

## MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

*To be assistant surgeons with the rank of first lieutenant.*

Arthur W. Morse, of Illinois, February 4, 1901.  
Frank C. Baker, of the District of Columbia, February 4, 1901.  
Henry Stevens Kiersted, of Pennsylvania, February 4, 1901.  
Allie W. Williams, of Georgia, February 4, 1901.  
John J. Reilly, of New York, February 4, 1901.  
Jerome Stewart Chaffee, of New York, February 4, 1901.

## JUDGE-ADVOCATE-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

*To be judge-advocate with the rank of major.*

Capt. Edgar S. Dudley, assistant quartermaster, United States Army (major and judge-advocate of volunteers), February 2, 1901.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

## ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

*To be lieutenant-colonel.*

Maj. John G. Butler, Ordnance Department, February 2, 1901.

## INFANTRY ARM.

*To be majors.*

Capt. William Paulding, Tenth Infantry, February 2, 1901.  
Capt. Lorenzo W. Cooke, Third Infantry, February 2, 1901.  
Capt. Francis E. Eltonhead, Twenty-first Infantry, February 2, 1901.

## CAVALRY ARM.

*To be captains.*

First Lieut. Selah R. H. Tompkins, Seventh Cavalry, February 2, 1901.  
First Lieut. Sedgwick Rice, Seventh Cavalry, February 2, 1901.  
First Lieut. Arthur Thayer, Third Cavalry, February 2, 1901.  
First Lieut. John T. Haines, Fifth Cavalry, February 2, 1901.  
First Lieut. Cecil Stewart, Fourth Cavalry, February 2, 1901.  
First Lieut. Floyd W. Harris, Fourth Cavalry, February 2, 1901.  
First Lieut. John T. Nance, Sixth Cavalry, February 2, 1901.  
First Lieut. Charles C. Walcutt, jr., Eighth Cavalry, February 2, 1901.  
First Lieut. John J. Pershing, Tenth Cavalry, February 2, 1901.  
First Lieut. Peter E. Traub, First Cavalry, February 2, 1901.

## MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

*To be surgeons with the rank of major.*

Capt. Adrian S. Polhemus, assistant surgeon, February 2, 1901.  
Capt. William C. Borden, assistant surgeon, February 2, 1901.  
Capt. Edgar A. Mearns, assistant surgeon, February 2, 1901.  
Capt. Guy L. Edie, assistant surgeon, February 2, 1901.  
Capt. William D. Crosby, assistant surgeon, February 2, 1901.  
Capt. William L. Kneeder, assistant surgeon, February 2, 1901.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

*To be surgeons with the rank of major.*

Joseph Milton Heller, of the District of Columbia, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.  
Arlington Pond, of Vermont, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.  
Henry D. Thomason, of Michigan, late major and surgeon, United States Volunteers.  
Samuel O. L. Potter, of California, late major and surgeon, United States Volunteers.  
Robert H. Zauner, of Pennsylvania, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.  
William Bowen, of Tennessee, captain and assistant surgeon, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers.  
Joseph N. Henry, of Pennsylvania, major and surgeon, Thirty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers.  
Walter Whitney, of Illinois, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

*To be assistant surgeons with the rank of captain.*

Clark I. Wertenbaker, of Ohio, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.  
Frank A. E. Disney, of New York, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.  
Charles H. Andrews, of New York, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.  
Robert M. Enders, sr., of Arkansas, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.  
Matthew Leepere, of Missouri, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.  
Charles Anderson, of California, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.  
James S. Kennedy, of Pennsylvania, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.  
Frank P. Kenyon, of Kentucky, late major and surgeon, Fourth Kentucky Volunteers.  
Guy G. Bailey, of Michigan, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

George A. McHenry, of Mississippi, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

Edward F. Horr, of New York, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

Shannon Richmond, of Missouri, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

Elmer S. Tenney, of New Hampshire, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

Samuel D. Huntington, of California, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

James J. Erwin, of Ohio, captain and assistant surgeon, Thirtieth Infantry, United States Volunteers.

James F. Presnell, of Iowa, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

Frederick H. Sparrenburger, of New Jersey, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

Irwin E. Bennett, of Pennsylvania, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

James H. McCall, of Tennessee, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

Thomas C. Stunkard, of Indiana, late major and surgeon, One hundred and fifty-ninth Indiana Volunteers, and acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

Harold W. Cowper, of New York, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

Dwight B. Taylor, of Ohio, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

## FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

First Sergt. Benjamin M. Van Wart, Company E, Forty-sixth Infantry, to be second lieutenant, February 6, 1901.

## FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

Sergt. Maj. George B. Kelley, Forty-ninth Infantry, to be second lieutenant, February 6, 1901.

## ELEVENTH CAVALRY.

First Sergt. John Braeuninger, Troop C, Eleventh Cavalry, to be second lieutenant, February 5, 1901.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

*To be brigadier-general.*

Lieut. Col. James R. Campbell, Thirtieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, January 3, 1901.

*Twenty-ninth Infantry.*

First Lieut. Stephen O. Fugua, Twenty-ninth Infantry, to be captain, February 1, 1901.

Second Lieut. George M. Holley, Twenty-ninth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, February 1, 1901.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 13, 1901.

The House met at 12 o'clock m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

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

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SHATTUCK, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

## SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of further considering the sundry civil appropriation bill, and, pending that motion, I should be glad if we could agree upon the time for general debate.

Mr. McRAE. What proposition does the gentleman submit this morning?

Mr. CANNON. Well, we had an hour upon this side yesterday. Suppose that we make it four hours, two hours and a half to that side and an hour and a half to this side, which would divide it equally, considering that we consumed an hour upon this side yesterday.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I hardly think we will be able to get through in that time, but in the spirit of compromise I will agree to accept that.

Mr. CANNON. The general debate to close in four hours, two and a half hours to the other side, to be controlled by the gentleman from Arkansas, and an hour and a half upon this side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 14018, being the sundry civil appropriation bill, and pending that motion asks unanimous consent that general debate be closed in four hours, two hours and a half to be controlled by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] and one hour and a half to be

controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill, with Mr. HOPKINS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of further consideration of the bill H. R. 14018, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. I should be glad to have the gentleman from Arkansas use some of his time.

Mr. McRAE. If I may have time now, I will yield forty-five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, the real thinking citizens of the country at large are paralyzed at the unprecedented extravagance and expenditures of this Congress. They have every reason to be paralyzed, because, probably since time began, there has never been such a reckless expenditure of money by any other great deliberative body. So calloused have many of the members of both Houses and heads of Departments become that it is now disreputable in their sight for anyone to even suggest or call attention to the criminal waste that is going on in every department of the Government.

One decade ago, or in 1890, it cost us but \$297,736,486.74, or \$4.75 per capita, to operate the Government. In 1897, just before our war period, it cost us \$448,439,622, or \$6.16 per capita, an increase over 1890 of \$150,703,135.26, or a per capita increase of \$1.41.

According to the estimate of Senator ALLISON, of the Finance Committee of the Senate, it will require \$760,000,000, or over \$10 per capita, to operate the Government for 1901, an increase over 1890 of \$462,263,516.26, a per capita increase over 1890 of \$5.25, an increase over 1897 of \$311,560,378, or a per capita increase over 1897 of about \$4.

The appropriations for the War and Navy for 1897 were \$85,787,101. The estimates for this year are \$248,000,000, or \$163,000,000 for 1901 more than for 1897. This leaves \$148,560,378 not accounted for or traceable directly to war appropriations. Then to what must we attribute this enormous increase? I would say largely to the reckless extravagance begotten by the war spirit. Our great Army in 1895 consisted of a little more than 23,000 men and cost us for that year \$23,000,000, or \$1,000 each. Our increased Army hereafter will range from 58,000 to 103,000, and if kept at home on a peace basis will cost us, when full, \$100,000,000 per annum, or an increase over 1895 of \$77,000,000.

Think for a moment the great number of important public buildings this would erect throughout the country. Think how many acres of the arid domain this would reclaim and how many homes this would make for the poor in the congested cities.

The possession of this mighty Army is a constant incentive for the Administration to keep it in some foreign land, where it will be much more expensive, that the people may not be aroused by the mobilization of this great number in useless idleness.

What are the people getting for this increase in the Army and Navy of \$163,000,000 over 1897? They get the right to control a mass of foreign islands and alien races who utterly hate us. Does it pay? We would say "No." Is it just? Not unless the domination of the weak by the strong is just. What else have we obtained? We have been led into such wanton and criminal extravagance in public expenditures and into such a state of royalty and class distinction that we will probably never return to the simple methods of the fathers upon which the exemplary reputation of this Government was established.

While this bill, in common with all other bills during the past several Congresses, is enormously large, it is in keeping with the policy adopted by this Government; and if this policy is to prevail it is difficult to see how these enormous appropriations can be materially reduced.

This is the greatest history-making epoch of the New World. We have the great phantasmagoria passing before our minds, showing the enterprises of the world being grouped into billion-dollar companies, and the great governments of every part of the world in a harmonious step wiping out all small governments, and the monopoly of private industry and of government domination is to be consummated at one and the same time.

What will this great innovation bring forth? Is it to be one or two great governments dominated by the rich for the rich? Are all productive enterprises to be owned by the syndicates for the syndicates? Or is this a great economic evolution moving onward and upward in spite of man? Is the result to be greater economy in government and greater economy in production? Is the goal to be that all business will ultimately be done at a profit and everybody be employed at remunerative wages?

The latter possibility is the natural, inevitable tendency, and what must ultimately be evolved out of this onward march,

though those leading the procession intend it for a special and a favored and limited class.

That business can be conducted more economically by having the railroads all under one management there is no question. That the iron and steel and other industries can be more economically conducted where one great institution practically dominates the business can hardly be disputed. That the government of the world can be more economically, justly, and beneficially administered if the interest of everyone is the concern of all there can be no doubt; and while our double-quick step along the line of universal culmination in government and private enterprises is now dominated by the utterly selfish, practically the only hope left for the everyday citizen is that it is demonstrating beyond measure that the public can and should manage many of these dominating enterprises for the benefit of all.

Misery, hunger, want, poverty, and gross injustice will be scattered all along their slimy trails, but they will certainly teach the masses that the economics of production and transportation are boons that the people will sooner or later demand for themselves, either by a strict governmental regulation or by an ownership for the benefit of all.

That the great iron and steel syndicates, that the oil syndicates, and all the other great trusts have obliterated competition there is no question; that organized labor in the United States and in Europe has obliterated competition between organized laborers there is no question; and a great many of the most advanced thinkers of the world look upon a free and unobstructed competition not as a mere survival of the most persistent, but as one of the most wolfish and selfish principles that was ever placed in an economic code.

You can hear the rumblings in every civilized quarter of the attempt to wipe out competition for all business and all labor, that they may be done at a recognized margin of profit and that all may be permitted to work.

Economists and statesmen may applaud and celebrate the beauties and salutary benefits of a free and unobstructed competition, but the evolution of the times has relegated this long-appreciated doctrine to the waste of the past, and in the future the objects of practical laborers and producers will be to catalogue and regulate a just line of profits due to each class and enterprise, and the aid of the Government will be demanded in support of the new doctrine of a more equitable distribution of the products of labor.

What sound logic or sacred principle is involved in the action of the commission merchants in every great market under the ignoble competitive system, daily competing among themselves with the cotton, wheat, corn, and other products of the producers, with no interests but that of a commission? In their deadly struggle for self they often dispose of the producer's stuff for less than the cost of production. What logic or sound principle is involved in productive communities being burdened with many railroads and many sets of high-priced officials, many great offices and other fixed expenses, for the mere purpose of lowering railroad rates through this old academic principle of free and unobstructed competition. It is not the railroads, but the people, who bear all of the expenses of transportation; and experience has taught the world that wherever combination is possible competition is impossible, and therefore they have the burdens of these numerous useless roads, equipments, and organizations, with but a temporary benefit pending the preparation for a combination. The competitive system is being invaded in every domain of production, transportation, and exchange.

