according to the custom of the Senate, these various propositions are to go on any bill, they should go on the deficiency bill. I hope that it may be delayed in some way and thrown off of this bill, so that the Senator from Iowa may make some progress; and if we are to discuss such claims, and if they are ruled in order or not in order, or if they are voted down or voted up, that that shall be done upon the deficiency bill.

The honorable Senator from South Carolina has a paper which shows the various acts under which the State claims have been paid. I find only two of them where payments were made upon appropriation bills. They have been special bills nearly all the time. There was a special act for Virginia, March 3, 1825; a special act for Maryland, May 13, 1826; a special act as to Delaware, May 20, 1826; a special act as to the city of Baltimore, May 20, 1826; a special act as to the State of New York, May 22, 1826; a special act as to the State of Pennsylvania, March 3, 1827; a special act as to the State of South Carolina, March 22, 1832.

It seems the State of South Carolina did not get her Revolutionary claims fully adjusted under that act. Then we come to the act for Maryland, which was passed March 3, 1857, and which was a provision in the sundry civil appropriation act. The Massachusetts and Maine bill was a separate one, and was passed July 8, 1870. There was a special act for Alabama, January 26, 1849; a special act for Georgia, March 3, 1857; a special act for New Hampshire, January 27, 1852; and then one more special act for the State of California, August 5, 1854.

If the Senate had been obliged to debate all these various State adjustments on either the sundry civil or the deficiency appropriation bill, there would have been no end to the discussion, and I am afraid no end to the sessions of Congress.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire ought to recognize that the amendment, which has just been ruled out on objection, does not provide for an appropriation; it does not provide for any payment of money. It simply provides for an adjustment of the account by the officers of the Government, so that they can report next winter for the information of Congress the amount that is due by the State to the United States or by the United States to the State. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] shakes his head, but he has not read the amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will allow me a moment, I have made no objection to that clause, but I am confronted by the fact that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] says he must have something on the bill, and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] says he must have something on the bill, and my colleague [Mr. GALLINGER] says New Hampshire has a good claim, as she has, of \$400,000, and we shall be complained of in our State if we are not as smart as the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. TILLMAN. Are you being sued?

Mr. CHANDLER. I therefore say that all these additional claims certainly ought to be left until the deficiency bill is reached, and then we shall have more time to discuss them.

Mr. TILLMAN. Has anybody come in on a conference report and provided that the State of New Hampshire should be sued?

Mr. CHANDLER. No, Mr. President; and I do not think—

Mr. TILLMAN. Yet such a provision came in here last year, and was passed through without anybody knowing of it, and without it being specifically pointed out that any State that owes the United States on account of Indian trust bonds shall be sued unless they settle up. My State is ready to settle up and will settle up. Why do you not let her settle up?

Mr. CHANDLER. Where were the two Senators from South Carolina when the bill passed Congress?

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator ought not to ask that question. He knows the Senator from South Carolina is usually in his seat, trying to attend to his duty as a Senator from South Carolina; but no Senator can tell what is sneaked through in one of these conference reports, unless he gets up and makes inquiries.

Mr. CHANDLER. Well, there are some very dangerous things that go through on appropriation bills, I notice.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator does not seem to understand the amendment.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am speaking about the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am talking about the amendment pending before the Senate; which reads:

And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to suspend until further action of Congress any act or proceeding which he has taken under provisions of section 4 of the act approved March 3, 1899.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. DANIEL. I withdraw the appeal, Mr. President.

Mr. TILLMAN. I took the appeal, but I will withdraw it and let you gentlemen, who are so honest and decent and pleasant and generous, take care of this thing in your own way. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The appeal is withdrawn.

Mr. DANIEL. I was about to say—

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer another amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. I believe I have the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. DANIEL. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota in a few moments.

I wish to say that the position we occupy in this matter has been one which, I think the Senator from New Hampshire forgets, has rather been forced upon us by the action of the Senate in the unknown passage through this body and the other, on a conference report on the Spanish war-claims, of a general provision for the suing of States, there being nothing on the face of any paper before the Senate, and nothing in any communication made to the Senate upon the floor, to apprise us that such a matter was proposed.

I would also state in respect to this particular matter, in answer to what was said by the Senator from Rhode Island, that there was laid before the committee a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury bringing down a statement, so far as my own State was concerned, from the general statement made in 1892 by the then Secretary of the Treasury to the present date.

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not refer to Virginia.

Mr. DANIEL. But as the appeal has been withdrawn, Mr. President, I shall say no more at present about the matter.

Mr. CARTER. I ask unanimous consent for the insertion of the amendment which I will send to the Secretary's desk to be read. In connection with the request I wish to make a brief statement.

By an act of Congress approved in 1895 the county of Dawson, in the State of Montana, was authorized to construct a bridge across the Yellowstone River. In that act the county was required to put a draw in the bridge, which cost about \$15,000 extra, on a river on which there is no commerce at all. It was an oversight. The War Department reports that there has been no commerce on that river since 1883. There are no boats at all upon the river.

Above this bridge a short distance is a railroad bridge; indeed, railroad bridges cross it frequently. There are numerous railroad bridges; but there are no draws in those railroad bridges. The pier was, of necessity, put in the middle of the stream at a point where the current is very swift, and operated to cause an ice drift or a gorge to form at that point, which swept this bridge out of the stream in the winter of 1899. The bridge had cost in the neighborhood of \$75,000. The bridge is about to be rebuilt. The plans and specifications are prepared for it. It crosses the river, which divides this large county in about two pieces, about one-half of the population residing north of the river at the county seat and the other half of the population south of it.

I desire to offer this amendment now to relieve the people of that county from the wholly needless expense of putting a draw-bridge in that stream, there being, as I have stated, no commerce at all on the river. The amendment has been favorably reported substantially as I offer it by the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. Mr. ALLISON. Do I understand that the Senator from Montana asks unanimous consent of the Senate to offer the amendment, recognizing that it is not in order?

Mr. CARTER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. After line 17, on page 114, it is proposed to insert:

That the provisions of an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Yellowstone River, in the County of Dawson, State of Montana," approved February 23, 1895, so far as they relate to and require a draw span to be erected and maintained, are hereby so far modified as to permit the erection of an iron or steel bridge under said act, without erecting and maintaining a draw span in such bridge: *Provided, however,* That the spans of said bridge, when repaired and constructed, shall give not less than 100 feet clear space between the piers, and that the two easterly spans shall give a clear head-room of 25 feet above low water, as defined in the Government surveys at the locality.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to inquire of the Senator why he moves this amendment if there is no commerce on the river?

Mr. CARTER. The original act provided that there should be a drawbridge; and instead of repealing the act and having another act passed I simply ask that these onerous conditions be eliminated from the law.

Mr. HOAR. If there is commerce on the river, there should be a drawbridge; and if there is not any commerce on the river, it seems to me these elaborate provisions are out of place, and would seem to admit that there is some commerce.

Mr. CARTER. I suppose that the desire of the Government is to retain some control over these meandering streams, so as to prevent obstruction from being placed in the streams—

Mr. HOAR. What has the Government to do with the matter if there is no commerce on the river?

Mr. CARTER. I doubt whether the Government has anything to do with it; and I think an amendment providing that any person or county should erect a bridge over the Yellowstone River would be entirely adequate and proper.

Mr. HOAR. I will not object; but I think the provision rather a queer one.

Mr. ALLISON. I will not object to it; yet I have seen every morning here bills coming from the Committee on Commerce for the construction of bridges passed without objection. We pass such bills every day; and it seems to me that it would be wiser for the Senator to have such a bill passed as a separate measure, upon the recommendation of the Committee on Commerce. I shall not, however, object to the amendment.

Mr. CARTER. A bill has been reported favorably by the Committee on Commerce, but it is very obvious at this stage of the session that these people will be compelled to invest \$15,000 in a useless drawbridge unless this amendment is passed.

Mr. TELLER. I want to say to the Senator from Montana that if this were in Colorado, I should insist on the right to build the bridge without any reference to the General Government. If it is not a stream having commerce, the Government has no control over it whatever; and any provision of that kind in a bill may be treated with absolute contempt if the State chooses to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in after line 13 on page 80.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After line 13 on page 80 it is proposed to insert:

For the survey of lands in the Fort Buford abandoned military reservation, in the States of North Dakota and Montana, to be made in the manner as other surveys of public lands are made, \$11,000.

Mr. ALLISON. Does that come from the Committee on Public Lands?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. It has the unanimous report of that committee and is recommended by the Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I would suggest to the Senator from Virginia that if he would ask unanimous consent that this part of the paragraph should be inserted in the bill, there would probably be no objection to it:

And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to suspend until further action of Congress any act or proceeding which he has taken under provisions of section 4 of the act approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to reimburse the governors of States and Territories for expenses incurred by them in aiding the United States to raise and organize and supply and equip the Volunteer Army of the United States in the existing war with Spain,'" as respects the States of Virginia and South Carolina.

That would suspend litigation and leave the question of settlement for future action on the part of Congress, and then the claims of these States may be subsequently taken up together and disposed of. I ask unanimous consent, unless the Senator from Virginia objects, to the insertion of what I have read.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest that the Senator make the suspension for two years, and then I shall not object to the proposed amendment.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I shall object to anything except to the repeal of the provision authorizing suits against the States, because, if we have to be sued, I prefer to trust the Supreme Court of the United States to recognize the claims of the States which have been declared to be valid by the Secretary of the Treasury and by previous acts of Congress, rather than attempt to get justice here. I will not consent to anything other than a repeal absolutely of the provision authorizing the suits to be begun. Otherwise let the suits go on.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to ask the Senator from Virginia whether or not these claims of the States of Virginia and South Carolina against the General Government are not proper offsets which can be set up in the suits that are brought against them, and whether, if at the end of the suits it is found that the States owe to the General Government, the court will not be authorized to find those facts?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I would not care to express a legal opinion on that subject. There are difficulties about that which make this legislation desirable.

I was about to offer an amendment affecting my own State, and I send it to the Secretary's desk and ask that it may be read and inserted at the point where the previous amendment was offered.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I understand the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota is still before the Senate, but I hope the Senator will withhold that for one moment.

I want to say, respecting the claims of the States of South Carolina and Virginia, the first step taken was that the accounting officers of the Treasury examined these claims and settled them along in the years running from 1822 to 1830 and 1849; that these claims have been once settled, and settled without the payment of interest; and therefore they can not be opened, unless they are opened by legislation, for the consideration of any court as respects those offsets.

These claims were opened for reexamination and reconsideration in every case where they have been considered, and if it was not for the impediment of the law respecting these claims, the accounting officers of the Treasury would need no statutory provision for the purpose of settling them. They could then settle them; but they can not now do so unless there is some authority given them whereby interest may be paid upon the advances made by these several States in 1812 and in the Seminole war. So when the Committee on Appropriations inserted these provisions, they inserted them in order that these States, being pressed with suits, should have an opportunity of placing as an offset to the claims of the United States the claims that had been paid by eight or ten States of this Union under similar circumstances. Therefore all these devices will accomplish nothing, unless we go into the question of allowing the Government officers to reopen these claims.

I want to say to the Senator from South Carolina that, in my judgment, he makes a mistake in objecting to the suggestion proposed by the Senator from South Dakota, because not one of the claims of South Carolina can be made a set-off to the bonds which the United States holds against these States.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, there is this about it: The Supreme Court can not sell South Carolina out, even if you get a judgment. This matter will have to come to some decision by Congress some day or other. As soon as the court have examined into the cases and have had an opportunity to determine what is equitable, I suppose they will make some decree; but I prefer to trust them rather than to trust to getting unanimous consent here from Senators who are determined that the claims of their States, which are of only ten years' standing, shall be recognized, while my State fails to have claims recognized which are ninety years old.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I repudiate the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina. I have made no objection in connection with his claim or the Virginia claim or any other claim, except to having it considered on an appropriation bill. As I understand the proposition of the Senator from South Carolina, I will vote for it as a separate measure. What I said was that the Senators from New Hampshire would be blamed if they did not make an effort to get the New Hampshire claim upon an appropriation bill when other Senators were getting their State claims upon appropriation bills. That is my position, Mr. President; and I do not want to be told that you can not get justice in the United States Senate for South Carolina or for Virginia or for any other Southern State, because the rules of the Senate preventing legislation of this kind upon appropriation bills are enforced against one State as well as against another State.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator will not get excited over something that did not touch him at all. It was the other Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] to whom I alluded, and I did that in no disrespectful spirit, but simply called attention to the fact, which is very patent here, that we would have had no trouble about this matter but for the fact that the Senator from South Dakota said, "If you put these claims in, the claims of my State

must go in, too." I sat silent and was content to let them go in anyhow, but the Senator from New Hampshire steps up and says, "You can not get them in unless I get mine in."

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is misstating my position entirely. I made no suggestion that a New Hampshire claim would be offered to this bill. On the contrary, I stated it would not be offered, and if the Senator had listened carefully he would have known that.

Mr. TILLMAN. I believe I did the Senator an injustice. It was not that he wanted his dollar, but he objected to putting South Dakota in. It was not dog-in-the-manger policy on his part, but was just simply a little contrariness.

Mr. GALLINGER. Be that as it may—

Mr. TILLMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon for using that plain word, but I did not intend any personal offense.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, the Senator is always amiable and delightful in his language, and never disturbs me in the least degree.

Mr. President, I thought I yielded a considerable point when I consented, after the claims of Virginia and South Carolina had gone out on a point of order, to have the extraordinary parliamentary suggestion made and acted on that they might be restored by unanimous consent. I did not object to that; but when they began to enlarge the list, when South Dakota proposed to have her claim put in here, I saw no justice in permitting that to be done, and I did object to having the list enlarged, either by putting in the South Dakota claim or the old Indian war claims of South Carolina or the claim of California.

Mr. President, I thought I acted very generously toward my friend from South Carolina; and I think honestly that he owes me a more ample apology than he has yet made.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am perfectly willing to make seventeen apologies, if the Senator wants them; but the fact remains that here we are sued by the United States, and the United States Congress will not afford us relief. Senators know this is a just and proper thing to do, and yet they will not overrule the Chair and sustain the amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand that nobody now wants the South Carolina suit to go on except the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am perfectly willing to let it go on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Perhaps the Chair can relieve the Senate from the dilemma it is in and stop further discussion by saying that if the committee's amendment is offered in the Senate as an amendment to the bill he will violate his rule and submit the question of order, if it is raised, to the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. When the bill gets into the Senate the amendment as proposed in the bill will be in order, and the Chair, instead of ruling it out of order, will submit the question to the Senate to determine whether it shall go in the bill or not. I think that is cutting the Gordian knot.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. If the point of order is raised against the amendment when offered in the Senate, the Chair will, contrary to his custom, submit the question of order to the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. The amendment omitting Nevada?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the committee.

Mr. PENROSE. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. I have offered an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia desire the amendment stated?

Mr. DANIEL. I do.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, after the amendment adopted on page 67, the following:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to adjust the accounts between the United States and the State of Virginia, as stated in the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury contained in Executive Document No. 17, Fifty-first Congress, second session, and to restate and settle said accounts according to the principles of the statements made on pages 5 and 7 of said document, and adopting July 1, 1862, for the settlement, at which time the accounts aforesaid would have almost evenly balanced had settlement then been made; but it is provided that the State of Virginia shall not be charged with Treasury settlement No. 7554 of 1889, amounting to \$16,923.70.

Mr. ALLISON. I make the same objection that I did to the other. It is general legislation.

Mr. DANIEL. I hope I may be permitted to say a word. Do I understand the Senator from Iowa to object to that?

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. RAWLINS. On page 53 of the bill I move to amend by striking out the word "station," in line 9, and inserting the word "stations;" in line 11, on the same page, I move to strike out the word "point" and insert "points;" and in the same line, after "Idaho," I move to insert the words "and Utah."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That amendment is not in order until the bill is in the Senate, the amendment having already been agreed to as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RAWLINS. I withdraw it for the present.

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

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert at the end of the bill the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reexamine and readjust the claim of the State of Pennsylvania for money expended in 1864 in liquidating the indebtedness incurred by the governor and Secretary of War for militia called into the military service under the proclamation of the President of June 15, 1863, and to fully indemnify the State for the money expended: *Provided*, That the amount to be paid to the State of Pennsylvania under the provisions of this act shall not exceed the sum of \$46,345.26: *And provided further*, That the amount found due be paid out of the unexpended balance of the appropriation made by act of Congress approved April 12, 1866, for the payment of said militia, which is hereby reappropriated if the same is not available.

Mr. ALLISON. I make the point of order that the amendment proposes general legislation.

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

Mr. COCKRELL. One moment. As I understand, this amendment, in the shape of a bill, has been considered by the Committee on Military Affairs and reported favorably from that committee and has been passed by the Senate. If I am not mistaken, a bill for this purpose has been passed by the Senate no less than three or four times.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator is right. It has passed the Senate a number of times.

Mr. ALDRICH. That does not make any difference.

Mr. ALLISON. It is legislation notwithstanding. It is the reopening of an account settled in 1867 and fully paid at that time, except that there was a question about interest. This is a question wholly of interest and nothing else, and it stands upon all fours with every question we have been debating.

Mr. COCKRELL. This is for money borrowed from a bank by the State; and when the appropriation was made three or four months afterwards to pay it, the bank necessarily demanded interest upon it. It was a loan by the bank to the State and the State had to pay interest.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly; but that does not change the situation. This is a claim—

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not think there has ever been a case where the State has actually paid interest where there was a refusal to reimburse the State for the interest actually paid.

Mr. ALLISON. That is the very case we have been debating. The State of Virginia has been paying interest all the time.

Mr. FORAKER. I rise to say that I hope the point of order raised by the Senator from Iowa will be sustained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been.

Mr. FORAKER. I think it was properly made; otherwise I shall have to present the same claim precisely on behalf of the State of Ohio. I have withheld offering it simply because I thought it would not be in order. It is a claim amounting to nearly \$500,000, which the State of Ohio paid and to which it is justly entitled and for which it ought to be reimbursed; but I did not think this the proper time or place to present it. But I want to give notice that if any of these claims are allowed I shall insist that our claim be allowed also.

Mr. ALLISON. The State of Iowa borrowed \$300,000, every dollar of it from the banks of its own State, and it has been paid, but not the interest, and there is expectation that some time it will be paid.

Mr. GALLINGER. In accordance with the notice given two or three days ago, I now move to strike out the proviso on pages 135 and 136, which I ask the Secretary to state.

Mr. PENROSE. I call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the fact that my amendment has not been acted upon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been ruled out.

Mr. CULLOM. It has been ruled out on the point of order.

Mr. ALLISON. It was ruled out.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I rose before the Senator from New Hampshire. However, I will not interfere. I will gladly wait until he has concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER. I beg the Senator's pardon. I was recognized some time ago. There has been quite a debate going on since I was recognized; but I will yield to the Senator from Indiana with pleasure.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I thank the Senator. I was not aware of his prior recognition. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of offering an amendment, although it may be subject to the point of order which has been fatal to other proposed amendments. As the senior Senator from Missouri says, interest paid by States on money borrowed constitutes, under the act of 1861 and the joint resolution of 1862, as decided by the Supreme Court of the United

States in the New York case, a perfectly valid and absolutely just claim against the Government.

Indiana has a claim for payments on account of discount upon bonds and interest paid thereon for the support of the Federal Government during the civil war amounting to over \$600,000, and I offer an amendment to the bill, and trust it may receive favorable consideration. There exists no more meritorious claim than this. Its payment has been delayed much too long. I have upon a former occasion explained fully its character. It has received the favorable consideration of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will allow my amendment to remain quiescent until this matter is acted upon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the amendment adopted on page 67, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay to the governor of the State of Indiana, or to his duly authorized agents, the claims of the State of Indiana for interest paid on bonds sold, and expense of selling said bonds, properly incurred by said State for enrolling, subsisting, clothing, supplying, arming, equipping, paying, and transporting troops employed in aiding to suppress the rebellion, heretofore filed in the Treasury Department under the act of Congress approved July 27, 1861, entitled "An act to indemnify the States for expenses incurred by them in defense of the United States," and the joint resolution approved March 8, 1862, entitled "Joint resolution declaratory of the intent and meaning of a certain act therein named," without regard to any statute of limitations or any action heretofore had with respect thereto in said Treasury Department; such payment to be upon proper vouchers filed and passed upon by the proper accounting officers of the Treasury.

Mr. ALLISON. I make the same point of order on the amendment.

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

Mr. GALLINGER. I now move to strike out the proviso on pages 135 and 136, which I ask the Secretary to read.

The SECRETARY. On page 135, line 20, it is proposed to strike out the following:

Provided, That in the settlement of claims of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines, or their representatives, and all other claims for pay and allowances within the jurisdiction of the Auditor for the War Department or the Auditor for the Navy Department, in which it is the present practice to make deductions of attorneys' fees from the amount found due, no deductions of fees for attorneys or agents shall hereafter be made, but the draft, check, or warrant for the full amount found due shall be delivered to the payee in person or sent to his bona fide post-office address (residence or place of business).

Mr. STEWART. I do not think that amendment ought to prevail.

Mr. DANIEL. I object to the amendment. It is general legislation.

Mr. STEWART. It is general legislation.

Mr. ALDRICH and others. The proposition is to strike it out of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. To strike it out of the bill? Then I am in favor of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The SECRETARY. On page 73, line 25, before the word "*Provided*," it is proposed to insert:

And said superintendents, assistant inspectors, supervisors, and rangers shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, examine all lands within the boundaries of any forest reservation that belong to any land grant railroad company and have not heretofore been sold in good faith for a valuable consideration, and report to the Secretary the character and value of said land, and pending such examination and report none of said lands shall be exchanged for other lands outside of said reservation.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, the amendment I propose is a provision for the protection and administration of forest reservations. Three years ago in an appropriation bill we provided for the protection and administration of these reservations, and intended to provide that any actual and bona fide settler who had taken a claim within a forest reservation afterwards created could exchange his land, if he desired to do so, for a like area of the public domain. It was the intention of the law to allow a settler whose land was embraced in any forest reservation to exchange his land, if he desired to do so, for lands outside of the reservation, acre for acre.

But certain words were inserted—I know not whether in conference or in the original bill, and it makes no difference—under which the Department has decided, and I think rightly decided, that a land-grant railroad company can exchange the worthless lands—lands from which the timber has all been cut, tops of mountains, the inaccessible and snow-capped peaks of the Rockies and Sierra Nevadas—for the best land the Government has, acre for acre. So they have swapped lands on the Cascade range, which are covered forever with ice and snow, not worth a tenth of a cent an

acre, for lands worth from six to ten dollars per acre in the valleys of Washington and Oregon and Idaho and Montana, thus depriving the settlers of a chance to secure these lands, besides enlarging the grants of the railroads to that extent.

Now, my amendment simply provides that these lands shall be inspected and examined by the officers who have charge of the reservations, and they shall report to the Secretary the character of the lands that belong to these companies, so that in the future we can make a proper adjustment—not an adjustment by which they shall receive a thousand times more than that which they surrender—and that while the appraisal is going on no more exchanges shall be made. That is all that the amendment aims to accomplish, and it is one in the interest of the public beyond all question, suspending the operation of a law which Congress would never have passed if it had been discussed.

Mr. STEWART. Is your amendment intended to include persons who have bought of a railroad and are in possession of land?

Mr. PETTIGREW. No. If any person has bought land of a railroad company, he can go on with the exchange. I only aim to suspend the spread of this pernicious practice until the matter can be thoroughly investigated.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to have the amendment again stated.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to say that this amendment, as it appears to me, is general legislation. Certainly on the statement made by the Senator from South Dakota it changes the existing law. I hope he will not press it on this bill, because if he does I shall be obliged to make the point of order that it proposes general legislation.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I wish to say that I do not believe it is subject to the point of order, because it prescribes the duties of these officers who are provided for and the method of the expenditure of the appropriation now in the bill. Therefore I do not believe it is subject to the point of order. It seems to me if it is possible to insert the amendment we ought to do it and protect the Government and the people of this country against the execution of a law which we never would have passed if we had known what it contained.

Mr. ALLISON. If it is so pressing, I should think at this long session of Congress the Committee on Public Lands would have given us some information that would have enabled us to act intelligently on the subject.

Mr. CARTER. If the Senator from Iowa will yield for a moment, I desire to make an explanation with reference to this amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator from Montana, before he begins, whether this legislation was on an appropriation bill and where the Senator from South Dakota was when it was adopted?

Mr. CARTER. I think the legislation was placed on an appropriation bill. It was recommended by the Committee on Public Lands, and was supported unanimously, I think, by that committee and likewise by the Committee on Appropriations. The conditions out of which the legislation grew seemed to bring to us at that time necessity for immediate action.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to give notice, so far as I can, to Senators that I shall be glad to have them complete the bill to-night. I want to finish the bill this evening. I think it very important that we should do so. I believe it can be finished in a very short time if we will go on with it.

Mr. CARTER. Admonished by the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa, I will be as brief as possible, in order to get a clear view of the situation before the Senate.

For many years, it will be recalled, Senators from the Western country most strenuously objected to the establishment of forest reservations in the States, in the Rocky Mountains, and on the west coast. There seemed to be an irrepressible demand, constantly recurring, for the establishment and maintenance of these forest reservations. It was insisted that their existence was necessary to preserve the water supply of the country, to preserve the timber from ruthless destruction, and to prevent forest fires by a proper system of patrol. Contrary to the wishes of the Senators and Representatives from the country affected, forest reservations were finally, by sweeping Executive order, created.

Having been created, the reservations including, in many instances, millions of acres of land, an unfortunate condition of affairs was found to have been brought into existence. All settlement was checked, prohibited within the limits of the reservations, thus preventing the building of the schoolhouse by the neighbor who would come in next year to assist it, and it left these people practically upon a reservation without possibility of expansion or normal development. The railroad companies owned within the limits of some of the reservations quite extensive areas of timber. By the rules and regulations we practically had arranged to confiscate their property.

To meet this compressed situation this law was passed permitting an exchange, acre for acre, of land within the reservation for unappropriated public lands outside of the reservation. These exchanges have gone on. Generally speaking, the timbered lands in the reservations are better than the remaining uplands unappropriated on the plains. In the State of Montana, where the largest reservations exist, outside, I believe, of Colorado, I have yet to hear from a private citizen or through public print the first complaint of any abuse arising under this exchange system. It has proved satisfactory to the people; it has proved satisfactory to the press, and, in so far as I know, to everyone having to do with the public affairs of that State.