Mr. Connelly, our representative at Auckland, New Zealand, some years ago reported to this Government that for many years concentrated capital had possession of this fertile little country; that the people became desperate, filled the legislative halls with the middle and laboring classes, and wiped out, as it were, the law of competition in all public works. That government in building its railroads, dirt roads, and public buildings, bridges, etc., did not put them up to the highest bidder, but had the state engineer estimate the real value of roads, public buildings, bridges, etc., made its specifications, and then advertised to the laboring men, who prepared and organized for the purpose of completing this work as per plans and specifications, and he reported that the men did organize in divisions, the strong and robust taking the most difficult parts and leaving the easier parts for the old and less able, and in this way the most robust worked from ten to twelve hours instead of 8, and made from \$3 to \$4 per day instead of \$2, the engineer's estimate, and the weaker ones worked shorter hours and earned less, but that all were satisfied, and that this was a country and a time in which every man was, in a measure, his brother's keeper.

Mr. Connelly reported that after four years' trial this was a complete success. He further showed that the government insured the life of any citizen at about one-half the price of the old-line insurance companies, made a small profit, and saved the people the enormous expense of keeping up a crowd of insurance agents, expensive offices, and high-salaried officials; and prevented the



sad spectacle of impoverished widows and orphans. He also reported that when these advanced lines were consummated all of the insurance, banking, and speculative classes doing business there avowed that such would ruin the credit of New Zealand and drive capital away. But, said Mr. Connelly, to the contrary of all these prophecies, the credit of this country was never better, the people were never more harmonious or prosperous than they are now; and now, eight years later, we find they are still progressing.

In last Saturday's *Star* the well-known correspondent, Mr. Frank Carpenter, writing from the capital of New Zealand, says:

The people are running this part of the world; Australia and New Zealand may be called the workingman's continent. They are the Edward Bellamy lands of the present and the centers of all sources of new experiment as to government control in society and labor. During the past year I have traveled quite extensively over them; everywhere I find the eight-hour law and the weekly half holiday. Everywhere in Australia the workmen are to some extent a balance of power, but in New Zealand they boast they own the country.

The government owns the railroads, the telegraph, and telephone, and there are those who hope they will eventually become the owners of the coal mines, gold mines, and factories.

Also, in last Sunday's *New York Journal* Mr. Kolkins, writing from New Zealand, says:

One of the pleasantest features of a railroad ride in this country is to witness the children flocking to the trains in going to or returning from school. They get on the train as if they owned it, and no one asks them for tickets. They ride free of charge. Stations are provided at frequent intervals and each one is a post-office, telegraph and telephone office, and a savings bank as well as railroad and express office, as the government conducts all of these classes of business.

Think of the saving in office expenses by this system and you will be able to comprehend why the railroad fares and the parcels posts are so much cheaper here than in America. In spite of the great expense in the construction and equipment of railroads in this land of high wages and short hours, the railway passenger rate is only about three-fourths of the average price in the States, while the parcels post and telegraph rates are far cheaper. A telegram is sent at a cent a word.

All unskilled labor here is sure of work at a much better wage than in any other country I have ever seen, but I can not recommend skilled laborers, clerks, doctors, etc., to come here. If a man wants a good home and is willing to work hard at any labor to secure it, New Zealand offers splendid advantages, but the man who expects to grow rich from the labor of others, or who is looking for a soft snap, will do well to stay away. This is not the land of millionaires or tramps.

What a eulogy to the statesmanship of this little government. The last Colorado legislature sent a committee to New Zealand to examine this advanced condition, and that committee has made its report to the present legislature, commending many of their advanced methods, and the operating of a government of, by, and for the people. The authorities in Canada are now discussing the advisability of expending the surplus revenues in buying the private telegraph systems of the Dominion, and so the work and the sentiment of the economic world move on in the interest of the people all around us, and while the people of the United States are plunging headlong into the vortex of complete syndicate domination.

The North American, a Republican paper, on February 6, in discussing the unprecedented amalgamation of capital during the last few months, and of the steel trust in particular, says:

Immense quantities of the stocks of corporations wanted for combinations were quietly absorbed at the low level. The multimillionaires had absolute confidence of the reelection of Mr. McKinley, although they did not show their hands until after the election, when they were sure of a clear field for four years.

Is it not possible that this favored one of the trusts and combines will unwittingly be the stumbling-block of their downfall? Are not they so overworking these open opportunities that they are hastening their own ruin?

But some one says, "Be specific, and point out some of the great abuses of this Government and locate the evil."

I would say unhesitatingly that the responsible source, real seat of the evil, is in the truckling subserviency of Congress. Congress tolerates, nurtures, and encourages all existing public evils. The abominable spoils system, and the persistent attempt to remunerate the great syndicates and trusts all over this country for their political aid, and the endeavor of Congressmen to prevent other high officers in other departments of the Government from performing their whole duties, is a withering blight on our body politic. The everlasting tramp of the employees of the Government at the heels of Congressmen, and the nauseating assertion that they must have Congressional influence for every move, is most despicable, disgusting, and degrading.

It is strange, indeed, how careful we all are in hiring our individual help and in economically expending our individual money and keeping dangerous foes from our private property, and how lavishly profligate we are in employing help for the Government and in expending the people's money, and leaving the bars down for all kinds of governmental transgressions.

The other day I stepped into the Pension Office to suggest the reinstatement of an old soldier. The Commissioner replied: "He is getting a pension and is aging very rapidly; in a short time he will be practically worthless to me or my office." I told him that in five or six years he could let him out. He laughed and said, "No, no, no; I could not let him out. You would not allow it."

He pointed out men in his Department and said: "There are men getting a thousand dollars a year and a large pension, and unable to do any efficient work." In fact, he said that their \$1,000 salary is as much of a pension as the \$12 per month they receive in the name of pension. I said, "Why do you not put them out?" He said, "If I were to put one out, a drove of Congressmen would pursue me relentlessly until he was reinstated. You do not allow me to put anyone out." There is too much truth in this.

He said some time ago before the Appropriations Committee that he could dispense with 100 employees without injury to the service. These men are receiving an average of more than \$1,000 per annum. Here is a clear \$100,000 that is being thrown away through the influence of Congress; and not only this, but the old soldiers throughout the country are dying, with their pension claims not reached by reason of this inefficiency. The keeping of old soldiers in the Department after they are utterly disabled and have been pensioned by this Government to sustain them is a gross injury to the great mass of the old soldiers throughout the country and to the people at large. It is merely an indirect increase of their pensions to the amount of the salary they draw and gives them preference over the ninety-nine out of every hundred of the old soldiers that never have nor never can have these advantages. If we are going to retire any old soldiers on pay we ought to take in those who did not have the advantage of a remunerative public employment during their early lives. This policy gives the favored ones the advantage of these salaries while they can work and continues them when they can not work. It is making a special official class among the old comrades that is quite as objectionable as any other class preference.

You may strike the Civil Service Commission and censure it for neglecting to execute the law, and it will tell you that Congressmen who make the laws will not permit their execution. It is they who find and demand ways of avoiding the laws they make. Another source of these ruinous extravagances is found in the fact that we all make the selfish aims and objects of our immediate constituency first and the service of the Government a secondary consideration. We can see that cropping out in bill after bill as they are presented to this House.

A few days ago we saw the mighty river and harbor bill come into this House loaded down with its sixty-odd millions of dollars and with a combine so perfect that nothing bad in the bill could be gotten out of it and nothing good outside of the bill could be gotten into it.

There has been no secret in Congress for many years that the primary object of those combines is to get as much money as possible spent in the special Congressional districts of the members, and commerce and navigation is really a secondary consideration.

There is no doubt in my mind that from five to ten millions of this appropriation could be saved without any injury whatever to navigation if a disinterested committee had control of it.

This same principle crops out whenever any industry or enterprise is to be benefited in our special districts. We had an ocular demonstration a few days ago when this Southern subsidy bill came up, and almost to a man every member through whose district one of these roads passes, from New York to Florida, voted for the bill, though the Post-Office Department protested and declared that it did not benefit the service.

We saw a like exhibition when we reached the point of giving the railroads coming into this city much valuable land that has always been too precious with us to permit of our own buildings being placed thereon, and to give them millions of dollars' worth of property and money. Almost to a man the members through whose districts these roads run unhesitatingly voted for it.

I have before referred to our great extravagance in turning over the inauguration of a President to a private committee of the city of Washington, whose chief aim is to make a spectacular display, attracting enormous crowds for private business gain. At the same time the Government pays the inauguration expenses in addition to furnishing this committee our parks and other public places out of which to speculate.

I made a suggestion some time ago that after the last inauguration Commissioner Murphy signed a statement that the allowing of the use of the Pension Office to this private committee four years ago cost the Government the sum of \$70,000 because of the loss in wages of the employees alone, who were put out of office for something like ten days that this committee might move the furniture from the first and second floors to the third floor, or to the basement, and properly decorate the building.

The present Commissioner the other day wrote me the following letter:

The appropriation for clerk hire in this Bureau for the present fiscal year is \$1,971,210, which represents an outlay of about \$5,400 per day.

But he said as there would be two holidays between the 25th of February and the 7th of March, the time this committee would have possession of the building, it would bring the loss on clerk hire down to about \$30,000.



But I venture to say that by the time the office is reinstated, the furniture rearranged, and everything repaired and placed as before, we will find that for the privilege of having what we call an inaugural ball and a grand inaugural concert, which are mere tolling machines, it will have cost this Government \$70,000, as well as putting off the allowance of the pensions due to many decrepit and dying old soldiers.

I might here say, in passing, that if the Secretary of the Interior has a legal right to turn the Pension Office over to a private committee for eight days, he has the same right to turn it over for 365 days. If he has a right to let the employees off for eight days on wages paid by the Government, amounting to over \$30,000, and not falling under the sick leave or annual vacation, which he has agreed to do, then he has a right to let them off on pay for 365 days. I am credibly informed that the Secretary of the Interior strenuously opposed the plan, but again it was the members of Congress that demanded that this Department officer should violate the law.

A few days ago the House passed a bill appropriating \$7,000 for as many seats at the east front of the Capitol in which members and their friends can sit for from three-quarters to one hour and hear the inaugural address of the President. If any member of this House was going to have that done out of his own funds, instead of giving \$1 per seat, he would have them made for 20 cents each, or, it is more probable, he would stand, or he would go and buy a good oak cane-bottom chair for 75 cents, sit in it for an hour, and probably sell it for 50 or 60 cents. But the idea prevails here that economy is degrading.

We passed through the committee the other day a bill for \$31,000 for extra lighting of public places for three nights succeeding the inaugural. We have our own electric plants. A private individual would do this probably for \$3,000 or \$4,000, and besides, it is utterly foolish to light up for more than one night. But we must show the greatness of this Government through our wanton extravagance.

Congress being so reckless and ready to yield to these expenditures makes every department of the Government equally ready and lavish in its expenditures.

In this bill there is a provision for buying the land adjoining the insane asylum for \$1,000 per acre. Two sessions ago the Senate voted to pay the owners \$2,500 per acre; we refused. By the last session the land fell in price \$1,000, or to \$1,500 per acre, and we refused that, but almost enough members to pass the bill voted in this last session to pay \$1,500 an acre for the same ground. At this session they dropped to \$1,000 per acre. May we not be making a further mistake of \$500 an acre?

I understand the speculators who picked up this ground to sell to the Government got it for less than \$700 per acre, and if they should sell to us for \$1,000 per acre they would make over \$300 net profit on each acre. They feel justified in holding up their Government, and they can get all kinds of official encouragement to do it. We have made grievous mistakes before relative to public property, and though we had all kinds of evidence of good faith from all kinds of experts, including any number of Government officials, but a little stiffening of our backs brought great profit to the Government, and a failure to pass this bill might save the Government \$40,000 more; at least the past has made the present dubious.

We have had the humiliating spectacle in this House at former Congresses of having the Pacific Railroad Committee insisting that our rights in the Pacific roads were practically worthless and that our equities were without value, and pleading with us to make a settlement practically giving all of our interests to the roads. Some of the journals of New York, with flagrant heartlessness, according to the views of said committee, waded into the fight and declared that these equities were worth face value and that it could be obtained but for the subserviency of members toward this great corporate interest. The committee was sustained in the House, but when the bill got to the Senate public sentiment was so appealed to by the press that it was amended, and the Government got its millions of dollars in defiance of the members of this House. I wish some of our enterprising journals would come to our aid now. A little stiffening in the back would be wholesome.

You can also find in this bill a large appropriation for rent for that historical custom-house in New York City sold by the Government to the National City Bank, the money placed in the bank, and the Government simply taking credit in that bank, allowing the use of the money without interest, and yet paying an enormous rent for its own building. Why did we sell this building, if we need it so? Last year after the appropriation bill reached the Senate the Secretary of the Treasury sent a note to the committee there saying:

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay for the use of property known as the old custom-house, New York City, formerly belonging to the United States, from August 18, 1899, to June 30, 1900, both inclusive, \* \* \* \$109,847.12—

which was allowed. That night the newspaper men generally

sent out dispatches to the effect that the purchase money of that favored bank for this ground never left its vaults, and it retained the use of the money and many millions of dollars more belonging to this Government without interest, while the State treasurer of New York at the same time was collecting from the banks of New York 3 per cent per annum on all of the permanent State deposits, such as the canal fund, etc., and a cent and a half on deposits subject to daily checks.

One of the anomalies of the age is found in our paying 4 per cent on the value of the old custom-house building as rent, without claiming a set-off for the use of from \$12,000,000 to \$20,000,000 of United States money in the National City Bank. If the purchase money of this bank is worth 4 per cent per annum, is not our deposit worth as much, and would there not be a large balance due us? Suppose the Secretary of the Treasury personally owned this bank deposit and personally occupied this building, does any one think there would not be a balancing of accounts? This bank has had possession of three or four times as much of the Government property as the Government has had of the bank's property, and yet we must pay more than \$130,000 per annum for the use of the bank's property and get nothing for ours. Is not this astonishing?

To-day this Government has in the banks of the United States about \$100,000,000 without interest, when the value of these deposits is shown to be worth over \$7,000 per day, according to the average rate obtained by the State treasurers in the different States of the Union, and these deposits have as well fixed a value as has corn or cotton.

The President of the United States, on this floor, February 28, 1888, declared that the Government then had \$59,000,000 "out among the banks without interest," and condemned Mr. Cleveland for permitting these favors to the banks. What would you or I do if we had all of this money to our credit? We would collect interest on every dollar of it.

Can anyone wonder at this Administration being a great favorite of the banks and syndicates? It is hard to think that any private individual would be guilty of such reckless extravagance on his own account, and yet these things are going on in every department of the Government. The State governments generally collect interest on their daily balances in the banks.

The aggressive and sagacious chairman of the Post-Office Committee a few years ago said here that any private individual could get rich managing the Post-Office Department for one-half of what it costs the Government. You say, Why should it cost the Government so much more than it does the private individual? I say it is that same monotonous streak of human nature found in us all that renders us willing to expend the Government money lavishly and recklessly, while we spend our own with economy and judgment. It is Congress that must set the example. It is Congress that makes the laws, and it is Congressmen who first defy them. It behooves the nonofficeholding people to take hold of and control these ruinous extravagances before this country is plunged hopelessly into an enormous interest-bearing debt.

One of the reasons for the great increase in expenditures comes through the mistake made in distributing appropriation bills among the different committees in Congress and leaving no committee solely responsible for the appropriations.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has five of the great bills under his supervision, and it may be said has five times the responsibility resting upon his shoulders that those have with but one bill, and he has often been compelled to take unkind and unjust criticisms for his alertness in trying to limit the appropriations of the Government to the necessary expenditures. But this gentleman has the compensation of knowing that his services have been worth millions to the people of his country annually, and I might say that Governors Sayers and Dockery, for many years ranking members of the minority, saved the people annually millions of dollars though their objections, brought forth by a sense of this great responsibility resting upon them.

No one in the House has ever observed the chairman or other members of the committees having in charge a single appropriation bill here standing guard over the people's money.

At the beginning of the Government the Committee on Ways and Means not only controlled the question of raising revenues, but until 1865 also reported all appropriation bills. Probably the fatal error was made when this power was taken from the Ways and Means Committee. In 1866 the Appropriations Committee was established, and to it was given jurisdiction over all appropriation bills.

If that law could have been kept in force, you would not have to-day every member who reaches this House, and has a navigable stream of water in his district, or a part of the coast line, moving heaven and earth to get on the River and Harbor Committee. You would not have every friend of the Army and Navy moving heaven and earth to get upon the Army or Naval committees, and so on throughout the committees. In 1880 the appropriations for the Agricultural Department were given to the Agricultural Committee, and in 1886 the appropriations for the

other special subjects were distributed to the separate committees, and now we have the folly of these committees vying with one another to see how much money they can get expended through their special committees, instead of having a great Ways and Means Committee, or one Appropriation Committee, making it a point to cut off all unnecessary appropriations and to run the Government with economy in all of its Departments. The people will, they must, put a check on our present mad career. I never expect to see the people of this country, however, wholly returned to the economic and simple policies of Jefferson. In fact, we hear from every source, from the press, from the current literature of the country, a constant ridicule of these simple and sagacious methods, and the indication is apparent everywhere that the ruling classes are with contempt turning their backs upon the unpretentious methods that lifted this Government to the most influential and exemplary position occupied by any of the nations of modern times.

Our children are being instilled with a contempt for these simple and democratic customs.

Lilian Bell, the Mark Twain of her sex, after being entertained by aristocracy at the different courts of Europe, and after having seen our representatives in their plain black broadcloth mixing with the ministers of the monarchies of Europe, with their glittering and jingling gold lace and dangling swords, in disgust wrote in her most instructive work, *As Seen by Me*:

If it were really Thomas Jefferson whose Administration inaugurated the disgusting simplicity which goes by his name, I wish the words had stuck in his throat and strangled him. Jeffersonian simplicity! I despise it! Thomas Jefferson, I believe, was the first Populist. We had had gentlemen for Presidents before him, but he was the first one who rooted for votes among the common herd by catering to the gutter instead of to the sky line, and the tail end of this policy is to be seen in the mortifying appearance of our highest officials and representatives.

What an indictment by a brilliant woman of a great son of her native State. Like criticisms are appearing everywhere in diplomatic circles, in the Army, in the Navy, and among the people; and ere long our diplomats will shed their proverbial simple black broadcloth and be regaled in the gold laces and clanking swords of the representatives of the monarchies, and will exchange their simple and unpretentious modes of living for the royal glare, purple robes, and great display of national wealth, thereby blotting out this distinction between the ways of a simple republic and that of an empire in foreign lands.

However much we may deprecate these changes, however much we may pathetically fondle the old maxims and traditions of this Republic, we shall inexorably be whirled into the vortex of "The New Times." But we may fondly hope that these improved methods of production and distribution may be diverted to the benefit of the public.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It is desirable now that the committee should rise, and if the gentleman will yield to me I will make a motion.

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly arose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. HOPKINS, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 14018) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state to the members of the House that it will be necessary to vacate the first three rows of seats immediately on the right of the Chair, for the use of the Senate, under the law, during the counting of the electoral vote. Gentlemen will please find other seats.

At 1 o'clock the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, preceded by its Sergeant-at-Arms, and headed by its President pro tempore and the Secretary of the Senate, the members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The President pro tempore of the Senate took his seat as Presiding Officer of the Joint Convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

Senators CHANDLER and CAFFERY, the tellers appointed on the part of the Senate, and Representatives GROSVENOR and RICHARDSON, the tellers appointed on the part of the House, took their places at the Clerk's desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. The two Houses of Congress are in joint convention, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws of the United States, to open the credentials and count the votes of the several States for President

and Vice-President. Following precedents well established on former occasions, unless there shall be a demand for it in any case, the mere formal papers will not be read by the tellers. On ascertaining that the credentials are authentic and in correct form, they will simply give the lists of the votes of the several States.

If there be no objection to the counting of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama, the tellers will receive the credentials and make a list of the vote.

Mr. CHANDLER (one of the tellers) read at length the certificate of the vote of the State of Alabama, giving 11 votes for William Jennings Bryan, of the State of Nebraska, for President of the United States, and 11 votes for Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, for Vice-President of the United States.

Mr. CAFFERY (one of the tellers) began to read the certificate of the vote of the State of Arkansas.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, can we not have the result announced without reading the entire certificate? I think we can trust the tellers. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent has already been had to dispense with the reading of the formal portions of these certificates; but it seems necessary to read the certificate brought by the messenger and handed to the teller from the State of Arkansas. It will be read by the teller.

Mr. CAFFERY (one of the tellers) thereupon read the certificate of the vote of the State of Arkansas, giving 8 votes for William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska, for President, and 8 votes for Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, for Vice-President.

The tellers then proceeded to announce the electoral votes of the several States in the alphabetical order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Gentlemen of the convention, the certificates having all been opened and read, the tellers will make ascertainment of the result and report the same to the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the tellers report the following as the result of the ascertainment of the count of the electoral vote:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 447, of which a majority is 224.

William McKinley, of the State of Ohio, has received for President of the United States 292 votes.

William Jennings Bryan, of the State of Nebraska, has received 155 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice-President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice-President of the United States is 447, of which a majority is 224.

Theodore Roosevelt, of the State of New York, has received 292 votes.

Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, has received 155 votes.

The report of the tellers is as follows:

The undersigned, WILLIAM E. CHANDLER and DONELSON CAFFERY, tellers on the part of the Senate, and CHARLES H. GROSVENOR and JAMES D. RICHARDSON, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice-President of the United States for the term beginning March 4, 1901:

State.	Number of electoral votes to which each State is entitled.	For President.		For Vice-President.	
		William McKinley, of Ohio.	William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska.	Theodore Roosevelt, of New York.	Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.
Alabama	11	11	11	11	11
Arkansas	8	8	8	8	8
California	9	9	9	9	9
Colorado	4	4	4	4	4
Connecticut	6	6	6	6	6
Delaware	3	3	3	3	3
Florida	4	4	4	4	4
Georgia	13	13	13	13	13
Idaho	3	3	3	3	3
Illinois	24	24	24	24	24
Indiana	15	15	15	15	15
Iowa	13	13	13	13	13
Kansas	10	10	10	10	10
Kentucky	13	13	13	13	13
Louisiana	8	8	8	8	8
Maine	6	6	6	6	6
Maryland	8	8	8	8	8
Massachusetts	15	15	15	15	15
Michigan	14	14	14	14	14
Minnesota	9	9	9	9	9
Mississippi	9	9	9	9	9
Missouri	17	17	17	17	17
Montana	3	3	3	3	3
Nebraska	8	8	8	8	8
Nevada	3	3	3	3	3
New Hampshire	4	4	4	4	4
New Jersey	10	10	10	10	10
New York	36	36	36	36	36
North Carolina	11	11	11	11	11



State.	Number of electoral votes to which each State is entitled.	For President.		For Vice-President.	
		William McKinley, of Ohio.	William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska.	Theodore Roosevelt, of New York.	Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.
North Dakota.....	3	3	-----	3	-----
Ohio.....	23	23	-----	23	-----
Oregon.....	4	4	-----	4	-----
Pennsylvania.....	32	32	-----	32	-----
Rhode Island.....	4	4	-----	4	-----
South Carolina.....	9	-----	9	-----	9
South Dakota.....	4	4	-----	4	-----
Tennessee.....	12	-----	12	-----	12
Texas.....	15	-----	15	-----	15
Utah.....	3	3	-----	3	-----
Vermont.....	4	4	-----	4	-----
Virginia.....	12	-----	12	-----	12
Washington.....	4	4	-----	4	-----
West Virginia.....	6	6	-----	6	-----
Wisconsin.....	12	12	-----	12	-----
Wyoming.....	3	3	-----	3	-----
Total.....	447	292	155	292	155

WM. E. CHANDLER,  
DONELSON CAFFERY,  
*Tellers on the part of the Senate.*

JAMES D. RICHARDSON,  
C. H. GROSVENOR,  
*Tellers on the part of the House of Representatives.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 447, of which a majority is 224.