When this matter was first brought to my attention, about ten days ago, by a telegram from Montana, I undertook to look it up. Finding that it was to be pressed, a couple of weeks ago I telegraphed to the gentleman who had sent me the telegram, requesting him to send a statement of the facts connected with the matter. Omitting the names, I will read his statement, so that the sentiment of the State, so far as it could be hastily gathered from this source—and this gentleman is a man of wide information—may be gleaned from the letter. He says:

Replying to your telegram of this date—

That is, of May 22—

Replying to your telegram of this date, asking for information in regard to the act of June 4, 1897, and the effect its repeal would have on citizens of Montana, I have the following to offer:

Several stockmen of the State are at this time owners of large tracts of forest-reserve lands, which they have purchased in good faith, to be used in making lieu selections under the provisions of said act. The company of which I am president is also the holder of several thousand acres of these lands. If the act should be repealed, practically without consideration, by making the repeal measure a rider on an appropriation bill, it would work a serious financial injury to these people.

Whatever may be said to the contrary, the fact is this act is a benefit to our State, in that it has aided, and can further aid, in placing the stock business on a permanent basis, by enabling the cattle and sheep men to acquire titles to lands in sufficient quantities to establish ranches where they can feed their stock in winter, rather than, as in the past, letting them "rustle" for themselves on the ranges. There is little or no danger of monopoly, for the price of these base lands—from \$4 to \$4.50 an acre—precludes the possibility of acquiring vast tracts by any individual or company. There has been wonderful progress in Montana the past two years in the line of establishing permanent ranches and feeding plants by the stockmen, and nothing has tended more to this result than the availability of land scrips—soldiers' additional and the forest reserve lieu rights—at a price that has enabled the stockmen to acquire titles and extend their plants in a modest way.

This is done in a legitimate way, too, without resort to the fraudulent methods of having Tom, Dick, and Harry enter and make proof on land for the benefit of the stockmen. The stock industry of Montana is a great one, and it is growing on new and better lines. To those engaged in this industry the right to make lieu selections under the act of June 4, 1897, has been and is of great importance, and I believe the stockmen generally of the State would feel it to be an injury to them to have this act repealed.

This act has not been taken advantage of in a speculative way in this State, either in selecting range or timber lands. Every acre entered, so far as I know, has had in view the promoting of these industries, and the benefits to the State have been of the most marked character.

But for the real merits of the case we must look at its other side. The Government has created large reserves and by so doing rendered practically worthless lands held by individuals and corporations within the limits of these reserves. For the double purpose of enabling the Government to own all the lands within the reserves and to compensate in part the private owners the law of June 4, 1897, was enacted.

It was nothing more than a fair provision, and at this time nearly all the lands within the reserves available under the act have been relinquished to the United States and made the basis for lieu selections. To repeal the measure now is somewhat akin to locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. If there is mischief in this enactment, it is already done; but I am convinced that instead of its being harmful it is, in fact, a measure of justice to those who have private land holdings within the reserves and a positive benefit to the public-land States, where advantage has been taken of the lieu privileges. There is so much to be said in its favor that I am surprised it is proposed to effect the repeal of the act by the "rider" method instead of letting it stand on its own merits and stand or fall after fair consideration and discussion.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Is that what is trying to be done now?

Mr. CARTER. The proposition here is practically to repeal this law or suspend it until some vague and indefinite time in the distant future.

Mr. ALLISON. I insist upon the point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of opinion that this is not general legislation, as there is an appropriation of three or four hundred thousand dollars for these surveyors, engineers, etc. This seems to be a limitation upon the method of disposing of the appropriation and defining certain duties of the officers.

Mr. CARTER. It will be found, I think, upon an inspection of the amendment, that it actually suspends the law, a general law now in operation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. But that is not necessarily general legislation. It is the rule of the House that no amendment shall be in order which changes existing law. That is not the rule in the Senate. The rule in the Senate is against general legislation. The Chair is not inclined to think that it is general legislation. It rules that the amendment is in order, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President—
Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the question will be put on agreeing to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, a short time ago I endeavored to get established in my State a forest reservation, and I was informed by the Secretary and the Commissioner of the General Land Office that under the operation of the law in force at present the grossest outrage was committed by the exchange of land within forest reservations, practically worthless, for the most valuable lands to be found anywhere in the country belonging to the Government; that by reason of this fact the Department had suspended the creation of any further reservations, and would not order the establishment of further forest reservations until some such provision as this had been adopted; so that where a party or a corporation hold lands on a forest reservation they could only be permitted to exchange it for equivalent land elsewhere. It seems to me that it is a meritorious provision and ought to be adopted.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. Let the vote be taken on the amendment.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I am reluctant about letting a vote be taken until it is further discussed.

The amendment is just simply that we suspend the exchange of these lands until we can investigate their value. I say they are exchanging lands from which they have cut all the timber for heavy timbered land of great value; that they are exchanging lands covered with ice and snow that are not worth the tenth of a cent an acre for lands worth \$10 an acre. They are thereby shutting out actual settlers from the good lands, and that the law as now administered, which was never discussed in Congress, is practically an enlargement of the grant which can not possibly be justified by anybody.

Mr. ALLISON. May I suggest an amendment which occurs to me now? I know, in the nature of things, a good many settlers upon these lands must have gone off and taken other lands.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not disturb them at all.

Mr. ALLISON. The suspension of this law should certainly not operate to hinder or delay those who have already taken advantage of it to the extent of partially exchanging lands.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I only suspend the operation of the law as to lands at the present time owned by the land-grant railroad companies. I do not suspend it as to those that have been sold in good faith for a valuable consideration, nor as to any actual bona fide settlers, and for this reason, that the bona fide settler has got as good land as there is in the reservation, and therefore no harm can come from his exchange; but where the railroad company has a land grant that takes good and bad, all alike, if they can exchange hundreds of thousands of acres on the tops of mountains that are worth nothing for the best land the Government has, an injustice must be worked by an enlargement of the grant. I want to suspend that until we can determine the question; that is all.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator allow me an interruption? I thought I understood the purpose the Senator has in view, and I am heartily in sympathy with it if it is properly expressed. As I understand, under the law as it stands now, exchanges may be made of land of equal area without regard to value.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Exactly.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. But it is the intention of the Senator that for exchanges to be made in the future—not those in the past; that is past and gone—but for exchanges to be made in the future there shall be an ascertainment of the value of the land owned by the Government and of the other land, and the exchanges shall be on the basis of the valuation and not of area.

Mr. STEWART. That will be very proper.

Mr. PETTIGREW. That is what I aim to get.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, that is a difficult thing to reach.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not try to reach it in this amendment. It is because of these difficulties and for fear it would be general legislation if I added that, I aim to suspend the operation, intending that some action of Congress may adjust this matter upon that basis; that is all.

Mr. TELLER. I will state that there is a bill here, and it is a House bill, touching this matter. I think it would be well to pass this amendment and then legislate on the subject, because it is only a question of the suspension of the railroad lands as long as it does not interfere with settlers.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. As this can be, in my opinion, adjusted in conference in such a way as to make it operative, I would be glad to see it go into the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. Let the amendment be read again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be again read.

The SECRETARY. On page 73, before the word "Provided," insert:

And said superintendents, assistant inspectors, supervisors, and rangers shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, examine all lands within the boundaries of any forest reservation that belong to any land-grant railroad company and have not heretofore been sold in good faith for a valuable consideration, and report to the Secretary the character and value of said land; and pending such examination and report none of said lands shall be exchanged for other lands outside of said reservation.

Mr. PENROSE. I make the point of order that this is general legislation and contrary to the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has overruled that point of order. It has already been made. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. I have one amendment to offer that I hope the chairman of the committee will consider favorably and not object to it as being amenable to a point of order. On page 10, line 7, after the word "Service," I move to insert:

Toward the construction of an addition to Providence Hospital, to be erected on the grounds of said hospital, under the supervision of the Surgeon-General United States Army, \$10,000. *Provided*, That said addition shall be exclusively for persons unable to pay, who shall be sent there by the Surgeon-General of the United States Army and the authorities of the District of Columbia.

I will state that they have a most eligible place and they are doing very excellent work, surpassing almost any need of praise that can be conferred upon them. Any person can go there and see it. I present a resolution of Spanish war veterans setting forth the treatment that they have received in this institution, and praying for the adoption of this amendment. I will not read it, but it is short, and I will ask that it be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the paper will be printed in the RECORD.

The paper referred to is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, FOURTH IMMUNE CAMP, S. W. V.,
Washington, D. C., Elks Hall, June 11, 1900.

SIR: In accordance with a resolution passed at a meeting of the Fourth Immune Camp, No. 15, Spanish War Veterans, held this evening, I herewith transmit a copy of the minutes of said meeting and respectfully call your attention to the portion containing reference to an appropriation for Providence Hospital.

The committee appointed to wait on you will do so in a few days, and trust you will be able to grant them an interview.

With high regard, I am, very respectfully,

J. J. DUFFY,
Adjutant, Fourth Immune Camp, S. W. V.
Address, 1845 R street NW., City.

By order of camp.

HON. WILLIAM M. STEWART,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

The Fourth Immune Camp, No. 15, Spanish War Veterans, held an important meeting Friday evening, May 12, 1900. The officers elected at their last meeting were installed, as follows: Commanding officer, Mr. Lee Lipscomb; first lieutenant, E. H. Brian; second lieutenant, Charles Bartel; sergeant of the guard, Joseph L. May; quartermaster sergeant and treasurer, Daniel C. Eberly; adjutant, J. J. Duffey; chaplain, E. L. Robinson.

The former adjutant, Mr. P. J. Keleher, submitted his report of work done and amount of receipts and disbursements for the six months of the camp's existence, which showed that the camp was now in a flourishing condition and had been instrumental in securing employment for quite a number of its members, had relieved numerous cases of want, and had aided numerous members who were ill during that period.

The attention of the camp was called to an article published in Monday evening's Star, reciting a resolution offered by Senator STEWART, asking for an appropriation of \$50,000 to build an addition to Providence Hospital for the exclusive use of the poor of the District. It was moved and unanimously carried that a committee be appointed to wait on Senator STEWART and urgently request that a ward be set apart in the proposed addition to be known as the "soldier's ward."

Several members spoke of the noble and humane work done by this institution for the sick soldiers of the District. No matter how crowded the institution was, if there were no room in the public wards, sick soldiers were placed in the private wards and given every attention. Several of the members of the Fourth Immunes had been cared for in this manner. It was contended that no institution of its kind could boast of the war record possessed by Providence Hospital.

It was used as a soldiers' hospital during the civil war, and during the thirty-five years that the late Sister Beatrice presided over the establishment the old soldier was ever welcome. At the breaking out of the Spanish-American war several of its staff of doctors and surgeons offered their services to their country, and were commissioned and served faithfully during the war. All the nurses who had graduated offered their services and several served as nurses in different camps in the States. Eight of its male attendants enlisted, six in the Fourth Immunes. It had also sent its quota of Sisters, who served as nurses in the States and in Cuba. Its doors are ever open to the soldiers, as the following letter received from Sister Louise, in charge, in March last, by the Spanish war camps of the city, will testify:

PROVIDENCE HOSPITAL, Washington, D. C., March 6, 1900.

To the Commanding Officer, Fourth Immune Camp, Spanish War Veterans.

DEAR SIR: I have been informed by one of your members, lately ill at our institution, that there is a great amount of sickness and distress among the soldiers who served their country in Cuba, and our other new possessions, residents of this city; and that owing to the trouble and bother of going to the authorities for a permit admitting them to some of the hospitals of the city, they remain at their homes and are cared for by their comrades as best they may.

Young men who gave up so much for "country's sake" deserve a better fate than to be ill without funds; too proud to ask admission to the hospitals where their trouble could be skillfully treated.

Allow me to say, if this be the fact, that I regret of not being aware of it before, for the doors of Providence Hospital are always open to the Spanish war veterans of the District; no permit is necessary; a note from the commanding officer will admit them, and everything that care and treatment can do will be done to relieve their sufferings.

With high regard, I am, respectfully,

SISTER LOUISE, *In Charge.*

The committee, consisting of Capt. Lee Lipscomb, Lieuts. Charles Bartel and William H. Mellach, and P. J. Keleher, were requested to call on Senator STEWART and place before him the request of the Fourth Immune Camp. They were also instructed to call on the officers of the Harding and Miles camps, and in conjunction with said officers do everything in their power to secure the much needed ward for the soldiers of the District.

The camp adjourned to meet Friday evening, May 25, 1900.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope this amendment of the Senator will share the fate a good many others have done. I doubt not the worth of the others, nor of this amendment, but it is not in order, it is not estimated for, there is no law authorizing it, and no committee that I know of reported it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order. Are there further amendments as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not know that I wish to offer a further amendment, but I wish to make a few brief comments in regard to the Industrial Commission. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. With the kindness of the Senator from South Dakota, I offer an amendment to come in on page 100.

The SECRETARY. On page 100, after line 14, insert:

For acquiring, by purchase or condemnation, the land in the square surrounding Fort Constitution, at New Castle, N. H., to be used for barracks and quarters for troops, \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. ALLISON. I think there is no law for this appropriation.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will say to the Senator that this amendment is moved by direction of the Committee on Coast Defenses, and is approved by the Department. It is an appropriation of the same nature as the appropriation for military posts, on page 99, and it is to enable the Secretary of War to acquire about 6 acres of land directly around Fort Constitution.

Mr. ALLISON. For coast-defense purposes?

Mr. CHANDLER. No; it is for the purposes of military posts of the same character as the million dollars is appropriated for.

Mr. ALLISON. What is the amount appropriated?