William McKinley, of the State of Ohio, has received for President of the United States 292 votes:

William Jennings Bryan, of the State of Nebraska, has received 155 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice-President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice-President of the United States is 447, of which a majority is 224.

Theodore Roosevelt, of the State of New York, has received 292 votes:

Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, has received 155 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice-President of the United States, each for the term beginning March 4, 1901, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Gentlemen, the purposes for which this joint convention was called having been accomplished, the Presiding Officer now declares it dissolved, and the Senate will return to its Chamber.

The Senate then retired from the Hall (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.), the Speaker resumed the chair, and the House was again called to order.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HOPKINS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 14018. The gentleman from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. BELL resumed and concluded his remarks as reported in preceding pages of proceedings of the House.

Mr. McRAE. I yield forty-five minutes of my time to the gentleman from Missouri.

[Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. RUSSELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate

had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 5520. An act to establish a fish-hatching station in the State of Utah;

S. 5672. An act granting an increase of pension to Annie A. Neary; and

S. R. 157. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to remove from the files of the Department of the Interior certain letters, to be donated to the State of Iowa.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 1792. An act granting a pension to Martha C. M. Fisher; and

S. 3376. An act granting an increase of pension to James McMry.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. McRAE. I yield such time to the gentleman from Tennessee as he may desire.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we are now considering next to the last of the great appropriation bills of the Congress. There are in all, I believe, 13 general appropriation bills. This is the twelfth that we are considering, and we have only one more, and that is the general deficiency bill.

Mr. Chairman, I offer no apology for commenting upon the state of the appropriations of this session and of this Congress. It has already been stated by two gentlemen who preceded me today on this side of the House that it is conceded by leading Representatives and Senators who have to deal with the appropriations of the Government that the appropriations for the next fiscal year, made during this session of Congress, are to be \$780,000,000. These gentlemen, in making these admissions, have not taken into account certain other sums that must of necessity be expended and appropriated for. I will not stop to enumerate the additional sums, but I do assert that, in my opinion, they will reach the additional twenty millions, and make the total appropriations which will be included in the 13 bills passed during this session of Congress, with the deficiencies which must follow, not a dollar less than \$800,000,000.

I do not believe that the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee will challenge the truth of that statement. Eight hundred millions of dollars in one session in the annual appropriation bills and in the deficiency bills which must of necessity follow! Mr. Chairman, too much time can not be spent calling the attention of the people, and of this House itself, to this fact. This means \$1,600,000,000 for one Congress. Why have these appropriations so enormously increased? Four years ago, when the present Chief Executive entered upon the administration of the affairs of this country, and the Republican party took possession of all the branches of the Government, the total appropriations for the Government were a little less than \$500,000,000. At one time they had reached during a Congress, the Fifty-first, \$1,000,000,000. But upon the accession to power of the party to which I belong, after that expenditure, the appropriations were reduced somewhat, and yet they reached \$470,000,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, during this Administration, in one year the appropriations have increased to \$800,000,000, or a net increase of over \$300,000,000 per annum. And what have we to show for it? I concede that in the natural course of human events there will be a gradual increase in the appropriations for this Government, but why should there be this enormous increase so suddenly made in our expenditures? It may be said that we have had a war. That is true. But, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen can not find in that war, or the facts growing out of it, any justification or excuse for this enormous increase. I have here the reports made by the different committees in this House upon the several appropriation bills. I have them all except the report on the general deficiency bill, which has not yet been made. What do these reports show, Mr. Chairman? They show that in every solitary bill passed by this House of Representatives the appropriations for the next fiscal year are larger than those of the past year, with three exceptions. One is the pension bill, one is the present bill we are now considering, the sundry civil, and the other is the fortification bill, which we passed early in the session. The pension bill was identically the same in amount as the bill of last year.

Now, with these exceptions, Mr. Chairman, every other appropriation bill has been increased, and many of them very largely. I ask if gentlemen shall seek to excuse these appropriations by referring to the late war; and if not, why is it that this Republican House of Representatives has increased these appropriations in the cases I have cited? Did the war make it necessary to increase the expenditures in the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of our Government, as set forth in the bill which provides for those expenses? There was a large increase there. I have the exact figures, and will insert them, with the consent of the House,

in my speech. In the next bill which we considered after the legislative, executive, and judicial, came the pension bill, which, I have already stated, is identical with the former appropriation of \$145,000,000. Next, the urgent deficiency bill, which I do not take notice of at this time. Next, the Military Academy, and then, in order, the Indian appropriation bill, the river and harbor bill, the District of Columbia bill, the naval bill, the Post-Office Department bill, the Agricultural bill, the diplomatic bill, the sundry civil bill, the fortification, and the military appropriation bills.

Now, I say, Mr. Chairman, it can not be said with any degree of accuracy that the Spanish war would have increased appropriations in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. Why should the Spanish war have increased the appropriation in the Indian bill? Why in the bill for the District of Columbia? Why in the Post-Office Department? And yet there was an increase in the latter bill of nearly \$10,000,000. And soon—I will not take the time to go through each one. I want to emphasize the fact, however, that in every solitary case, in every bill, as I have stated, there has been this increase. You can not escape it by saying that we have had a war. All these enormous increases are in the bills as reported to this body by our committees. How much will be added to them in the Senate no one will predict.

But, Mr. Chairman, suppose you attempt to account for all this increase by saying, "We have had a war with Spain." What is the effect of this admission?

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Did you not vote for both the river and harbor bill and the Post-Office bill?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. What if I did?

Mr. HEPBURN. Then you are particeps criminis, and criticizing your own action.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. What if I did vote for the river and harbor bill? What does that demonstrate? I can not stand here and hold back the necessary appropriations for the post-offices if you have incurred the liability. It is not expected that I would be as unpatriotic as that.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me again?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. These appropriation bills are for the next fiscal year; does the gentleman understand that the liability has been incurred?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I stated that they were for the next year. Mr. Chairman, if it be said that all these increases are to be attributed to the fact that we have had a Spanish war, then I ask when are we to get away from the expenditures incident to that war? Are we stop all improvements of the rivers and harbors in the Union because we have had a little war with Spain? It seems this is to be the policy. Are we to have no appropriations for public buildings in the country because we have had a war with Spain that hardly is entitled to be called a war? It seems this is to be the new policy. Every dollar that may be called for is to be voted freely for the military and a foreign policy that is extravagant and vicious, while all home or domestic matters are to be neglected.

Three hundred million dollars a year! And the figures will show this for the first year after the war, the second year after the war, the third year after the war, and the fourth year, for which we are now appropriating. Are we to be told that \$1,200,000,000 have been appropriated of necessity in four years because of the war with Spain? When is it to stop? Are we to have \$300,000,000 increase for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903? We are to have it for the year ending June 30, 1902. Is it to go on for 1903, and 1904, and 1905? I repeat, when is it to stop? Is it a permanent increase to continue year by year, and every year indefinitely, and all because we have had this small war? It is growing. It is not less for 1903 than it was for 1901. It was no less for 1901 than it was for 1900.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. This bill carries appropriations amounting to some \$60,000,000—an increase, as the gentleman says, of some \$10,000,000 over the appropriations of three years ago. I am very anxious to carry out the gentleman's views of economy, and as a member of the subcommittee that prepared this bill, I wish to give these exact figures: For the year 1887 we appropriated \$22,662,000; in this bill we propose to appropriate \$59,703,000. Can the gentleman tell me anything in this bill that ought to be stricken out?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will do so before I get through.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I shall be very glad to have the gentleman do so. Now let me ask the gentleman whether he voted the other day for the establishment of the Soldiers' Home in Tennessee?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I do not think there was any vote on that question. It passed unanimously.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Oh, no; I voted against it. Let me ask the gentleman whether he is opposed to the payment of the Bowman Act claims which are coming before Congress.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I voted for the Bowman Act claims to the amount of \$300,000. I repeat, are we to have no appropriations for home purposes? Must just claims be further postponed because of this war?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I shall be glad if the gentleman will point out any appropriation in this bill which he wants to have cut down.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I have not time to go through the bill and pick out item by item; but I will mention at least one matter to which I invite the attention of the gentleman. One of the gentleman's colleagues sitting near me reminds me of the fact that there are in this bill a number of increases of salaries. I shall take very great pleasure in voting against every one of them. Will the gentleman vote for them?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not now call to mind more than a single increase of salary.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will not take time upon that point now.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. A point of order will lie against any such increase of salaries, and I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will invoke it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Let the gentleman himself make the point of order. He is more familiar with the bill than I am, for he assisted in making it up. I invite him, as one of the guardians of the Treasury, to make such points of order.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I will do it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I assume that the gentleman heartily indorses every dollar of the \$300,000,000 increase in the appropriations of next year as compared with those of the present year?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Then the gentleman and I agree exactly.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The increase of public expenditures demands no partisan talk, but demands the earnest consideration of every man on this floor.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I am trying to get nonpartisan consideration, but the gentleman is thrusting in partisan considerations. I have not said a word about politics. I am simply trying to tell the country that you and your colleagues propose to expend \$300,000,000 more than was spent the year you came into power. That is true. I ask the gentleman whether he indorses it, and he says he does not. Then we agree. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Let me say, we agree in the general profession in favor of economy; but the gentleman votes for the expenditures, while I vote against them.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I suppose that if the gentleman is allowed to pick out certain objects or provisions in the bill and except to them, he will be satisfied; and in that way he would reduce the aggregate. If I agree to do the same thing, the gentleman ought not to find fault with me for exercising the same privilege that he himself exercises.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not. I welcome the gentleman's speech.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Well, I am not on the Committee on Appropriations. Therefore I can not do as much as the gentleman from Massachusetts can in keeping down these appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from Tennessee allow me a moment?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman, and I wish to say this: Much of appropriation has been made, and no doubt will be made, which I do not indorse, and I think my friend from Tennessee will not. But while the appropriations are mounting up quite fast enough, I do not want to commit myself to the correctness of the gentleman's statement that the appropriations of the next fiscal year are to run anywhere near \$800,000,000, or that they will be \$300,000,000 more than they were three years ago. I do not care about going into it, but I do not desire by my silence to assent to the correctness of the gentleman's prophecy.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, there is no living human being who knows more about the appropriations for this Government than the gentleman who has just addressed me. Now, if he can show this committee and the country that we are going to spend less than \$780,000,000 in the next fiscal year it is his duty to do so; not now, because he has his time reserved, and I have but a little time. I believe that a good many of these expenses have been piled up in opposition to the wishes of the gentleman from Illinois, for I have respect for him as an economic



legislator. I ask him to tell us where there is any mistake in this assumption that \$780,000,000 are to be expended during the next fiscal year. The gentleman will not deny it, in my judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take more time. I find I am using more than I intended. Only a few minutes are left me. The gentleman has asked me to enumerate some items in this bill to which I shall object. I will name one. On page 5 of the bill the gentleman will find an item I object to, as follows:

For rent of old custom-house at New York, N. Y.: For rental of temporary quarters for the accommodation of certain Government officials, from August 28, 1899, to June 30, 1900, \$109,847.12; from July 1, 1900, to June 30, 1901, \$130,600; from July 1, 1901, to June 30, 1902, \$130,600; in all, \$371,047.12.