Mr. CHANDLER. Fifty thousand dollars. I do not wish to explain it now at length. If the Senator does not think when it is in conference that it ought to remain in, I shall not insist.

Mr. ALLISON. Giving the conferees that latitude, I will not ask the Senator to explain it at length.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is strictly in order, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. ALLISON. I should be glad to submit the question as to whether the amendment is in order. I have never heard of it before, but that is not strange.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is in order.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Chair for the suggestion to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, there was some question the other day in regard to the Industrial Commission editing or altering testimony taken before it. The result was that a statement was made by the chairman of the Industrial Commission with regard to the matter. As I understood it, he asserted that no changes were made except grammatical corrections or the transposition of some words where they were not in a proper connection.

But it appears the Industrial Commission have a rule or a set of rules by which they edit this testimony, and it appears also that most of the work of the commission is done by the 9 citizen members, there being 10 members of the two Houses of Congress, and 9 others, that these 9 others all belong to one political party, that they do most of the business of the commission, and that out of their number a committee is selected to edit the testimony taken by the commission.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. A majority of that 9 is a quorum of the entire commission.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Five of the 9, I believe, are a quorum, under the rule. Now, I will read the rules under which all the testimony that is taken is scrutinized.

1. Grammatical errors should be corrected in all instances.
2. Repetitions which do not serve to emphasize or make clearer matter under examination shall be cut out.
3. Personal opinions of commissioners must be eliminated.
4. The name of the witness, when used in a question addressed to him, must be cut out.
5. Remarks of commissioners immediately preceding questions, which do not make the questions clearer to the witness, must be omitted.
6. Answers of commissioners to questions asked of witnesses by commissioners must be cut out.

7. Opening remarks of presiding officer, with explanation to witness of mode of examination, shall not go in the record. Complimentary remarks of presiding officer at conclusion of testimony are to be omitted, but the reply of witnesses to same, if bearing on the well-being of their organizations or industries or to the work of the commission, shall be printed.

8. Leading features (as known in law) of a question should be avoided as much as possible.

9. Where the meaning of the question or answer is doubtful, it may be left intact or submitted to the commissioner asking the question.

10. When partisan politics appears in question or testimony, the same shall, in accordance with the rule of the commission, be eliminated.

The tenth rule, then, provides a great latitude. It leaves these commission members, five of this board of nine, to judge whether there is any politics in the question or answer, and if they think there is they can eliminate it; and as all the members of this board are Republicans, all supporters of the Administration, you can judge of what value the testimony of this commission may be hereafter. As a sample of the way they exercise this power, I will read one of the sentences eliminated by this board. Mr. Lockwood, in his testimony, said:

The control of the public highways is the most important duty of the Government. Mr. Chairman, give me the control of the highway over which the products of your labor must go to market, and let me fix the charges, and I can make you my slave.

They struck that out under this power of editing. They struck out long paragraphs. Now, is that a political question? This board seem to decide that it is. If they can exercise that latitude of power, I ask of what value is the Industrial Commission? When it was appointed the law declared that it should be non-partisan, for the purpose of collecting information with regard to the relations of labor and capital, that we might use it in the future—that we might obtain valuable statistics. Yet we find that we built up a political machine which takes the power of eliminating answers to questions that they think would not be of advantage to the political party to which they belong.

Allusions to the Standard Oil Company are stricken out of Mr. Lockwood's testimony, or materially changed. Is that a political question? I am inclined to agree with the commission that it is. I am inclined to agree that as Republicans they ought to keep from the public anything that would be detrimental to the Standard Oil Company and any other trust. It seems to me they are acting upon that basis, and that that is the purpose of the organization as now constructed.

But this is not all. Mr. Lockwood's testimony is not the only testimony that has been edited. I have here a letter from Mr. James Earrett, who, I understand, is the assistant secretary of the State board of agriculture of Georgia. It is addressed to Mr. H. B. Martin, 1227 Pennsylvania avenue, Washington, D. C., and is as follows:

DEAR SIR: My testimony was badly reported and much left out.

This Industrial Commission took testimony in the Cœur d'Alene mines last year. The witnesses who appeared before the Industrial Commission appeared this winter before the House Committee on Military Affairs, and I want to read extracts from their sworn testimony. This is from the testimony of Allen F. Gill:

Q. You were examined in regard to these matters concerning the strike up there and the destruction of that property and the conditions obtaining in the Cœur d'Alenes, were you not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Before that commission, I will ask you if, in your testimony, you used this language:

"That day the mill was blown up they were all at work [referring to the men under your employ]. In fact, they could not get away in any case, because they had to work, as the mine was flooding, so we were all there. There have been several of them in the bull pen since then. Quite a number of them I got out on my affidavit. I was arrested myself at Burke, along with everyone else, I guess, except the postmaster."

Was that your testimony?

A. In reading that thing all the way through I would not recognize the answers. I made objections when the proof was sent to me. I made objections in several different instances.

Q. Was that proof sent back to the commission?

Representative LENTZ. Let him finish his answer.

A. I say I objected to it, and I made corrections which have not been made in my answers there on many important points.

Q. I repeat: Did you state, "There have been several of them in the bull pen since then. Quite a number of them I got out on my affidavit?"

A. I may have stated there that I made affidavit for quite a number of them.

Q. Did you state, "Quite a number of them I got out on my affidavit?"

A. I believe that that is a mistake in the printing.

Q. Do you wish to have it go in the record, then, that that was not your evidence before the Industrial Commission?

A. I don't believe that that was my answer.

Q. They had a stenographic reporter, did they not?

A. Yes, sir; and if I am not mistaken, I think I made objections to that report.

Q. Did you file your objections?

A. Yes, sir; I sent it back.

Q. To whom did you send it?

A. The commission, I believe, here in Washington.

Q. And your report of your corrections is now in the charge of that commission, is it?

A. They refused to make any corrections.

Q. I say your report to that commission is on file with the commission here now, is it not?

A. I think so. I was going to say that in a number of different instances I made corrections, and, to my knowledge, none of the corrections have been made except in the spelling of names.

Q. Then, if this particular part of your evidence was not corrected by you, this was the evidence you gave before the commission?

A. It was not corrected.

There are five different witnesses who testified, I think, to the same thing. For instance, Mr. Levi R. Miller testifies:

Representative ESCH. You were examined by the Industrial Commission on the 26th of July last, were you not?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; I was.

Representative ESCH. You then stated the entire circumstances surrounding your arrest, did you not?

Mr. MILLER. As much as I could think of at the time.

Representative ESCH. You were asked a question, and then you went on and narrated the entire circumstance?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; as nearly as—

Here he was interrupted.

Representative ESCH. That narration was practically correct and complete, was it not?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; that was correct as I gave it, but it was not correct as it was published.

Representative JETT. Do you know whether it was correctly reported as your testimony in what has been published?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, no; it was not anything like what I had given in my testimony. I corrected it, and then the corrections were not all made.

Representative LENTZ. You have read it, then, as it has been published, have you?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Representative LENTZ. And that is not the testimony as you gave it?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Representative LENTZ. It has been edited, has it?

Mr. MILLER. This part of it, where I was having trouble with the soldier that morning, is not in that evidence at all.

Representative LENTZ. Did you give it on that occasion?

Mr. MILLER. I did; yes, sir. I had to give it just as it occurred.

Representative HAY. Was that before the Industrial Commission?

Representative ESCH. Yes, sir.

So it appears that large portions of his testimony were left out, everything, of course, that the commission thought was politics or would be of injury to the Republican party.

Mr. ALDRICH. If it will suit the convenience of the Senator, I suggest that he have printed the remaining extracts.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will be very brief. I am not reading it for the purpose of convincing or converting the Senator from Rhode Island, because I know that would be absolutely useless, and I do not believe he would read it if I merely had it printed in the RECORD without reading.

Now I read from the testimony of Mr. Thomas Heney:

Representative LENTZ. Do you know whether any prisoners in the bull pen were taken before the Industrial Commission?

Mr. HENEY. Not one; no, sir.

I will state for the information of Senators that the bull pen referred to in this testimony is a place where the United States Government imprisoned miners during the Idaho mining troubles. They gathered up the whole population, practically, of the towns, and swept them into this stable yard or corral and kept them there in unsanitary and unhealthy conditions. Some of them went insane owing to the misery of their surroundings.

Mr. KEAN. Approved by a Democratic governor.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Approved by the President of the United States and a Democratic governor who also supports the President of the United States, if the Senator wants to go into that question.

Representative LENTZ. Do you know whether any prisoners in the bull pen were taken before the Industrial Commission?

Mr. HENEY. Not one; no, sir.

Representative LENTZ. Do you know whether any men were run into the bull pen and prevented from appearing before the Industrial Commission; whether they were taken into the bull pen about the time the Industrial Commission got there?

Representative ESCH. I object to that.

Representative LENTZ. I ask him whether he knows.

Representative ESCH. I object to it, anyhow, as incompetent, immaterial, and irrelevant; and it is raising the question that was raised the other day about the report.

Representative LENTZ. We are not going into the report. We are simply showing an effort to shut out evidence from an inquiring board.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think it is our business to investigate what the Industrial Commission did.

Representative LENTZ. We are investigating the abuse of the power they had there to take away from an inquiring board that went there certain witnesses that might tell things that they did not care to have told.

The fact of the matter is that the testimony of one witness is that as soon as he was subpoenaed he was arrested and thrown into the bull pen, and when he protested, the Industrial Commission, he says, said they would come there and take his testimony and that of others, but they never did come. I will not read all of this. There are several others. I will read one brief extract from Mr. James R. Sovereign's testimony.

Q. Mr. Sovereign, have you looked over the Industrial Commission testimony as reported—that is, your testimony as reported by the Industrial Commission?

A. No, sir; I have not. I have only casually glanced over that.

The CHAIRMAN. I object to that. We have nothing to do with the Industrial Commission.

Representative LENTZ. I simply want to ask whether that which you did look over was edited or not, or whether it was just as you gave it?

A. The proof sent to me was edited, and they only gave me ten days and I couldn't get it back.

Further, there is the testimony of several other witnesses to the same effect.

One of the members of the Industrial Commission told me day before yesterday that they examined before the Industrial Commission one of the Arbuckles; that he testified that they were buying sugar land in Cuba, and when asked why he did it he said because their competitors, the Rockefellers, were also buying sugar land, and then he went on to testify to the value of the sugar land; the best in the world, where sugar could be produced the cheapest.

Questions were then asked him as to what effect the production of sugar on those cheap lands would have upon the beet-sugar industry in this country if the sugar was admitted from Cuba free of duty; and that testimony, which went quite into detail with regard to the effect upon the beet-sugar industry, and all the questions and answers with regard to the sugar business in Cuba and their connection with it were stricken out by this editor.

So I say, Mr. President, the report of the Industrial Commission, as now constituted, certainly is a worthless document. The time spent is absolutely lost, and the money we have invested is thrown away. I call the attention of the country to these facts because I am well aware that as now constituted the Industrial Commission with its evidence will be thrown into our faces until next November at every step of the coming campaign. I wish, therefore, to call especial attention to the fact that this Republican board is destroying the value of the evidence for all industrial purposes, for all economic purposes, and only leaving it in such shape as to be of advantage as a political machine or a political inquiry.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word.

I think the Senator from South Dakota is too sweeping in his denunciation of the Industrial Commission. I believe they are high-toned and honorable men; that they are not governed by partisan considerations, and the testimony which they have taken and the reports which they have made will be found useful and reliable documents. Having said that, I wish to repeat my criticism of the commission as to these rules concerning the editing of the testimony that comes before the commission. I do not see among these 12 rules but 2 which are justly subject to criticism; one is that—

Repetitions which do not serve to emphasize or make clearer matter under consideration shall be cut out.

Mr. President, no Senator in this Chamber would be willing to have his speeches edited and repetitions cut out. In the second place, the provision that—

When partisan politics appears in question or testimony, the same shall, in accordance with the rule of the commission, be eliminated.

That rule is a very unsafe rule to be enforced by the editor of the testimony.

Mr. CARTER. Do I understand the Senator to insist that repetition is a certain form of emphasis that should be retained in a speech?

Mr. CHANDLER. I think a witness who is expounding these questions before the commission should have the same privilege of repetition that the Senator from Montana has in repeating a great many times over a good idea when he finds he has come into possession of one. It is a very dangerous provision that whenever the chief stenographer of this commission is revising testimony he shall strike out everything that is partisan in its character in his judgment.

Now, I do not concur in the reflection which the Senator from South Dakota makes upon the commission, that they will intend to do anything unfair. I do not believe they will intend to do anything unfair. But no commission should have that power over witnesses that come before them, and there should not be any elimination of testimony beyond the grammatical errors. There should not be any elimination of testimony without the consent of the witnesses themselves. I hope the commission, in the testimony they may take hereafter, will be careful and not justly subject the commission to the criticism which the Senator from South Dakota for partisan purposes seems to have made in this Chamber.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be reported to the Senate if there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BACON. I desire to offer an amendment which I send to the desk. I ask that it be read. Then I will just occupy one minute in stating its purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

Mr. BACON. I ask that it go in on page 138, at the close of the subdivision of the Department of Justice.

Mr. HALE. Let us have the amendment read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 138, after line 18, insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to distribute to each of the places where a circuit or district court of the United States is now holden, or hereafter established, one complete set of Federal Cases, with digest thereof: *Provided*, That he shall distribute but one set to each of the places where both circuit and district courts are holden; and the clerks of said courts shall, in all cases, keep said Federal Cases for the use of the courts and the officers thereof.

SEC. 2. That such sum of money as is required to pay for said Federal Cases, the delivery and distribution of which are provided for in this act, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5 per volume shall be paid for the same, the said money to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I will occupy but two or three minutes of the time of the Senate. As is known, under the present law the Federal courts are supplied with all the decisions of the Supreme Court and the circuit courts of the United States. There were a great many reports made prior to 1880 in the circuit courts of the United States. They comprise some 200 volumes which have been edited by various reporters. All of these reports have been comprised into 30 volumes under the name indicated in the amendment, Federal Cases. It is of the utmost importance that the courts should have these books.

I will state to the Senate that this suggestion comes from the judges of the courts. The amendment which I propose has been before the Committee on the Judiciary. It was unanimously recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary and was then sent to the Committee on Appropriations. There is a letter from the Department of Justice, which I ask may be read, which fully states the case and will obviate the necessity of my saying anything further in reference to the amendment. It is of the utmost importance to the courts all over the United States to have these reports.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator has stated all there is in the case. We know the Attorney-General has written a letter in favor of it, that the judges want it, and that \$31,000 will buy these books. I leave the matter to the Senate, as the Judiciary Committee has reported the amendment.

Mr. BACON. I should like permission to have the letter read.

Mr. ALLISON. Let it be inserted in the RECORD without reading.

Mr. BACON. It is not for the purpose of inserting it in the RECORD that I present it, but I will consent to that suggestion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the letter referred to will be inserted in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1900.

SIR: Referring to your letter of 8th instant, with which you inclose a copy of an amendment to be proposed by Senator BACON to the sundry civil appropriation bill, relative to the distribution of digests of the Supreme Court reports and copies of Federal cases, I have the honor now to transmit to you copy of a letter covering the subject written by Mr. Finch, the librarian of the Department of Justice, which has my concurrence. I return the letter of Judge Newman to Senator BACON, as requested by you.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. GRIGGS,
Attorney-General.

Hon. GEO. F. HOAR,
Chairman Judiciary Committee, United States Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1900.

SIR: Complying with your recent request for an expression of my views in regard to Senator BACON's proposed amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill in regard to supplying Federal cases, etc., to United States courts, I have the honor to make the following suggestions:

The Federal Reporter contains, or purports to contain, all the circuit and district court cases from 1880 to the present time. Prior to 1880 the same class of cases was reported at irregular intervals by many different persons. There are some 200 odd volumes of these reports, and it is now very difficult to make up a complete set. Still more difficult, if not impossible, would it be to supply the Federal courts with these books.

The Federal cases is a reprint of all these decisions, in concise form, so arranged that they can be referred to without inconvenience where the reference is to the old report or even where the name of the case only is known. The series contains not only all the cases to be found in the old circuit and district court reports, but many decisions found only in manuscript form and in newspapers. The subsequent history of each case is also noted. These old cases are of inestimable value, as you are aware; they are cited in practically every Federal decision, and in all treatises touching Federal questions. There is no question that these decisions should be accessible to every United States judge.

For the Federal cases a price not exceeding \$6 per volume should be inserted. The regular price is \$10 per volume, but the company has sold them to judges for \$6.

Senator HOAR's letter of the 8th instant and accompanying papers are herewith inclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES A. FINCH, Librarian.

Hon. JOHN W. GRIGGS,
Attorney-General, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1900.

DEAR SENATOR BACON: I learn at the Department that under such a law as is here suggested, 179 sets of these cases would be distributed at the present time, with the probability that the number would be increased to 200 in the near future.

The market price for these cases is said to be \$300 a set. The librarian of the Department of Justice suggests \$6 a volume as an appropriate price to pay for them.

The librarian of the Interior Department suggests \$5 a volume as probably sufficient for so large a purchase.

There are 31 volumes, including the digest. At \$5 a volume this would amount to \$155 a set; 179 sets would cost \$27,745, and 200 sets, \$31,000.

Very truly, yours,

EDW. C. GOODWIN,
Clerk Committee on the Judiciary.

Hon. A. O. BACON,
United States Senator, etc.

Letter of Judge William T. Newman.

UNITED STATES COURTS
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA,
Atlanta, Ga., March 6, 1900.

My DEAR SENATOR: I beg to call your attention again to the matter of the law books about which we had some correspondence and also a conversation. The books that I mentioned that I thought the Government ought to buy for the judges are the "Federal Cases," especially for use in bankruptcy business.

Embracing as they do all the decisions of the circuit and district courts prior to the first volume of the Federal Reporter, it is exceedingly important that we should have them. * * * If you could get these three matters arranged on some of the appropriation bills, or as much of it as the committee think right, it will be of great service, I am sure, to all the judges. We must depend on you down here about these matters, as you are the only representative we have now from this section on either of the Judiciary Committees.

With kind regards, very truly, yours,

WM. T. NEWMAN.

Hon. A. O. BACON,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCBRIDE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert, on page 77, after line 2, the following:

To enable the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain what persons made entry of lands within the limits of any wagon road or railroad land grant in the State of Oregon, or entered upon such lands under the public-land laws of the United States in good faith, believing such lands to be a part of the public domain, and the title to which lands was determined by the courts to be vested in such wagon roads or railroad companies as against persons making entries as aforesaid; the date of such entry and the respective amounts paid to the United States and the date of such payments; also the names of persons who received certificates of entry or patents from the United States and the date of such certificates or patents; also the sum or sums paid by the holders of such certificates or patents, their heirs or assigns, to purchase the paramount title as settled by the decisions of the courts, and also the value of such paramount title in cases where such purchase has not been made by any of the holders of such certificates or patents, and to ascertain such other facts as in his judgment are necessary to enable the United States to properly and equitably adjust the claims of persons who entered upon such lands, receiving from the proper officers written evidence of entry or settlement upon any of said lands, \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available, and the said Secretary shall make report thereon to the Congress at the next session.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator from Oregon if that is the amendment printed in italics prepared by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MCBRIDE. It is not.

Mr. ALLISON. Then, Mr. President, unless the Senator will offer that amendment as a substitute, I will make the point of order.

Mr. MCBRIDE. I will offer the amendment printed in italics if the Senator insists on the point of order.

Mr. ALLISON. I thought the Senator intended to offer that amendment. I said to him that, so far as I was concerned, I had no objection to that, but I object to the amendment now offered by the Senator.

Mr. MCBRIDE. Then I withdraw the first amendment and submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon withdraws his first amendment and submits another amendment, which will be read:

The SECRETARY. On page 77, after line 2, it is proposed to insert:

Entry of lands in wagon-road and railroad land grants in Oregon: To enable the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain what persons made entry of lands within the limits of any wagon-road or railroad land grant in the State of Oregon, the date of such entry and the respective amounts paid to the United States, and the date of such payments; also the names of persons who received certificates of entry or patents from the United States, and the date of such certificates or patents; also the sum or sums paid by the holders of such certificates or patents, their heirs or assigns, to purchase the paramount title as settled by the decisions of the courts, and also the value of such paramount title in cases where such purchase has not been made by any of the holders of such certificates or patents, and to ascertain such other facts as in his judgment are necessary to enable the United States to properly and equitably adjust the claims of persons who entered upon such lands, receiving from the proper officers written evidence of entry or settlement upon any of said lands, \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available; and the said Secretary shall make reports thereon to the Congress at the next session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, which has been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and

the estimate for which has been made in a letter of the Secretary of War, contained in Document No. 578 of this Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 104, after line 8, it is proposed to insert:

Memorial bridge across Potomac River: To enable the Secretary of War to commence the construction of a memorial bridge from the most convenient point of the Naval Observatory grounds, or from some point adjacent thereto, across the Potomac River to the most convenient point of the Arlington estate property, according to the recommendations of the board of officers of the Corps of Engineers and of architects, approved by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, as set out in Document No. 578 of the House of Representatives, first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress, the sum of \$200,000.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope this amendment will not be pressed. I do not think it is in order. There was a report authorized last year on this subject, which has just been made, or made within two or three weeks, and printed within a very few days. This memorial bridge can wait for a year.

I make the point of order respecting the amendment that it is not estimated for, although I believe the Committee on the District of Columbia has reported the amendment. I hope the amendment will not be inserted if it is in order; and I hope it will be ruled not to be in order.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I hope I may be allowed to say a few words respecting this amendment.

On April 9, nearly two months ago, the report and the estimates for this bridge were received by the Senate; and two months was certainly time enough for anyone who wished to become acquainted with it to see the estimates and specifications in detail.

I beg leave for the rest of the argument on this subject to read the following passage from the message of the President which was delivered to Congress on December 5 last. In that message, on page 52, the President says:

Congress at its last session appropriated the \$5,000 "to enable the Chief of Engineers of the Army to continue the examination of the subject and to make or secure designs, calculations, and estimates for a memorial bridge from the most convenient point of the Naval Observatory grounds, or adjacent thereto, across the Potomac River to the most convenient point of the Arlington estate property." In accordance with the provisions of this act the Chief of Engineers has selected four eminent bridge engineers to submit competitive designs for a bridge combining the elements of strength and durability and such architectural embellishment and ornamentation as will fitly apply to the dedication, "A memorial to American patriotism."

The designs are now being prepared, and as soon as completed will be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of War. The proposed bridge would be a convenience to all the people from every part of the country who visit the national cemetery, an ornament to the capital of the nation, and forever stand as a monument to American patriotism. I do not doubt that Congress will give to the enterprise still further proof of its favor and approval.

There is no measure, Mr. President, which has more frequently been forecast by appropriations made by Congress, there has been none which has been more thoroughly and sedately examined, none which has been more uniformly recommended by the Secretary of War for military purposes, and these frequent recommendations have now culminated in this hearty indorsement and approval by the President of the United States.

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

Mr. CARTER. In connection with this matter of a memorial bridge, I desire to make a suggestion. The thought underlying the construction of this proposed bridge is beautiful, and I hope the bridge will finally be constructed. I think, in connection with its construction, however, we ought to take into consideration the state of facts with reference to the country on the south side of the Potomac River, which formerly constituted a part of the District of Columbia. I have never investigated the subject, but I believe there exists a question as to whether Congress had the right to re-cede jurisdiction to the State of Virginia over that portion of the District of Columbia lying south of the river. We have, however, acquiesced in the act of cession for many years.

The result of the State jurisdiction immediately south of this large city is injurious alike to this city and to the State of Virginia. We observe that along the District line to the north and the west and the east, quiet, orderly communities project themselves beyond that line, whereas immediately south of the Potomac River we find a rendezvous for the criminal classes—murders, robberies, difficulties that affect the police court here and no doubt lay a heavy burden on the State of Virginia as well.

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator will allow me, the Government owns a large tract of land at the south end, so that there can be nothing of the kind.

Mr. CARTER. My proposition goes beyond that. Immediately south of the Long Bridge there has grown up in the course of a few years a settlement said to be lawless, giving great difficulty to the authorities of Virginia, and certainly causing great expense in the administration of law in the District of Columbia. Here, but a few days ago, we noticed that a peaceable citizen, who lives south of the Potomac, going home in the evening across the Long Bridge, was sandbagged, stricken down—and I believe stricken unto death—by three outlaws, who find their

home and lodgment and protection at some place called Jackson City, on the south side of the Potomac. If the jurisdiction of the United States extended over the District of Columbia as originally laid out, these things could not be as they are.

Again, it is a matter of considerable importance to the health of the District that Congress should have the right to fill up the marshes and endeavor to confine the banks of the Potomac, so that the malaria-breeding swamps south of the river could be disposed of.

I should like to see the State of Virginia take into consideration the matter of re-ceding to the United States jurisdiction over that portion of the District formerly laid out, lying south of the river. It would be, I think, advantageous to Virginia, and certainly would render less expensive the administration of justice in the District of Columbia, and it undoubtedly would result in greater security to life along the southern border of this city.

These are suggestions thrown out which I think might be fairly considered in connection with this memorial bridge when the time comes to act upon it.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I do not assume to be an architect or an expert in the matter of bridge construction, but I merely wish to record my opposition to the plan proposed for the memorial bridge. It is a contradiction of all just ideas of such a structure. I sympathize with simplicity in art. I have talked with a gentleman skilled in these matters, and he concurs with me. I see in the plan proposed that there are two structures in the middle of the bridge, as if they were intended for derricks.

I simply wish to say that I am not at all satisfied with this plan; and I have behind me some artists of renown. I wish this plan might be revised, so that the bridge might have something of beauty, something of grandeur, something of dignity in it, and be truly a magnificent structure. The lithographs have but just come to the Senate. Let us wait for the judgment of the best architects.

Mr. HOAR. A gentleman in whose judgment I have the greatest confidence, whose life work, in fact, has been to study works of art in all countries and in all eras, who is very strongly and earnestly devoted to the scheme of a bridge of this kind in Washington and to the improvement of Washington, expressed to me to-day the same opinion which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] has expressed, and I have no doubt it is well founded, that the scheme is not one from the point of architectural beauty which will satisfy the Senate or the public or posterity. This gentleman also thinks—he was a business man in former times and has had large experience—that the price of iron is so changed that the postponement of this contract for ten or twelve months would probably save a half million dollars in the cost of the bridge. I know nothing about it myself.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. This report, notwithstanding the suggestion made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], has only been accessible within the last two or three weeks. The plan which is suggested in the amendment at the Secretary's desk, I think, proposes a bridge to cost some eight or nine million dollars.