I shall object to that item, and move to strike it out.

I want to say a few words about it. How does it arise, Mr. Chairman?

To state the matter briefly, the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to sell the old custom-house property in New York City. A limit was put upon it. He sold it for \$3,265,000 to the National City Bank, of New York City. He made a contract, and it was a condition of the trade that he was to rent this property from the bank and pay a rental equal to 4 per cent on the purchase money. The bank bought it in August, 1899, for \$3,265,000.

As a further part and condition of that trade, Mr. Chairman, he made an agreement with that bank that as long as the Government of the United States held the title to the property the bank should not be liable for taxes to the State or city of New York. In other words, an agreement was made that a small sum should be reserved and not paid by the bank for the property, and that so long as that state of affairs existed the bank was not to be liable for municipal and State taxes in New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, what followed?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Can the gentleman give some idea of what the New York taxes, city and State, would amount to on that property? I should like to have that statement in the RECORD.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I think I have that, and before I conclude I will try and give it to the gentleman.

After this trade was made the National City Bank of New York, without paying the same, gave a deposit check to the Secretary of the Treasury for the purchase money, \$3,000,000 and over, as I have stated. The purchase money was not paid, but a simple deposit check was given to the Secretary of the Treasury for this purchase money, and the money was left with the bank.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Less \$50,000.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes, as my friend says, less \$50,000. This small cash payment made. Mr. Chairman, immediately the contract was made to pay 4 per cent upon this purchase price, which was not paid and which has never been paid. In addition to the purchase price of this property the Secretary of the Treasury has maintained a deposit in that bank on an average every day since that time of \$15,000,000 and over. I leave out the odd figures. I will publish here a table which shows the average of deposits with that bank:

**\$15,337,859 IS BANK'S AVERAGE UNITED STATES DEPOSIT.**

United States deposits held by the National City Bank, of New York, as reported to the Comptroller of the Currency on the dates given, are as follows:

September 7, 1899	\$13,739,257
December 2, 1899	13,739,257
February 13, 1900	17,745,000
April 23, 1900	17,745,000
June 29, 1900	15,575,500
September 5, 1900	14,490,500
December 13, 1900	14,330,500
Average deposits	15,337,859

If you take simply the contract, charge the Government of the United States with a sum equal to 4 per cent rent on the purchase price, \$130,600, and also credit the bank with 4 per cent interest on the purchase money, \$130,600, which was kept, you will find that the rent and the interest will amount to \$261,200 per year. But in addition to that, take the interest on the \$15,000,000 at 4 per cent that the Secretary of the Treasury has kept on deposit with that bank; count 4 per cent interest upon that per annum and you have \$600,000 of interest upon those deposits. Six hundred thousand dollars interest upon the deposits added to \$260,000 upon the other items that I have mentioned makes \$860,000.

Mr. BELL. May I suggest to the gentleman that in a letter that I recently received from the secretary of state of New York he states that he gets 3 per cent interest on all moneys of the State of New York which form what he calls the permanent fund, the canal fund.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. He has a contract with the banks to that effect?

Mr. BELL. With the banks, and on daily deposits he receives 1½ per cent.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I am obliged to the gentleman for the information. So, then, you have each year a net profit to the banks of about \$860,000 by reason of this transaction. Three years have expired, or two years now, and three years when you come to the end of the fiscal year 1902, for which this bill carries the appropriation. So you will have three times what I have stated the sum to be for each year, which will make more than two and one-half million dollars that the bank will have received from the Government without paying it a dollar.

Mr. QUARLES. In four years it will pay for the property.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. In four years, as suggested, the bank, without having paid a dollar, will have received as a present this custom-house property, worth \$3,265,000. Now, is that right? Is that proper?

There was another corporation, the Farmers' Loan and Trust Company of New York, which offered to pay \$3,055,000 cash for the property. That proposition was turned down; this one was accepted, with the additional provisions in the contract which I have referred to, which, in effect, will donate as a gift this custom-house property to the National City Bank of New York.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it necessary to comment further upon this state of facts.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. In a moment. I want to tell you why, in my judgment, this thing was done. I do not want to comment harshly upon any man, but I hold in my hand a letter from the president of this bank, or the vice-president, Mr. Hepburn, a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Gage, the gentleman who made this contract with the National City Bank. I will put the entire letter in my printed speech, but will call attention to the concluding sentence. Let us look for the inducement for making this splendid contract by the Secretary of the Treasury and this bank. To know the motive we should look to what they said before this trade was consummated. Here is what Mr. Hepburn, the vice-president of that bank, said to Mr. Gage, the Secretary of the Treasury—as an inducement to him to make the trade, I suppose.

The concluding sentence of his letter, which is found on page 60 of the letter transmitted by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Senate of the United States on January 10, 1900, reads as follows:

And if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors, you will see that we also have very great political claims in view of what was done during the canvass last year.

The following is the letter itself:

THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK,  
New York, June 5, 1897.

MY DEAR MR. GAGE: The National City Bank of this city, of which I recently became vice-president through the consolidation of the business of the Third National with it, is one of the banks designated as a United States depository, and I write to request that in any changes which may be made under the Administration we may not be disturbed in this respect. We should like to remain a United States depository as at present. Of course the bank is very strong, and if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have very great political claims in view of what was done during the canvass last year.

Yours, very truly,

A. B. HEPBURN.

HON. LYMAN J. GAGE,

United States Treasury, Washington, D. C.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. That was the campaign of 1896.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. This letter was written in 1897.

Mr. CLARK. They presumably had larger claims after the last election.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Whether they had greater claims since the last election than they had at first, they are pursuing the same policy, based upon the same contract, and a contract made presumably because the Secretary of the Treasury had been reminded that the officers of this bank, which has received this subsidy or gift from the Secretary of the Treasury, had made large contributions to the Republican campaign fund in 1896.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts rose.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I do not know whether my friend from Massachusetts will indorse that or not. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether it was intended that all these facts should be made known or not, but I have an additional letter which will reflect upon this side of the case. It may be said, Mr. Chairman, that these facts are not new, that they were commented upon in the last session of this Congress, which is true; but we have gone a step further. We did not know but what by this time those conditions and circumstances would change. We did not know but what the money might be paid into the Treasury of the United States directly, the rent stopped, the trade consummated, and the title passed to this bank and the bank made liable to the city and State of New York for taxes. But it seems that these things have not yet been done.

How much longer the present condition will continue I do not know. My friend from Missouri suggests possibly new considerations have entered into this matter as the result of the recent campaign. I do not know how that is. It is a considerable effort to



go through this volume, containing all the letters from the Secretary of the Treasury with reference to all these national banks; but let us turn to page 345. Mr. Chairman, we do not know how all these things occurred, but I was a little surprised when I found what one letter in this pamphlet contains. Whenever you see men who are negotiating a transaction which does not exactly commend itself to their own consciences, they always seek to keep it from the public. They do not want the newspapers to get hold of it. They want it kept out of the press as much as possible.

Now, was there any such fact as that connected with this transaction? If so, it speaks volumes, it seems to me, as to the regularity or irregularity of the transaction. Let us see. The letter which I will now read was written very early after this transaction was consummated; but it reflects upon the deal. It shows the circumstances and conditions under which it was negotiated, and it shows the parties to it were endeavoring to keep the public and the people of the United States from a knowledge of this transaction. Now, let us see if I am right in that. Here is the letter signed by Mr. Stillman, president of the National City Bank, addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, dated September 12, 1899. I will read the concluding portion of it, and I invite the attention of the House, the committee, and the country to its contents, for it shows that they were endeavoring to prevent the people of this country from knowing all the facts in this case. Mr. Stillman says to the Secretary of the Treasury:

I am writing to you personally—

He was writing about this transaction—

I am writing to you personally, and I desire to avoid publicity of the contents of this letter, as the reporters seem to have access to everything that goes upon the files in connection with this matter. The delay in earlier communicating with you has been due to my absence from the city.

THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK,  
New York, September 12, 1899.

SIR: On the 1st instant an official letter was written you acknowledging the receipt of yours of the 31st ultimo, and stating that the subject-matter had been referred to the counsel of the bank. They have examined the proposed quadruplicate contracts and deeds and approve of the adoption of the various suggestions, except the insertion in two places in the contract of the words "subject to appropriations to be made by Congress." If these words had been used in the act or been made a part of the terms of the Department advertisement, dated June 1, 1899, no objection would now be made to their insertion in the contract, but such was not the case.

It is immaterial to the bank what method the Department adopts for raising the money with which to pay the rent. It may be that its only method is, as suggested in your letter, through an act of Congress, authorizing an appropriation for the purpose. The bank, however, does not wish to agree that any particular method shall be adopted by the Treasury Department. It relies upon the act of Congress and the Department advertisement, the former of which explicitly states that "the Secretary of the Treasury shall lease said premises \* \* \* at a (certain) rental," and the latter, with equal explicitness, states that "as rent for such use the purchaser will receive interest on the purchase price at 4 per cent per annum." I think, therefore, that you will recognize the justice of this position and will not insist that these restrictive words be inserted, when neither the act nor the Department advertisement imposed them as a condition of the compulsory lease.

I am writing to you personally, as I desire to avoid the publicity of the contents of this letter, as the reporters seem to have access to everything that goes upon the files in connection with this matter. The delay in earlier communicating with you has been due to my absence from the city.

I am, yours, respectfully,

JAS. STILLMAN, President.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, D. C.

He was very anxious that the reporters—the newspaper reporters—should not know what he was writing him in respect to this transaction. Mr. Chairman, why not let the newspaper men know what he was doing in dealing with a public officer? Why should he not publish to the world what he was writing to that officer in respect to the trade for this property which had then been made? I will put all the letter in evidence; but I have read a portion of it. It is found on page 54 of this communication of the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to comment further upon this transaction, but I do not believe that this Congress ought to make an appropriation of \$371,000, as set forth in this item in this appropriation bill, to carry out this improvident contract or trade with the National City Bank of the city of New York. I invite my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] to assist us here and now in striking out one improper item at least from this immense sundry civil bill.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman pardon a single interruption right there?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Let me say to him the subcommittee having charge of this bill, consisting of some Republicans and two eminent gentlemen from that side of the House, put this appropriation in solely upon the ground that the National City Bank had the right to go into the Court of Claims and recover that money as a judgment against the Government. We submitted it to the gentlemen upon that side of the House. They were of the same opinion as we were. Now, if the gentleman can point out that the City National Bank has not the right to recover in the Court of Claims, I for one will join with him in striking out this appropriation.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, that does not answer the argument I have made.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not intend to answer the argument. I realize the force of the criticism the gentleman has made.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. If the Secretary of the Treasury has made this improvident contract and sought to bind the people of the United States by it, I for one am unwilling to vote the people's money to carry it out. [Applause.]

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Let me say a bill is to come before the committee just as soon as we can get to it appropriating \$5,000,000 for the St. Louis Exposition. I voted against that bill. I shall vote to make the appropriation, because I believe the Government ought to keep its contracts, whether they are provident or improvident, and I think we ought to keep this contract if it is a lawful one, whether it is improvident or provident.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman from Massachusetts is getting away from the question. The question is whether the Secretary of the Treasury, as agent of the people of the United States, handling a trust fund, in the execution of a high public trust, has been guilty of making a contract which the people ought to repudiate; and for one I am ready to say that we will not vote that money in accordance with this contract.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Before the gentleman takes his seat, here is a bill carrying \$59,000,000, and the gentleman has pointed out one item, or some items, amounting altogether to \$371,000. Where are the rest of them?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. There are plenty of them.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If I can be recognized, I will yield to the gentleman time in which to point out the rest.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. How does the gentleman stand on the proposition to buy the property out at the asylum?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I shall inform the House of my sentiments upon that a little later. That is \$145,000; now what else?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Oh, there are many of them.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The gentleman is silent.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. My time has expired, and the gentleman has no time at this moment to yield.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MORRIS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 13058. An act granting an increase of pension to Ezra S. Pierce; and

H. R. 12258. An act granting a pension to John H. Doremus.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 13705) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HALE, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. TILLMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say, if the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] will allow me a minute of my own time—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. CANNON. I do not desire, Mr. Chairman, to use his time; I want to use a minute of my own time. I do not desire to speak to it at this time until we reach this item under the five-minute rule. I do not think it is necessary, but I do not by my silence desire to admit for a moment that there was the slightest corruption or irregularity in the sale of the New York custom-house to the City National Bank. On the contrary, it was done by authority of law, and the law fixed what the rent should be, and the sale was made to this bank at a very considerably larger price than anybody else bid. When the facts come to be known, and this old campaign thunder that was thrashed out by the gentleman from Tennessee at the last session of Congress and upon the stump everywhere comes to dwell in the pure, white light of fact, as I trust it will dwell when we reach it under the five-minute rule, I think the gentleman from Tennessee himself will be content to admit that he has discovered a second time a mare's nest.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois if he indorses this transaction all the way through from beginning to end?

Mr. CANNON. The transaction was thoroughly legal and was thoroughly honest. The very letter that the gentleman refers to which the president of the City National Bank wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury as a personal letter—I am not here defending him, I do not know the gentleman, and it is not necessary for



me to defend him, but the very fact that the alleged personal letter went on the files of the Department on the very day it was received and came into this report is sufficient answer to the proposition that a Government official was not seeking to suppress anything touching this transaction.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I ask consent to reserve the eight minutes remaining to me, which I had promised to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] to discuss the item referred to in relation to the New York custom-house, and to yield it to him when the paragraph is reached.

Mr. CANNON. I think that ought to be done, and I would be glad, if there is no demand for time on this side of the House now, after I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS], to reserve the remainder of my time for general debate as items are reached under the five-minute rule. I may or may not use it; but let the debate close and begin the reading of the bill.

Mr. McRAE. That is entirely satisfactory to me. Of course there are some items in the bill I desire to discuss myself, and also some members on this side desire to discuss.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, latitude will be given on some of the items, and ought to be. I will ask the Chair to ask unanimous consent that the eight minutes remaining to the gentleman from Arkansas and the time remaining after I yield to the gentleman from Michigan ten minutes be reserved for use under the five-minute rule when we reach amendments to items in the bill.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, my request is that the eight minutes remaining to me I may yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES], who wants to use it on the motion to strike out the appropriation to pay rent for the custom-house when the item is reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that eight minutes of time remaining in general debate allotted to him may be used by the gentleman from Virginia under the five-minute debate when the paragraph relating to the New York custom-house is reached. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the balance of the time allotted to him in general debate, excepting ten minutes to be used by the gentleman from Michigan, may be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois under the five-minute debate on such items as he may choose.

Mr. HEPBURN. How much time is there remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. There are seventy-seven minutes remaining to the gentleman from Illinois after the gentleman from Michigan uses his ten minutes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then I object.

Mr. CANNON. Well, then, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Michigan. I note the objection of the gentleman from Iowa, and trust the proprieties of the occasion when we reach the bill under the five-minute rule to take care of consent at that time.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not want any sharp practice like that.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says he does not want any sharp practice like that. No "sharp practice" has been adopted. I am not in the habit of attempting "sharp practice."

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not ask you to yield.

Mr. CANNON. Well, then, I object to the gentleman's saying a word in my time. The gentleman will be courteous if he talks in my time. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I asked time during the general debate in the consideration of this measure in order that I might present some thoughts not altogether pertinent to the bill. The appropriations made during the present session, including those in this measure, aggregate, I find, the sum of \$682,000,000. I have watched with much interest the large appropriation measures as they have been presented and considered; but not being a member of any of the committees having charge thereof, with the exception of one measure, I have not felt authorized or sufficiently informed to criticize them; and I am not prepared to say that the appropriations here made or attempted are not wise. I do desire, Mr. Chairman, to say that, in my judgment, some at least of the money that has been appropriated in some of the measures that have been considered might better have been applied in another way for the advancement of our country.

I find that the appropriations made for the Navy amount to \$76,000,000. A large proportion of that sum will be expended in the protection of our naval interests in the Pacific Ocean. I find appropriated in our Army bill \$117,000,000. A large proportion of that very large amount will be expended in protecting the naval and military interests of our country in the Pacific Ocean. The object of these large appropriations is to protect our country and our flag and maintain the honor and dignity of our nation.

I have called attention heretofore, not only in this Congress but in preceding Congresses, to the importance of the construction by

the Government of a Pacific cable. I want to occupy a few moments now to present the advantages to our country if we could but have this great public work performed. And without any desire to criticize the chairman of this great committee, I desire to call his attention to the fact that he was the man who a year ago on this floor defeated the measure which was passed by the Senate that would have given to the country the construction of a Pacific cable. But for his opposition the people of this country to-day would be enjoying the advantages of the operation of a Pacific cable constructed and owned by our Government for the benefit of our Army and Navy in the Pacific.

Had that bill been permitted to escape the objection and the vigorous opposition of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations we would have saved \$1,000,000 in cable and other communications which have been rendered necessary during the interim. If the gentleman had permitted that measure to pass, which was introduced as a part of the sundry civil bill by the Senate at the last session, our people would have been able to communicate with their sons in the Philippine Islands, and the fathers and mothers in this country would have been able to rejoice at the advantages and privileges that they would thereby have obtained. Our trade and commerce would have been advanced far more, in my judgment, than by all the subsidy bills that you can enact for the benefit of our merchant marine.

What we want in this country is rapid communication at a reasonable rate; and I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that since that day that powerful nation, Great Britain, recognizing as she has for years past the power and influence and advantage of cables, has gone on in this great work, and has let a contract for the construction of a cable across the Pacific, connecting her possessions at Vancouver Island and down through the Pacific with Australia, passing by Hawaii on the east. And before we can now construct our cable, Mr. Chairman, Great Britain will have a cable connecting her islands on the Pacific, while the great Government that we stand for is paying to a monopoly that holds the cable privileges of the world \$2.25 for every word that we communicate to the noble boys that are fighting for our country in the Philippines.

How long shall we stand here and permit this great public work to rest, while we go on appropriating money for a navy to be used in the Pacific? By building this cable we will add to the power of the Navy at least one-third of its usefulness. We can better afford to take \$10,000,000 from the naval bill, from the Army bill, or from any other of these large appropriation bills, and construct this cable. The President of the United States has repeatedly asked Congress to take action upon this measure. A commission, having charge of the consideration of the matter of the annexation of Hawaii, urgently recommended to Congress the construction of the cable. Twice the Senate of the United States has passed a cable measure, and still we have no opportunity to consider it here. The President of the United States, in his message in 1889, said that—

Such communication should be established in such a way as to be wholly under the control of the United States, whether in time of peace or of war. At present the Philippines can be reached only by cables which pass through many foreign countries, and Hawaii and Guam can only be communicated with by steamers, involving delays in each instance of at least a week. The present condition should not be allowed to continue for a moment longer than is absolutely necessary.

Now, I speak upon this matter because I feel that it is one of the greatest public improvements that can be made, not only for the protection of our Army and our Navy, but for the protection of the trade and commerce of our country. The people are interested in this subject, and all over this country, if you have read the papers, you have learned of the deep interest taken in this matter by boards of trade and other commercial organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CORLISS. I ask that I may have five minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I will not occupy the time of the committee further, except to ask within the five minutes allowed me that the Clerk read a resolution adopted by the Manufacturers' Club of the city of Philadelphia. Similar resolutions have been adopted at Pittsburg and in my own city and in other cities. Before the Clerk reads I want to say to the chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON], who is now here and to whom I referred a few moments ago, that at the proper time I shall ask him to allow the consideration of an amendment, notwithstanding the fact that it is new legislation, to authorize a contract for the construction of this cable. I do this because of the vital interest that it represents. I will ask him to waive any questions of order upon it, because I find, from a remark that he made during the consideration of the naval bill, that he has had a change of heart and now thinks that the cable should be constructed. I will appeal to him now, and, believing that he thinks as I do, that this measure is wise, that he will allow it to be considered as an amendment to this bill. Now I ask the Clerk to read.



The Clerk read as follows:

At the regular monthly meeting of the Manufacturers' Club, of Philadelphia, held December 17, 1900, at 8 o'clock p. m., and after the reading of a paper entitled "The Pacific cable," by T. E. Hughes, of Pittsburgh, Pa., which was discussed by Brig. Gen. A. W. Greely, Chief of Signal Service, United States Army; Dr. Arthur E. Kennelly, president American Institute of Electrical Engineers, Philadelphia, and John Gordon Gray, secretary Manufacturers' Club, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas the ownership and control of the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, in the Pacific Ocean, have greatly advanced the possibilities and commercial progress of our country, and with the construction of the Nicaraguan Canal will enable our people to develop a merchant marine and advance our trade and commerce with the Orient; and

Whereas Great Britain has largely controlled the trade and commerce of the seas by the construction, ownership, and control of cable lines and canals: Be it, therefore,

*Resolved*, That a Government cable, connecting the islands owned and controlled by our country in the Pacific Ocean, is a necessity for the proper advancement of our trade and commerce, as well as our military and naval protection; also,

*Resolved*, That the measure now pending in Congress, proposed by Hon. JOHN B. CORLISS, of Michigan, commands our hearty approval and, in our judgment, should be speedily adopted.

*Resolved*, That the foregoing resolutions be submitted to Congress, and a copy thereof submitted to each Member and Senator of this State.

I, John Gordon Gray, secretary Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, hereby certify that the above preamble and resolutions are a correct copy taken from the minutes of the said meeting.

[SEAL.]

JNO. GORDON GRAY,  
Secretary Manufacturers' Club.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., December 18, 1900.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, the cost of this cable will not exceed \$10,000,000. It can be operated without expense to this Government. The revenues from commerce and trade will maintain the operation of this cable. It will benefit our nation far more than the construction of battle ships, and the expenditure will bring a greater return in the future. It will not be necessary to make a direct appropriation here, but simply to authorize that contracts may be made, and the appropriation can be made at the next session of Congress. I desire to appeal to the members of this House and to the chairman of this committee at the proper time to allow the amendment, notwithstanding the fact that it may be subject to a point of order under the rules as new legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to yield further time in a general debate. I ask that the Clerk proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of old custom-house at New York, N. Y.: For rent of temporary quarters for the accommodation of certain Government officials, from August 28, 1899, to June 30, 1900, \$109,847.12; from July 1, 1900, to June 30, 1901, \$130,600; from July 1, 1901, to June 30, 1902, \$130,600; in all, \$371,047.12.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike that out; but I will gladly allow it to go over until to-morrow and go on with the reading of the bill, using the time remaining on that paragraph later.

Mr. CANNON. What page is that on, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Pages 5 and 6.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Arkansas, then, desires to move to strike out from line 18, page 5, to and including line 4, page 6?

Mr. McRAE. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. And the gentleman asks to let the motion be pending and let it be called up to-morrow?

Mr. McRAE. Yes, that is the proposition I make. I make the motion to strike it out. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] desires to make a point of order as to part of it.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I should like to reserve the point of order as to the first payments in that aggregate of \$371,000.

Mr. McRAE. It can all go over with the point reserved and the motion pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that request will be granted.