I submit that if we are to enter upon the erection of such a structure, to cost so large a sum, we ought to look most carefully into these plans before we begin the work. There will be no harm in allowing this matter to pass over until next session, when all the plans and suggestions can be more thoroughly examined.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wish to say that this subject has been before Congress now for several years.

Mr. ALLISON. These plans have only been before Congress for two or three weeks.

Mr. McMILLAN. The Secretary of War was authorized to obtain plans for the construction of a memorial bridge and to submit them to Congress. That work has been done, and the plans have been submitted by three or four different bridge builders. One plan was selected by the engineers who have charge of these matters. They reported to Congress as soon as they could get the plans prepared, printed, and put in shape.

The report which was made by the Committee on the District of Columbia was unanimous in agreeing to urge the commencement of this great work, which will cost in the neighborhood of between four and five million dollars. It may probably cost less, but the Committee on the District of Columbia felt that it was necessary that something should be done to commence the work, and therefore they asked for an appropriation of \$200,000 to begin it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLISON. Just one word, if the Senator will allow me.

Mr. MARTIN. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. The plan adopted by this amendment is the plan proposed in the report. There are three proposed or suggested plans, numbered from 1 to 3. The plan proposed in the amendment will cost \$15,000,000. Plan No. 2 is to cost \$13,000,000, and plan No. 3, \$4,000,000.

I submit that we are not ready at this time to enter upon any one of these plans. The Committee on the District of Columbia

may have had an opportunity of investigating the subject, they may have looked into these plans, and they may be informed as to which is the best, but for one I do not feel justified in voting for a bridge that will cost this large sum of money without understanding fully the extent of the obligation to be incurred.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I am a little surprised that the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER], if he wanted to antagonize the construction of this bridge, should have found it necessary to make a fling at the good order or the execution of the laws in the Commonwealth of Virginia. I think we can take care of good order and of the execution of the laws on the south side of the Potomac River, and I think the orderly condition of the people on the south side of the river adjacent to Washington will compare with the good order maintained in the city of Washington and the good order maintained in the State of Maryland adjacent to the corporate limits of this District.

I think that the Senator might have rested his opposition to this bridge on the merits of the discussion without making, as I say, this fling at the good order of the State of Virginia, which the slightest investigation or the slightest observation of current events in recent years would show to be fully as good as that maintained in the city of Washington, where murders, rapes, and other crimes are constantly paraded in the newspapers published at the nation's capital.

I apprehend, too, Mr. President, that the suggestions which have been made to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], and those which have been made to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], come perhaps from some architects, or perhaps from some disappointed competitor who competed in the selection of these plans.

Mr. HOAR. Oh, Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, the person to whom I referred is not an architect. He has no interest except in the ornamentation and improvement of the national capital, for which he has a great passion. He may be mistaken, but he is absolutely disinterested, and I am sure has no other motive but that which I have stated.

Mr. HAWLEY. I want to say about the same thing myself. I do not know very much about architecture, and I do not know that that has anything to do with it, but my judgment is based partly on my own opinion and partly on that of an architect who has been employed in different parts of the country, but has nothing to do with this business at all. He has, however, shown by his great works that he is really an architect.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, if we wait until some architects cease to criticise the plans gotten up by other architects we shall never have a memorial bridge.

This matter has been under discussion for twelve or fifteen years. These are not the first plans that have been prepared by the authority of Congress and submitted to this body. Colonel Hains, I think, is the name of one of the engineers of the War Department who submitted a plan, and Major Symons submitted another plan.

An appropriation was made and the Secretary of War instructed to invite the leading architects of the country to submit suitable plans. They were submitted by four of the most distinguished men in that profession in this country and subjected to the scrutiny and examination of a board appointed by the Secretary of War, composed of engineers and of architects. This board selected from the numerous plans submitted one which commended itself to them as meeting in every particular the demands of the occasion.

Mr. CULLOM. Which one?

Mr. MARTIN. The plan prepared by a man named Burr. That is the second of these plans.

Mr. CULLOM. To cost how much?

Mr. MARTIN. To cost less than \$4,000,000. I have heard a number of criticisms of the great draw, the massive proportions, and the magnificence of this structure, but it has remained for the Senator from Connecticut to criticise it because it is not expensive enough; it is not strong enough and magnificent enough.

Mr. HAWLEY. Why, Mr. President, I did not mention a figure in connection with it.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator need not have mentioned figures to convey that idea, but he conveyed that idea to my mind, and I may safely say he conveyed to the minds of other Senators the idea that this bridge did not rise to the proportions, did not come up to the grandeur of the structure that should be erected here as a monument to the patriotism and valor of the American soldier.

But, Mr. President, this matter, as I say, has been through careful investigation at the War Department. It has received the approval of the Board of Engineers and of architects, and it has received the approval of the Secretary of War. Fifteen years have been consumed in going over and discussing plans; and it does seem to me that if we are ever to erect a memorial bridge it is time to take the first step in connection with it.

The matter has received the careful consideration of the Com-

mittee on the District of Columbia. They reported in favor of it without a dissenting vote, as an amendment to this bill, and it was referred by that committee to the Committee on Appropriations. If the Committee on Appropriations has not seen fit to examine the matter, or has not had time to examine it, it has not been because it has not been persistently, and, I may say, almost continuously, pressed upon their consideration. My colleague and I have twice appeared before that committee and appealed to them in the most earnest manner to give this matter consideration.

It does seem to me that if this plan does not meet the approbation of that committee, the least they could have done would have been to devise something by which this matter could have been kept in motion and could have been proceeded with, with a view to an ultimate determination, instead of turning it down absolutely as unworthy of being taken up, and providing the means whereby something more worthy of the consideration of the Senate could be devised and presented.

We have a surplus of money in the Treasury. We see the Senate appropriating millions and millions of dollars, and yet we find hesitation in appropriating the small sum of \$200,000 to commence work upon a bridge constituting a link in the great highway from the national capital to the national cemetery on the Arlington estate.

Mr. President, I feel it is useless for me to prolong my remarks on this subject. I must say I feel that if this bridge is to be constructed at all, this, of all occasions, is the time to do it. It has been considered by competent men, by men skilled in the profession of architecture. We have a plan which has met their approval, and met the approval of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which I feel, I may safely say, has as much at heart the welfare of this city as has the Committee on Appropriations, and as much at heart the due regard which should always be paid to the Treasury of the United States as has that committee. The amendment has been recommended by the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I trust the Senate will adopt it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" have it.

Mr. MARTIN and Mr. STEWART called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TELLER. On this matter I intend to vote "nay," and therefore I want to say a word.

I am very much in favor of building this bridge, not simply for the purpose of a passageway across the Potomac. It is one of the things that we can do that will bring some credit to this city and to the nation.

We have a plan submitted, but I believe no Senator has seen the report until within the last three or four days. Unless we are to abandon the consideration of what kind of a bridge this shall be, and allow the engineers to determine that question for us, we are in no condition to pass upon this question.

Mr. President, I do not claim to be a bridge builder, but I have some knowledge of what I consider a good bridge, and I think that any man who has good common sense would make some criticisms of this bridge as proposed. I have no doubt that plan No. 1, which has been selected by the engineers, is the best plan, with the hasty examination I have made of the others, but it does not follow that that is just such a plan as we want. If we are to put fifteen or sixteen million dollars in this bridge, not for the purpose simply of a causeway across the river, but as a matter of beauty and as a monument to the distinguished dead, we want to take a little time. There is no hurry about this matter, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I recall that when I first came here there was a proposition to build a library for this Government, and on every occasion I voted against the schemes that came from the House, because they were not of the character I believed we were entitled to have. Year after year we resisted the attempt to build in haste a library, saying, "It is better to wait and build something creditable to the nation." We did wait, and we got that which everybody in the world who has looked at it declares is a credit to the American people.

I want a bridge of that kind; I want it built; I expect to see it built; but I do not believe in accepting the first proposition some engineer or some architect presents. As a member of the Senate, I expect to have something to say about it, and I want the architects and the bridge builders and the æsthetic people of the country to have an opportunity to determine which of the designs we ought to select. I shall regard it as exceedingly unfortunate if we now select one of these plans, with the little knowledge we have on the subject, hoping we will know more about it, and with the firm belief that we will build the bridge.

Mr. CULLOM. Of course we will.

Mr. TELLER. We will some time build it, and I hope we shall build that of which the people of the country may say, as they say of the Library, "It is a credit to the American people." I will vote against this proposition.

Mr. STEWART. If we do build it, I hope we will pay the architect and not do as we did in the case of the Library.

Mr. MASON obtained the floor.

Mr. McMILLAN. I suggest that we take a rising vote rather than by yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut in the chair). The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. McMILLAN. I beg pardon.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, one of the great things about civilization is the grand army of those who do not know, who have not had time to think. The proposition for this bridge has been submitted to the people whom we pay for thinking for us. It has been submitted to the proper Department of this Government. If you wish to go to Arlington to-day, there are two routes—one of them over a bridge where you have to go single file, for fear the bridge will fall down if your horses trot, and the other over a bridge where the locomotives run, which will frighten your team. This makes it almost impossible, naturally, to reach the soil of Virginia.

The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] said he was not sure about the architecture of the bridge. If all the questions that are presented to the American people that he is not sure of were submitted to him, there would be no question passed upon in the next six hundred years. We have left it to the Department to fix the memorial bridge. There is not a connecting link, an absolute geographical and physical connection, between the capital and Virginia, between the capital of the nation that was preserved by the boys who are buried at Arlington and that grand Commonwealth. You can go single file across a rotten bridge, or wait two or three hours to cross the bridge that we tried to cross yesterday.

Mr. President—

Art is long and time is fleeting.

They tell us that the North and the South are one, and that the Spanish war made us one. I heard yesterday, upon Memorial Day, speeches that put me in doubt as to whether we did not make a mistake when we licked you fellows down South. I thought it was right in a boyish way. Some of you thought differently. The proposition here to-day is to build a memorial bridge which shall be dedicated to the honor of all those who have died for their country, and in it are involved the sentiments of a nation and the practical possibilities of getting out of the hottest, meanest town in summer.

I do not mean to say that Washington in summer is the meanest town in the United States. I mean to say this: We are spending millions of money to acquire insular possessions. Transports are paid for out of the National Treasury. We are paying the national undertaker more than is proposed for this bridge. It is to be built, if it is built, for the honor of the soldiers who died for this country, and there is an underlying sentiment that it will unite in a physical way the old Commonwealth of Virginia, that was the mother of Presidents until Ohio broke into her class, and the capital of the nation. Why should we not honor those dead and gone, and build a bridge that will bring us physically nearer to that historic soil?

Before I sit down I will say that yesterday the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and the distinguished Senator from Michigan had a joint debate under the trees, and after it was all over we agreed that it was a common country, under a common flag, marching to a common destiny. I simply rose to give the reason why I shall vote in favor of the memorial bridge.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Iowa in his statement has doubled and trebled the cost of this bridge. I beg leave to call his attention to page 22 of the report on the subject, where it is shown that, with all the modifications recommended and suggested, its cost will be less than five millions, not nine or ten or fifteen.

Mr. GALLINGER. On page 2, I will say to the Senator from Virginia, there is this statement:

The estimated cost of Mr. Burr's structure, as designed originally, is \$3,680,672—

Mr. DANIEL. That is right.

Mr. GALLINGER. And General Wilson says:

And the board estimates that the modifications recommended will add about 32 per cent, bringing the total cost up to \$4,860,000.

Mr. DANIEL. I say, with all modification, it is less than \$5,000,000—to wit, \$4,860,000.

In respect of the suggestion of the Senator from Montana, a citation of a man being sandbagged on a bridge between here and Virginia does not by any means criminate anybody in Virginia, and I do not see why the Senator might not just as well have attributed the offense to Washington as to the other side of the river. As suggested by my colleague, disorders occur on the suburbs and sometimes in the heart of large cities, and the fact that those who belong to the sporting classes of Washington occasionally overwash into Virginia is no remarkable fact, but one which is coincident with the history of every city in the world.

But it does not constitute a reason why we should change the

Constitution and laws of the country, or why we should introduce into the discussion of a mere proposition to build a bridge judicial or political questions as to the retrocession of certain territory in Virginia to the District of Columbia. If the reforms which he thinks would follow the possession of that territory under the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia should arise, there would still be another border of the State of Virginia just a little farther on, where, if the facts were that these disorders are due to the circumstance that they are beyond the borders of the District of Columbia, there would be at once a duplication of them, and the distinguished Senator would have to be changing borders and retroceding and working over again the State and District lines of our country until he got even Montana into the District of Columbia.

So the suggestion, Mr. President, is a mere fanciful one and not predicated upon any condition which the distinguished Senator can suggest any method of alleviating, and certainly it is wholly disconnected with the establishment of this bridge.

The ground to which this bridge goes on the other side of the river is ground that belongs to the United States and is under the jurisdiction of the United States. It is territory already, by the necessary course of events, identified with the immediate interests of the national capital. With respect to Fort Myer, the Secretary of War has time and again called the attention of Congress to the fact that for military purposes this bridge is desirable. In connection with the national cemetery at Arlington a second feature of desirability arises. There is still another. The United States has established, by recent enactment, an agricultural station on the Arlington estate, and every day that we live new necessities arise for the connection of that territory with the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, as to the design of the bridge, I should be very modest and deferential in expressing my opinion upon the subject, for I do not pretend to be either a bridge builder or an expert judge of works of art, but looking at the design as it is pictured in the report which has been made to us by the Secretary of War, it appears to me to be a most noble and substantial and excellent design. There were four competing designs submitted to the Secretary of War and the board of experts who examined them. They recommend a particular design, with certain modifications. On that board were Lieutenant-Colonel Allen, of the Corps of Engineers; Maj. Thomas W. Symons, Capt. D. D. Gaillard, and Messrs. Stanford White and James D. Hill. Of course, any design of such a structure will find critics from some source or another.