Mr. CANNON. That is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. When will it be taken up to-morrow—at the end of the bill?

Mr. CANNON. It is not important to me. I would just as soon have it taken up in the morning after the House goes into Committee of the Whole. We can agree about that.

Mr. McRAE. Then we will have the understanding that we will take it up to-morrow when we resume consideration of the bill, so that there will be no misunderstanding.

Mr. CANNON. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For post office at Wilkesbarre, Pa.: For purchase of site and completion of building under present limit, \$75,000.

Mr. WILSON of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 19, page 7, the following:

"For furnishing the State House at Phoenix, in the Territory of Arizona, now completed but not furnished, the sum of \$20,000."

Mr. CANNON. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. WILSON of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the object of introducing that at the present time is this: The Territory has just completed its statehouse. It has paid for it the sum of \$120,000, but not enough money is left for the furnishing of the building. It has been in order heretofore, and I believe is now in order, for the Government to lend its aid toward the completing of Territorial buildings for Territorial purposes. That has been done heretofore, but not in this instance. This building has been completed by the Territory itself. Lacking the funds to furnish it, we take this method, and hope that the American Congress will grant this assistance, to furnish the building, which has been completed by the Territory.

Mr. CANNON. My point of order is that there is no law authorizing this appropriation to furnish a building built by the Territory of Arizona for its own purposes. It is true, I apprehend, that from time to time grants have been made to Territories of Government property. The sixteenth section granted for school purposes and grants of Army posts and buildings of one kind and another are examples of this; but that has always been done in accordance with law. Now, I know of no legislation authorizing an appropriation from the Treasury either to build or furnish a Government building for the Territory of Arizona.

Mr. WILSON of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman ought to know that the Territorial building, which is used for Territorial purposes, is also used as a Government building. The Government uses the building, Government officials occupy the building, and it is used in that way for Government purposes as much as many of the buildings included in this bill. That being the fact, I apprehend that the point of order is not well taken, because it goes to the question of use by the Government itself. It is Government aid for Government purposes. It is true that the building is a Territorial building, built by the Territory itself.

Mr. CANNON. It is not a Government building.

Mr. WILSON of Arizona. But the Government uses the building for its own purposes.

Mr. CANNON. It is not a Government building of the United States. It is a building of the Territory of Arizona. Who the occupants of it may be I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Port Penn range, Reedy Island range, Finns Point range, Delaware River, New Jersey: For reestablishment of ranges, \$80,000.

Mr. KERR of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 18, page 11, as a new paragraph, the following: "For the establishment of a beacon light on Hambrook Bar, Choptank River, Maryland, and beacon range lights to guide into harbor of Cambridge, Md., \$10,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman whether the act authorizing that light has been approved by the President?

Mr. KERR of Maryland. It was approved on the 8th of the present month by the President.

Mr. CANNON. Then it is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. McRAE. Was the point of order reserved? I did not hear.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says the act authorizing this light has been approved by the President.

Mr. McRAE. Unless it is the law, I reserve the point of order until I can hear from the gentleman.

Mr. KERR of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to state that there is great need for the establishment of these lights. Hambrook Bar is very dangerous to navigation, and there is absolutely nothing to guide the mariner past this shoal at night. The commerce of the river is steadily increasing, and the demand for lighting the river at this point is general. I earnestly hope the amendment will be accepted, as the establishment of the lights will be of incalculable benefit to my people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tender for the engineer of the Seventh light-house district: For constructing, equipping, and outfitting, complete for service, a new steam tender for construction and repair service in the Seventh light-house district, \$85,000. And the Light-House Board is authorized to employ temporarily at Washington not exceeding three draftsmen, to be paid at current rates, to prepare the plans for the tenders for which appropriations are made by this act; such draftsmen to be paid from and equitably charged to the appropriations for building said vessels; such employment to cease and determine on or before the date when the plans for such vessels being finished, proposals for building said vessels are invited by advertisement.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order



on that paragraph. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee—

Mr. CANNON. What page is it?

Mr. OLMSTED. Page 13. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether there is authority of law for the construction of the tender?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman that my recollection is that the sundry civil bill for a number of years has carried items for the construction of tenders. I am not prepared to say to him that it is not subject to a point of order, but, following precedents that seem to have been made without objection for a number of years, the committee, believing that the service required the construction of this tender, reported it to the House. I do not desire to say that it is not subject to the point of order. On the contrary, if my friend desires to make the point of order, so be it.

Mr. OLMSTED. I have heard the gentleman making the same point of order so often himself against unauthorized items in appropriations from other committees that I feel considerably like making it on this paragraph, and the following paragraphs, appropriating nearly a million dollars for construction.

Mr. CANNON. I am very willing for the broadest inquiry to be made. The estimates were many, and there was not reported anything like the amount asked for in the estimates; and after pretty thorough investigation these items were put in, and regarded as indispensable to care for the service. Now, there was no legislation, as I recollect it, authorizing the building of this tender. If the gentleman thinks it is subject to the point of order, I have not the slightest objection to his making it.

Mr. OLMSTED. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois want to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. Well, rather than discuss the point of order, I would appeal to the gentleman to withdraw it.

Mr. OLMSTED. I understood the gentleman had no objection to its being made.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I had none. I had no care about the Light-House Service more than my friend; probably not so much, because he hails from almost a seaboard State.

Mr. OLMSTED. There is no light-house on the Susquehanna.

Mr. CANNON. That is true; but there are a great many on the Delaware, and there are appropriations that are much more subject to the point of order on the Delaware than this. Now, I will say to the gentleman that my information is, and probably I have no greater interest than any member of the House, the information respecting the light-house tenders is that they are necessary for the service. If the gentleman will read the hearings before the committee and the estimates, he will come to the conclusion that so far as the committee has recommended these appropriations they are of absolute necessity.

Mr. OLMSTED. Well, is there any good reason why a law should not be passed authorizing the construction as well as in the case of a battle ship or any other vessel or a beacon light?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will say to my friend that the decisions on a point of order from the standpoint of principle are not harmonious at all. Now, the four battle ships, or the two battle ships and two cruisers, that were authorized to be built, so far as the House was concerned, on the naval appropriation bill, were never authorized by any legislation except in that general appropriation bill; and the whole Navy has been constructed the same way. The rulings have been uniform, commencing away back, I think under Speaker Keifer or Speaker Carlisle, that a general appropriation bill could carry an authorization of construction for the Navy. Now, I am not here discussing the propriety of the ruling, but the ruling has been made years and years.

Mr. OLMSTED. With one exception—

Mr. CANNON. I will read the gentleman the rule in a moment. After the general clause—

All proposed legislation shall be referred to the committee named in the preceding rule, as follows, viz: Subjects relating \* \* \* (7) to commerce, Life-Saving Service, and light-houses, other than appropriations for Life-Saving Service and light-houses, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Now, then, the construction of tenders—and I will ask the attention of the Chair while I am claiming the attention of the gentleman—the construction of tenders is not by that rule committed to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It has been for many years treated as a sundry-civil expense as incident to the Light-House Service. Appropriations for the Light-House Service as well as for the public service is committed under the rule to the Committee on Appropriations. The committee for many years, the House acquiescing, has made these appropriations, and I do not recollect of a point of order ever having been made before, although it may have been.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It has been.

Mr. CANNON. Not since the Fiftieth Congress. Now, it seems that this is defensible exactly as an appropriation for lamps, for lenses, for oil, for fuel to run the tenders, for light-house

keepers, and so on, as an incident to the service. I am of the opinion that it is not subject to the point of order under the rules and practice of the House.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Would it cripple the service?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, undoubtedly, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, it was distinctly ruled in the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress, on two different occasions, as shown on page 335 of the Manual, that the establishment of a light-house and the building of a new vessel for a light-house tender was not the continuation of a public work, and that, not having been previously authorized by law, such an appropriation should be stricken out. In the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress—the present Congress—it was ruled that the construction of a new vessel for the coast survey was not the continuation of a public work, and, not having the previous authorization of law, it was ruled out by the Chair.

Mr. CANNON. Since the light-house decision made in the Forty-ninth Congress, my recollection is—and I am verified in that recollection by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] and others, whose recollection is much better than mine—that there has been no point of order upon the building of tenders, and that almost every sundry civil bill has carried appropriations for tenders.

Since the Forty-ninth Congress—I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact—the ruling has been repeatedly made upon the naval appropriation bill that the construction of ships for the Navy could be originated and appropriated for. So that, I take it, the decision he refers to in the Forty-ninth Congress has not been followed by the House, and has been in substance overruled by the decision touching the construction of the Navy. Now, then, he says in the Fifty-sixth Congress the point of order was sustained as to the construction of a ship for the Coast Survey.

Mr. OLMSTED. I think the point of order was made by the gentleman from Illinois himself.

Mr. CANNON. I think not, but it may have been so. In the consideration of these bills my memory is not good enough to recollect all the things I have said and done or intended to do. And I take it that they are perhaps on different grounds. As I recollect, touching the Coast Survey, the Revised Statutes authorizes a detail of officers from the Navy and the use of ships of the Navy in the Coast Survey. So that the gentleman will see that it is not on all fours with this case. I say again, Mr. Chairman, the Light-House Service authorized by general legislation the jurisdiction of the legislation for that service and its extension is confided to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with no jurisdiction to that committee to legislate for the building of tenders. Now, then, this is a mere incident to the Light-House Service, for without a tender the light could not shine upon most of the stations.

Mr. McCALL. It is a necessary incident.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; it is a necessary incident, as much as the oil or new lamps or the machinery that is necessary to utilize the carrying on of the light service. Some of the lights are located out in the ocean, many miles from the coast.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I have only a word. This point is squarely covered by the decision in the Forty-ninth Congress, and is covered also by the decision in the present Congress on the Coast Survey vessel. I find other decisions that the construction of a new dry dock for the Navy not authorized by law is not the continuation of a public work within the rule. It was so decided in the second session of the Fifty-fifth Congress and the first session of the Fifty-fourth and the first session of the Fifty-second, and has been so decided whenever the question has been raised. This paragraph and the five succeeding paragraphs approximate six or seven hundred thousand dollars for the construction of new tenders. If they are necessary for the service, there is no reason in the world why a bill authorizing their construction should not be introduced.

My learned friend was about to make a point of order against the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. KERR] appropriating \$10,000 for a light-house station, or for a beacon light, on the ground that it was not authorized, and withdrew it only upon learning that an act had just been passed authorizing it. Why should a point of order be made against that \$10,000 appropriation for a beacon light, which is of as much importance as a tender? And why should almost a million dollars go through for new tenders without a question?

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend allow me there?

Mr. OLMSTED. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Legislation touching the establishment of lights and light-houses is referred under the rule to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Now, then, it is necessary, under that reference, under the rules of the House, before you build a new light-house at a new point, whether it be one that cost one hundred dollars or one thousand, that the proper committee should make its investigation and lead in the enactment of the proper legislation.



But when that committee has performed that duty, then all other appropriations incident to such legislation are authorized by law. Therefore the original appropriation having become law, not only may the fuel and the light and the lenses and the machinery necessary to carry on that light be appropriated for under the law, but the very vessel itself that enables a man to reach the light-house, to carry fuel and supplies to it, is an incident to the original legislation, and is therefore authorized by law.

Mr. OLMSTED. Take the case to which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. KERR] has just referred—the construction of a beacon light at Hambrook Bar, for which we have just appropriated \$10,000—would the construction of a tender at a cost of \$125,000 for use in connection with that beacon light be authorized by reason of the provision of law authorizing the erection of the beacon light?