A man must serve his time to ev'ry trade,
Save censure; critics all are ready made.

The expert officers of the Government who know about such things, who are constantly dealing in such things, with such assistance as has been invoked, have recommended this design. There is no proposition to have any other design submitted, and it seems to me that after fifteen years of preliminary motions the time has come to try this case and to decide it. It seems to me that this appropriation should be made and that the work should go on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. I will not insist upon the yeas and nays.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator can withdraw the call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw the demand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair understand that the demand for the yeas and nays is recalled?

Mr. MARTIN. I am willing to waive it. Let us take a rising vote.

Mr. McMILLAN. I suggested that we determine it by a rising vote.

Mr. ALDRICH. A rising vote, Mr. President.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

Mr. HOAR. I hope the call for a division will be withdrawn.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let the call for a division be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The call for the division will be regarded as withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does any Senator desire to reserve any amendment made as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. MORGAN. I reserve the amendment on the subject of the appropriation for the exposition at St. Louis.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is any other amendment reserved?

Mr. CULLOM and others. No.

Mr. RAWLINS rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah desire to reserve the amendment which he proposed as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. RAWLINS. Yes.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no need of that. The bill will still be open to amendment in the Senate.

Mr. RAWLINS. Very well.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no other amendments than the one reserved by the Senator from Alabama, the question is, Will the Senate concur in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole?

The amendments were concurred in.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is in the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. I beg leave to offer an amendment.
Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. There is an amendment reserved.
Mr. DANIEL. I offer an amendment to come in after line 15, on page 67. It is the amendment as to State claims, with slight verbal changes.

Mr. STEWART. Leaving out Nevada?
Mr. DANIEL. Yes; there are slight verbal amendments to which I ask the Secretary to call attention.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia offers an amendment.
The SECRETARY. After the amendment inserted after line 15, on page 67, it is proposed to insert:

Settlement of certain State claims—
Mr. DANIEL. This is the amendment which was reported and recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MARTIN. Striking out Nevada?
Mr. DANIEL. Striking out Nevada and leaving out certain words which are marked.

Mr. ALLISON. I will be glad to know the words that are stricken out.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will indicate the words stricken out.

The SECRETARY. The words "and Nevada," in line 19 are stricken out, the word "and" inserted between the words "California" and "Oregon;" and the same is done in lines 22 and 23 following.

Mr. DANIEL. Then there is one of which I will state the purpose. It refers to proceedings which have been taken. No proceeding had been actually taken in the case of Virginia, and it was simply to refer to the proceedings contemplated by that act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL].

The amendment was agreed to.
The amendment as agreed to is as follows:

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN STATE CLAIMS.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Attorney-General are hereby fully authorized and empowered to compromise, adjust, and finally settle with the governors, respectively, of the States herein named, or with such person or persons as may be authorized by the laws of said several States to act in their behalf in making the several settlements herein provided for, such settlements to be made upon such terms and conditions as to them may seem just and equitable, subject to approval by Congress as hereinafter provided, and said compromises, adjustments, and settlements to be made by said Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of War, and Attorney-General with the following States, namely:

Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New York for and on account of advances and expenditures made by said States in the war of 1812 with Great Britain and now in dispute; with the State of South Carolina for and on account of advances and expenditures made by said State in the war of 1812 with Great Britain now in dispute, and also on account of money expended by said State for military purposes in the Florida war of 1836, 1837, and 1838 now in dispute, and as against Virginia and South Carolina the claims of the United States on account of principal and interest of the unpaid bonds of said States, respectively, due to the United States and held in its own right or in trust by the United States; and with the States of California and Oregon for and on account of advances and expenditures made by said States in the war of the rebellion and claimed to be due them, being the claims and demands made by said States of California and Oregon, and now on file and particularly described and mentioned in Senate Report No. 544, part 2, second session Fifty-fifth Congress.

And any compromise or settlement they may make with the said States, respectively, shall be fully reported to Congress for its future further action, stating the amounts, if any, which should be paid by the United States to any of said States and the amounts, if any, which should be paid by any of said States to the United States. And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to suspend until further action of Congress any act or proceeding under provisions of section 4 of the act approved March 3, 1869, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to reimburse the governors of States and Territories for expenses incurred by them in aiding the United States to raise and organize and supply and equip the Volunteer Army of the United States in the existing war with Spain,'" as respects the States of Virginia and South Carolina.

Mr. COCKRELL. Now let us take up the reserved amendment. The Senator from Rhode Island has an amendment to offer to it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have two amendments to offer to the amendment. After the word "regulations," in line 13 of the printed amendment in relation to the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, I move to insert "and under conditions;" and, in line 1 on the second page of the amendment, to insert "hereafter" before "prescribed;" and strike out "the Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "Congress;" so as to read:

Under rules and regulations and under conditions to be hereafter prescribed by Congress.

Mr. COCKRELL. I agree to that amendment.
Mr. ALDRICH. That is, Congress instead of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.
Mr. ALDRICH. At the end of the amendment I move to insert:

And provided further, That all sums expended by the Government on account of said exposition, except for its own buildings and exhibits and the care of the same, shall be deducted from any general appropriation made for said exposition.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no objection to that.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.
Mr. MORGAN. I offer an amendment to reduce the sum appropriated \$2,000,000.

Mr. FORAKER. I make the point of order that no sum is appropriated. The amendment does not appropriate anything, as I understand it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not a dollar except \$10,000.
Mr. FORAKER. It is simply a declaration that when certain things have been done to constitute a condition precedent, Congress will then do something.

Mr. MORGAN. I move to reduce that sum \$2,000,000.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama moves an amendment to strike out "\$5,000,000" where it occurs and insert "\$3,000,000."

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I suppose this amendment has passed the stage where a question of order can be made upon it, and I am glad of it, and for the reason that I want the St. Louis Exposition provided for to a reasonable extent. I have here a statement of all the appropriations we have made for similar expositions.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Will the Senator from Alabama permit me? I understood the Senator to say that the amendment has reached a stage where a point of order can not be made. I do not feel like subscribing to that doctrine. I suppose the point of order can be made at any time, and if made in Committee of the Whole and overruled, it can be made again in the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. I made no assertion on that subject. I accepted the proposition for the purposes of my own argument that the amendment was before the Senate, no objection having been made to the right of the Senate to consider it. Under the rule, I believe, the amendment is open to a point of order. I do not choose to make it; I hope it will not be made.

For these subjects, beginning in 1866 for the first French Paris Exposition with an appropriation of \$206,403, we have now appropriated and expended \$13,599,340.12. I will put this entire statement in my remarks, to show just what we have been doing.

Aid or loans to expositions and expenses of Government exhibits thereat.

Paris, France, 1866	\$206,403.00
Vienna, Austria, 1873	200,000.00
Centennial Exposition, Philadelphia, 1876:	
Loan (repaid)	1,500,000.00
Government exhibit	578,500.00
Paris, France, 1878	180,000.00
Sidney and Melbourne, Australia, 1879	28,000.00
Berlin, Germany, fisheries, 1880	20,000.00
London, England, fisheries, 1883	70,000.00
New Orleans Exposition, 1884:	
Loan (never repaid)	1,000,000.00
Final aid to	350,000.00
Government exhibit	300,000.00
Cincinnati Industrial Exposition, 1884, Government exhibit	10,000.00
Cincinnati Centennial, 1888	147,700.00
Melbourne, Australia, 1888	50,000.00
Barcelona, Spain, 1888	25,000.00
Brussels, Belgium, 1888	30,000.00
Paris, France, 1889	250,000.00
World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893:	
Gift	2,550,000.00
Expenses of commission, building, exhibits, etc.	2,834,737.12
Atlanta Exposition, 1885, Government exhibit and building	200,000.00
Nashville (Tenn.) Exposition, 1897, Government exhibit and building	130,000.00
Omaha Trans-Mississippi Exposition, 1898, Government exhibit and building	200,000.00
Philadelphia Exposition of American Products, etc.	350,000.00
Toledo Centennial Exposition	500,000.00
Pan-American Exposition, Buffalo, N. Y.	500,000.00
Present Paris Exposition	1,379,000.00
Total	13,599,340.12

In 1875 we loaned the Philadelphia Exposition \$1,500,000, all of which has been repaid to the Government by the exposition company. We then provided for the Government exhibit there

\$578,500. That is all the money we are out for the great exposition at Philadelphia, to celebrate that great national event, the centennial of American independence.

Now we are asked to appropriate \$5,000,000, or to pledge the Congress so that there will be an appropriation of \$5,000,000 to assist in an exposition at St. Louis for the purpose of celebrating really the treaty of acquisition. I suppose that is the object of it. I have not heard this explained very fully by the friends of the measure, either as to their plan and purposes or as to the objects to be attained or the general scope of the exposition.

I do not know under what rules and regulations the exposition is to be conducted. I do not know whether the State of Missouri is contributing anything or whether it is to be done entirely by private subscription, but to appropriate \$5,000,000 or pledge the Government of the United States to appropriate that sum is a very great tribute to Mr. Jefferson and a much greater tribute to the doctrine of expansion than we have made to the declaration of the independence of the United States.

The plea of expansion is put up here as the justification of this very romantic expenditure of public funds. While it is not supported by Senators who have been very much committed to that doctrine, so far as I understand, I am very happy to know that we are now celebrating, or about trying to celebrate, the expansion of our commerce, of our population, and our enterprising vigor and of the influence of our institutions as it was in 1803 by the acquisitions that we made from France. The argument is very appropriate to existing conditions, and it answers a great many objections that have been made by gentlemen who have been rather flambouyant in their speeches on the opposite side of this question.

But I still believe that a sum of money equal to what was actually appropriated, without requiring any of it to be returned to the United States, for celebrating the independence of this country is quite sufficient for the purpose of celebrating the expansion that we had when we crossed the Mississippi River and commenced planting a field for the enterprise of our people beyond that great water course. If the Mississippi River had been 300 miles wide, as the La Plata is at Buenos Ayres, I suppose it is likely that the enterprise of the present generation would not have crossed it. That would be about the distance, I believe, from the nearest coast of the United States to Porto Rico, a much greater distance than that between Key West and the coast of Florida on the north.

The truth is that we have arrived at that period in our history when the American people receive with gratification the evidence of our success and prosperity under the doctrines that were laid down by Mr. Jefferson when he felt at first blush that he was really violating the Constitution of the United States in order to make that acquisition by treaty from France.

He soon got over his difficulties, however, when he realized the fact that the scheme of government which we had established here was not merely for the purpose of conserving the interests that were included in the original boundaries of the land, but that it really extended and spread itself out in one way and another, chiefly through its influence, but as largely as might be necessary through its physical power and its power of conquest, if you please, so as to comprehend all the nations of the earth that chose to accept it; not that we desired to force it upon anybody, not that we desired to become a propaganda for the purpose of spreading and confirming republican institutions in the world, but he saw, as we see now in the clearer light of experience, that it was a necessary element in the character of the people who occupied this country at the beginning of the last century that they should have room to expand all their genius and all their power and all their commercial enterprise and all their institutions of morality and religion to the uttermost parts of the earth.

Now I submit, Mr. President, that \$5,000,000 is too much for this exhibition at St. Louis. I do not blame the people of Missouri or the people of St. Louis for attempting to excel the people of Chicago in the great Columbian Exposition, and I am quite satisfied that in that rivalry which is at the bottom of a good deal of the enterprise on this occasion and on this subject it is not necessary that the Government of the United States should lend itself to the rivalry between St. Louis and Chicago.

Neither is it necessary that the Government of the United States should pass laws and appropriate money for the purpose most largely of the encouragement of the income and the increase of the income of the great railroad companies that concenter at St. Louis. When we come to think it over and find out who is going to make any money out of this enterprise, it is quite obvious it is not the people who will visit St. Louis during the exposition, for they are expected to pay from \$15 to \$30 per capita as a contribution to the treasury of the exposition. The Government will not make any money out of it. This amendment does not contemplate that the Government of the United States shall ever receive a dollar back of the expenditure of the \$5,000,000, and when we pass this amendment the expenditure will never be less than \$5,000,000.

Who, then, makes the money? Not, perhaps, the exhibitors

themselves. The merchants who live in St. Louis will make something, and I am gratified that they will have the opportunity of doing that. The hotel keepers will make a great deal. But the railroad companies will make the large bulk of the gain out of this contribution from the Treasury of the United States. Well, they are rich enough and they are strong enough. They have got power enough, and they use it with all possible severity.

They concenter at St. Louis and branch out to the Northwest as far as the State of Washington, and to the Southwest as far as the boundaries of Mexico, and across to the Pacific at various points where they tap that great ocean. They are carrying and will carry (and the Senate of the United States intends to help them to have the job) all the commerce between the center of this country and the Pacific Ocean. They have it monopolized now; and this amendment is a direct contribution to the assistance of that monopoly which now silences the voice of the Senate of the United States and makes it stand trembling before its master.

I had no reason, Mr. President, of comity or kindness; I have no prejudice of my Southern birth and my Southern sympathies to urge in behalf of this amendment or against it; but I have a keen sense of justice connected with it, and I am disposed to assert, and I think the Senate of the United States in its heart and mind will justify me in asserting, that we ought not to make contributions out of the Treasury of the United States to any great band of corporate authorities that are already reaping enormous harvests out of the people of this country.

This exposition is valued at \$15,000,000 to start with. It is expected that St. Louis, of course, or the company that controls the exposition, will make that money all back out of the people. The money that we are contributing now, the \$5,000,000 which we are called upon to contribute, comes out of the people of the United States. I made a little estimate about my own State, and I can not figure it down to less than \$250,000 that will be taxed upon the people of Alabama for the purpose of this contribution to St. Louis.

We love St. Louis well enough to do that for her if we were able to do it, but our people are not in a condition to pay that amount of money, levied upon them by the tax collector, for the glory and honor of any place, and more particularly is that a fact when we get no sympathy from St. Louis or Missouri and no assistance, so far as we know, in the records and annals of the Congress of the United States in any great enterprise that we are connected with and upon which the resurrection of the South depends. We have no encouragement, no sympathy, no assistance.

Notwithstanding that, I would most cheerfully vote for any reasonable sum, and I think I am voting for a very large sum when I put the claims of St. Louis for celebrating Jefferson's expansion upon the same footing precisely that I put the claims of Philadelphia when she was celebrating that wonderful event, the independence of the United States. Can she not afford to put up with a sum of money from the Government of the United States for celebrating the expansion of our territory and of our power to the West that our friends in Philadelphia even thought might be extravagant, and they promised to pay a million dollars back, and did it, in order to get our assistance to celebrate the anniversary of American independence?

Well, this business, Mr. President, really has gone far enough. When we have spent \$13,000,000 and upward in this work of expositions, and turn our attention to what results can be figured up and shown to the American people as having been accomplished by this expenditure, I think we will all feel that we have gone quite far enough in this direction. I do not propose to cut St. Louis off until she has had a full chance to compete with Chicago. She is entitled to it. That is what she wants, and I am in favor of giving it to her. I think that \$3,000,000 from the Treasury of the United States is quite enough to enable her to accomplish that feat if she can do it.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I have heard a great many remarkable speeches in the Senate, but never one so extraordinary as that to which we have just listened.

The memory of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] is very short. When I as a Missouri Senator stood here at the expense of my health and the risk of my life to prevent legislation that I thought and the Senator from Alabama said would ruin his State and the entire Southern people, I was under the impression that I was the friend of the South and that I was doing all I could to rebuild her ruined industries and her desolated fields.

I do not know to what measure the Senator refers when he says that Missouri has no sympathy with the South. Missouri showed during the war and since the war her deepest and most earnest sympathy with the South and solicitude for her interests. There has never been a measure before the Senate that I have not supported earnestly and vigorously in order to rebuild the Southern people and bring them back to prosperity.

I can imagine no other bill to which the Senator refers than the Nicaraguan bill, to which he seems to give his entire time and attention. I have never been able to agree with the details of that measure as presented by the Senator, and I tell him now that

rather than give up my right of judgment and my honest convictions upon that or any other measure I would sink all hope of this exposition a thousand fathoms beneath the waves of the ocean. I shall do what I consider to be my duty as he will do his, but no such threat and no such reproach as he has made here to-day will have the slightest effect upon my action as a Senator.

The Senator says that under no circumstances could the United States receive anything from this exposition. He has not read the amendment. The amendment provides that the United States, in the event that this exposition is successful, shall receive its due proportion of the profits, if there be any. The municipality of St. Louis, the people of the State of Missouri, propose to give \$11,000,000. Sixteen States and Territories are included in the Louisiana purchase, with more than twenty million people, and the valuation of billions of dollars, paying thousands of millions of revenues to the Treasury of the United States each year.

Are we asking too much when we consider what Chicago received? The Senator says, "This is a question of rivalry." If so, it is a generous and just and proper rivalry. Chicago received \$5,700,000. He says that \$5,000,000 in this instance is an enormous appropriation. It is true, by the list the Senator is now referring to, Chicago received \$4,700,000; but it must be remembered that there were two and a half million of souvenir half dollars, the first half of which were sold at a dollar each, making about \$5,700,000 that was appropriated in the bill for the establishment of the exposition in the city of Chicago.

It is not my purpose, Mr. President, to drag into this debate the question of expansion. I do not propose to be diverted from the legitimate question before the Senate by entering into that question, or the Philippines, or Porto Rico, or Cuba. Much is to be said upon that question. All I wish to say is that the people of this immense area, won to the Union by the prophetic genius of Thomas Jefferson—and all parties and men of all climes even bow before his shrine for that act, if for none other—deserve this \$5,000,000, at least when the people of the State and the citizens of St. Louis put up \$11,000,000 to this \$5,000,000, which is not out of proportion to the geographical extent or the population of that vast area.

Now, Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate by going into a detail of the vast resources and the great importance to the whole country of this exposition as developing what the American people are willing to do in that new country, which was the frontier at the time Mr. Jefferson made the purchase from France. We have celebrated the discovery of America. We celebrate each recurring year that great event, the declaration of American independence, and this, the next greatest event in the history of the American people, deserves to be celebrated in justice to the vast results which our civilization and the enterprise of our people have brought about.

We are not here as mendicants. We do not ask the Senator from Alabama for one single dollar in the way of a gratuity. We simply ask that in proportion to what we are willing to do ourselves in behalf of a great enterprise which brings to our shores visitors to go back and report the vast possibilities of this new Republic we shall have from the Treasury of the United States the same treatment that has been given to others.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendment.

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. RAWLINS. I offer the following amendment—

Mr. MORGAN. I rise to a question of order. What amendment was agreed to? I offered to amend the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment proposing to reduce the amount from \$5,000,000 to \$3,000,000 was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN. By a vote of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, sir; by a vote of the Senate. The Senator from Utah offers an amendment, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 53 strike out "station," in line 9, and insert "stations;" strike out the word "point," in line 11, and insert "points;" after the word "Idaho," in line 11, insert the words "and Utah;" so as to read:

For establishing fish hatching and fish-culture stations, including construction of buildings and ponds, and equipment, at some suitable points in Idaho and Utah, to be selected by the United States Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the purchase of a site.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

HOOR OF MEETING.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow, and at

the same hour on the remaining day of this week. I make the request for the two days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet at 11 o'clock on both Friday and Saturday. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WARNER, Mr. KNOX, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. LLOYD, and Mr. McDOWELL as managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ALLOWANCE OF EXCEPTIONS.

Mr. HOAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8366) to amend section 953 of the Revised Statutes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 1, and agrees to the same with amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out insert "but in case said judge is satisfied that owing to the fact that he did not preside at the trial, or for any other cause, that he can not fairly pass upon said motion and allow and sign said bill of exceptions, then he may, in his discretion, grant a new trial to the party moving therefor."

Strike out all of section 3; and the Senate agree to the same.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 2, and agrees to the same.

GEORGE F. HOAR,
O. H. PLATT,
A. O. BACON.

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOHN J. JENKINS,
JULIUS KAHN,
W. L. TERRY.

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

EDWARD GOTTFRIED.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in response to the Senate resolution of April 18, 1900, calling upon that officer to furnish to the Senate copies of all papers in relation to the alleged depredations on the property and injuries and indignities upon the person of Edward Gottfried, a citizen of the United States, by Peruvian revolutionists.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 31, 1900.

SAMUEL S. WHITE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 351) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. White.

The amendment of the House was, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twelve."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate nonconcur in the House amendment and ask for a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. QUARLES, and Mr. KENNEY were appointed.

LOUISE D. SMITH.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3662) granting an increase of pension to Louise D. Smith.

The amendments were, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-five;" and in line 9, after the word "receiving," to insert "and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said William H. Smith until they reach the age of 16 years."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

JOSEPH LONGMIRE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2938) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Longmire.

The amendment of the House was, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ANNIE D. M. WOOD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1975) granting a pension to Annie D. M. Wood.

The amendment of the House was, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CLARA H. INCH.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1593) granting an increase of pension to Clara H. Inch.

The amendment of the House was, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ROBERT GAMBLE, JR.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 294) granting an increase of pension to Robert Gamble, jr.

The amendment of the House was, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. GALLINGER. By unanimous consent it was agreed that half an hour should be devoted to pension bills after the sundry civil appropriation bill had been passed. I do not expect to call up that order this evening, but I beg to make the request, inasmuch as there are a large number of House pension bills on the calendar which ought to be passed, that the time be extended so that the committee will be given one hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. One hour when?

Mr. GALLINGER. Immediately after the routine morning business to-morrow.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wish the Senator would not make that request to-night. There is a bill which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS], who has left the Chamber, has been trying faithfully for two or three days to get brought up for consideration, which I think is a bill of the utmost importance, and that is the extradition bill. Of course it can not interfere with appropriation bills, but I wish the Senator from New Hampshire would not ask that the order which has already been made be extended. He will find other opportunities before the time of adjournment to get all his pension bills through.

Mr. GALLINGER. I accept the suggestion, Mr. President.

Mr. SEWELL. I gave notice a few days ago that immediately on the conclusion of the bill which we have just passed I would ask the Senate to consider the Military Academy appropriation bill. It is too late, I suppose, to-night to go on with that bill, but immediately after the morning hour to-morrow I shall call it up.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall insist that the unanimous-consent order shall not be vacated by a proposition of that kind. I may arrange it with the Senator from New Jersey, but I will not yield my right.

Mr. SEWELL. I was not aware that any unanimous-consent order had been made.

Mr. GALLINGER. Such is the fact.

Mr. McMILLAN. I was going to ask unanimous consent, with the consent of the Senator from New Jersey, to take up to-morrow morning as soon as possible House bill 11646, a short bill. It is called the "river and harbor bill," and it will not take more than fifteen or twenty minutes to dispose of it. There are a number of amendments to it, and I would like to send it over to the House to-morrow.

Mr. HALE. As there is a pretty full Senate, I want to present this consideration to the fair view of every Senator here: There are only two appropriation bills left—the general deficiency bill and the Military Academy bill.

Mr. PETTIGREW. And the river and harbor bill.

Mr. HALE. The river and harbor bill is not a regular appropriation bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no appropriation in the river and harbor bill.

Mr. HALE. That is a distinctive bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. For surveys.

Mr. HALE. It is not claimed to be an appropriation bill, but is for surveys.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Still it proposes to appropriate four or five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HALE. Still it is not a regular appropriation bill, because

it was determined that there should be no river and harbor appropriation bill this year.

Now, if the Senate will take up these two appropriation bills—and both can be passed, I think, to-morrow—then the appropriation bills will go into conference, and Saturday and Sunday will be spent upon them, and Monday, and in those days, after the appropriation bills have been passed, there will be opportunity for all these other bills. For the bill in charge of the Senator from Michigan, for the pension bills, for the extradition bill, and for all other bills there will be that space of time that can be taken up by their consideration.

I hope the Senate will allow the appropriation bills, which must be passed, to be passed first, so that we may get out of the way. Otherwise there will be a wrangle for precedence between different bills, and the appropriation bills will be postponed. They must come up, and they will come at a later time and interfere with everything. Let us get those bills out of the way of other Senators, and let us get them into the committee room—into conference—where Senators want us to be with them, and then the Senate can take up other matters.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 1, 1900, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, May 31, 1900.

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

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PAIR.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a correction. I have a general pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], and thinking that he was here yesterday, I voted. I find he is reported in the RECORD as paired. I very much regret that the record appears that way. I would not have voted, of course, if I had known that the gentleman was absent.

TRUSTS.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up the following privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred House resolution No. 273, have had the same under consideration and report the following as a substitute therefor:

Resolved, That House Joint Resolution 138, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, be made the special order in the House and taken up immediately on the adoption of this order; that general debate shall continue during the day and during a night session from 8 to 10.30 o'clock, and until 5 p. m. Friday, June 1, when the previous question on the resolution and amendments thereto reported from the committee to its final passage shall be considered as ordered, and the vote taken thereon without delay or intervening motion.

That the bill (H. R. 10539) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, be made the special order in the House and taken up immediately after the disposition of said House joint resolution 138; that general debate thereon be limited to one hour, thirty minutes on each side, and that the same be then considered under the five-minute rule as in the Committee of the Whole until 4 o'clock p. m., of Saturday, June 2, when the previous question on the bill and pending amendments shall be considered as ordered and the final vote taken; that at the opening of the general debate on House joint resolution 138 the amendments to H. R. 10539, proposed on the part of the minority in their views as filed, shall be read from the Clerk's desk and considered as pending when the vote is taken on said bill H. R. 10539, the time occupied in such reading not to be taken from the time of any member; that all members have leave to print upon such measures or either of them within five days after final vote taken.

This rule shall not interfere with the consideration of conference reports.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the previous question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand that will give us forty minutes for debate?

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

The question was taken; and the previous question was ordered.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, there are on the Calendar of the House two measures reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, one a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution that would place in the power of Congress the legislation upon the subject of trusts; the other is a proposed amendment to the Sherman anti-trust law. If this rule should be adopted, all of to-day and a night session lasting from 8 o'clock to half past 10 and all to-morrow until 5 o'clock would be devoted to general debate on the proposed constitutional amendment. At 5 o'clock to-morrow a vote is to be taken without intervening motion, and under the terms of the rule no amendment will be in order upon this first proposition.

Immediately upon the conclusion of this first proposition—that is to say, on Saturday morning, there will be general debate for one hour, thirty minutes on each side, upon the bill proposing an