Mr. CANNON. Congress would have the right to appropriate whatever sum might be necessary to reach the light-house to carry there the lights, the oil, the fuel. Whether Congress appropriates \$100 or \$5,000 or \$5,000,000 is a matter for the discretion of Congress. The object of the rule is to prevent legislation upon general appropriation bills. My point is that the construction of a tender, or a skiff, if you please—and the principle is the same, whether the cost be \$5 or \$5,000,000—is an incident to the service, and therefore authorized by the legislation creating the Light-House Establishment. It is for Congress to say whether it is wise legislation. The gentleman's argument that this tender cost too much would address itself to the discretion of the House.

Mr. OLMSTED. My argument is that this is a case for the application of the rule. When we come to appropriate this large sum in violation of the rule which the gentleman has so often invoked, and for which he gives such good reasons, I feel that I ought to invoke the rule here.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question?

Mr. OLMSTED. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. Suppose a bill were introduced here to build a light-house tender, to what committee would the gentleman, under the rules of this House, refer that bill?

Mr. OLMSTED. I think the Speaker would have no difficulty in finding the proper committee to which to refer it.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. The gentleman is finding fault with this committee for taking jurisdiction of this subject. Now, where would the gentleman, as a parliamentarian, send such a proposition?

Mr. OLMSTED. I will not stop to investigate the rules or the law relating to committees, or to determine the exact jurisdiction of different committees. But I know one committee to which I would not send such propositions; that is the Appropriations Committee, reference to which would be wholly inappropriate and in distinct violation of Rule XII.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Illinois has suggested that the appropriation under discussion is a necessary incident to carrying on the Light-House Service; that tenders to visit these light-houses are a necessity of the service and incident to what is already provided for by law. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania objects to such a proposition being gotten at in this way; but he confesses virtually that he does not know what committee such a proposition should go to.

Mr. OLMSTED. I do not say I do not know. I say there is an appropriate committee to consider such a proposition, and if I were Speaker I would have no difficulty, I think, in designating that committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. But the gentleman does not know what committee it is.

Mr. OLMSTED. It is not necessary for me to look it up now. I know it is not the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CANNON. The fact that this is a point of some importance will be my excuse for claiming further the indulgence of the Chair. I ask the attention of my friend from Pennsylvania and also of the Chair to this provision on page 14 of the bill:

#### LIGHT-HOUSE ESTABLISHMENT.

Supplies of light-houses: For supplying fog signals, light-houses, and other lights with illuminating, cleaning, preservative, and such other materials as may be required for annual consumption; for books, boats, and furniture for stations, traveling expenses, etc.

Now, sir, the provision for "boats" in this general appropriation—and this is the form in which it has been in every sundry civil bill for generations—would be subject to a point of order if the tenders in the paragraph under consideration are subject to such a point.

The gentleman objects under the rule to appropriating for a tender; yet if, in the clause I have just read, we had inserted a provision for tenders and launches, and had increased the amount to a million dollars or five million dollars, I apprehend it would have been entirely in order from the parliamentary standpoint. That is all, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] desire to be heard?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the only possible excuse I can have for addressing the Chair is the exceeding importance of the point of order which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has raised. Practically, it would require the House to depart from a practice that has been universal since 1886. Practically, under the rules, it would be impossible for the House of Representatives in any way to provide tenders for the Light-House Service unless they can be supplied in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to ask the gentleman whether he has any reference to any authority overruling the decision in the Forty-ninth Congress?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Not directly. I am aware of that decision, and I am aware of the fact that if the Chair follows it there is only one course open to him and that is to sustain the point of order. The only question for the consideration of the Chair—and doubtless that question has received due consideration—is whether the universal practice of the House since the time I have named, growing out of the necessities of the public service, is sufficient to warrant the overruling of that precedent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to call the gentleman's attention to a decision made by a Chairman of the Committee of the Whole a year ago on the sundry civil bill when the proposed appropriation was \$20,000, to be immediately available, for the purchase or construction of one small steamer for the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The point of order was made against that, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who was in the chair, sustained the point of order.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the distinction, it seems to me, arises out of the nature of the Light-House Service. If the Chair will bear with me for a moment; I know something about the work of this Light-House Establishment. We have in existence stations on the shore called light-house depots, where supplies for light-houses out in the sea are kept; the oil—the thousand and one things that are necessary for the management of those light-houses. Provisions are also stored in these light-house depots. We appropriate without question for the provisions; we appropriate without question for the maintenance of the existing light-houses.

Now, there is no manner in which we can transport the supplies which we buy or the provisions which we buy from the shore to the light-house except by the employment of these engineers' tenders. That is what they are doing. They are carrying the oil from the shore, where it is stored in the Government station, to the island or ledge in the sea where the light-house stands. It is an absolutely essential part of the service. The lights would go out in thirty days if the engineers' tenders were not in existence. The Light-House Service can not be maintained without the tenders any more than it can be maintained without the oil which is burned in the lamps, or any more than it can be maintained without the provisions which are consumed by the light-house keeper and his assistant.

It seems to me that this is a peculiar case, distinguished entirely from the precedent to which the Chair referred, which was a mere extension, a mere unit added to an existing service, but not the maintenance of a part of the service which is essential to its continuance.

I hope I have made the distinction plain which I am trying to impress upon the Chair. I am not framing this opinion for the necessities of this case. It has always seemed to me that that precedent was an ill-advised one, that there were very much stronger reasons for supposing that the construction of a tender for the Light-House Service was in order on a general appropriation bill than for supposing that battle ships for the Navy were in order on the same kind of a bill.

In the first place, the Chair will recall that originally the ruling was that ships for the Navy were not in order on a general appropriation bill. The practical results of that ruling were such that it became necessary in the interests of the maintenance of the Navy to overrule the decision. The practical results of the decision in the Forty-ninth Congress have made it necessary for Congress, up to this point, to abandon that decision as an authority, and to proceed upon the assumption that the construction of these tenders is in order upon a general appropriation bill.

For these reasons I respectfully submit that this is one of the cases where the Chair may overrule an isolated precedent and consider the question upon principle and upon its real merits.

Mr. OLMSTED. I should like to add just one word in answer to the question of my friend from Mississippi, as to what committee a bill providing for the construction of such a tender should be referred to. I think he will find the answer in clause 7 of Rule XI, which provides that matters relating to commerce, Life-Saving Service and light-houses, other than appropriations for Life-Saving Service and light-houses, shall go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Everything except the appropriations goes to that committee. This proposition never has been before



that committee and its insertion in this bill is clearly in violation not only of that rule, but also of clause 2 of Rule XXI.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Propositions for light-houses always do go to that committee, without question.

Mr. OLMSTED. But the argument of my learned friend is that this is an incident to the light-houses.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It is not a part of the light-house; but it is for the maintenance of the Light-House Service.

Mr. OLMSTED. It is for the building of a new tender. There are already tenders in existence, and this is simply a new construction, and the authorization of it ought to go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is constrained to follow the decision rendered by Judge Reagan in the Forty-ninth Congress, backed up, as the Chair thinks, and supported by the decision of the Chair, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], on the sundry civil bill one year ago. Therefore the Chair will sustain the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sabine Bank light and fog-signal station, Texas: For completing light and fog-signal station on Sabine Bank, in the Gulf of Mexico, off Sabine Pass, \$40,000.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. CANNON. Very well.

Mr. LLOYD. I notice that there is provided for light-houses, beacons, and fog signals quite an additional expenditure over last year—\$285,000. What is the necessity for this additional appropriation?

Mr. CANNON. Well, we have not reached that item yet.

Mr. LLOYD. You are now under the head of light-houses. I do not know just where this \$285,000 increase comes in, at what particular point.

Mr. CANNON. Well, it is all through here.

Mr. LLOYD. I have compared the old bill with the proposed bill, and I can not ascertain where it is that the \$285,000 increase comes in.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will take the trouble to sit down and add up the aggregate of the light-house appropriations he will find they aggregate over \$700,000.

Mr. LLOYD. Can the gentleman inform the House as to the number of new light-houses that are provided for and the number of new fog signals that are provided for in this bill?

Mr. CANNON. The bill itself shows.

Mr. LLOYD. Or the number of new beacons?

Mr. CANNON. The bill shows that specifically.

Mr. LLOYD. Where are they located?

Mr. CANNON. Well, the Sabine Bank light and fog signal is on the coast of the Gulf of Mexico, in Texas, the Lone Star State, that was admitted, I believe, about the close of the Mexican war. We had a fight and acquired a great big block of territory down there. They say it is an awfully dangerous coast, and it has the most insistent lot of Representatives touching appropriations for light-houses of any State in the Union, I think. [Laughter.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, you will observe, however, that all this appropriation for fog signals is under one section of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Which section does my friend refer to?

Mr. LLOYD. On page 15. So that it is impossible for us to determine—

Mr. CANNON. Why, we have not reached that yet, but I will get it in a moment. The Light-House Establishment is on page 15. It is not the Light-House Service.

Mr. LLOYD. "Expense of fog signals" is on page 15.

Mr. CANNON (reading):

For supplying fog signals, light-houses, and other lights with illuminating, preservative, and such other materials as may be required for annual consumption, etc., \$475,000.

That is the general supply appropriation.

Mr. LLOYD. I can not understand from that appropriation what the increase for fog signals is, or what the increase for light-houses is, and where these new light-houses are constructed; or, if there are no new light-houses, why it is necessary to increase the expenditure for the light-houses to so great an extent?

Mr. CANNON. Why, we are getting right at that here, reading them. We have just read one.

Mr. LLOYD. I am aware of the fact that you are reading them. That is the reason I call attention to them.

Mr. CANNON. Now, we will read another. I can not give the gentleman any additional information touching matters that he desires to inquire about further than to say that the items of the bill have been carefully investigated.

Mr. LLOYD. The misfortune with me is, and I suppose that is true of other members of the House, that we do not know the necessity for the appropriation at any given place, and have not had an opportunity to investigate and determine whether these are new appropriations or old ones.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will say to my friend that this particular appropriation, if I recollect aright—and I say it in good faith to him—was authorized by legislation that originated with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. LLOYD. Do you mean that all the additional appropriations for light-houses are authorized by that committee?

Mr. CANNON. Authorized by bills from that committee. That is my impression, that this appropriation is in pursuance of bills so passed.

Mr. LLOYD. Provided for by specific bills?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. LLOYD. Passed at the last session of this Congress?

Mr. CANNON. Well, some; and some for ten years back.

Mr. LLOYD. But those authorized in previous years were included in last year's bill.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; in quite a number of cases where they have been authorized no appropriation has been made, because the committee believed, and the House agreed with it, that with the amount of money that the House desired to appropriate there were more necessary lights elsewhere to be looked after first.

Mr. LLOYD. Can the gentleman inform the House how many there are of such light-houses provided for in this bill that have never been provided for before?

Mr. CANNON. The bill itself shows.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. And every one of these cases is dependent upon a law passed by Congress and signed by the President.

Mr. CANNON. I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tender for the Eighth light-house district: For constructing, equipping, and outfitting, complete for service, a new steam tender for buoyage, supply, and inspection in the Eighth light-house district, \$125,000.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. CANNON. I think under the ruling of the Chair it would go out.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the opinion of the Chair, and the Chair will sustain the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tender for the inspector of the Ninth light-house district: The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to enter into a contract for the construction of a steam tender for buoyage, supply, and inspection, heretofore authorized for the Ninth light-house district, at a total cost not exceeding \$115,000.

Mr. OLMSTED. I make the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tender for the engineer Ninth light-house district: The total cost of said tender, under a contract which is hereby authorized therefor, shall not exceed \$115,000.

Mr. OLMSTED. I make the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tender for the Tenth light-house district: For constructing, equipping, and outfitting, complete for service, a new steam tender for buoyage, supply, and inspection in the Tenth light-house district, \$120,000.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, following the lesson of my learned friends from Illinois and Massachusetts, I make the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tender for the Thirteenth light-house district: For the completion of a powerful seagoing tender for the Thirteenth light-house district, \$20,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. OLMSTED. That is for the completion, I know. It would not have passed the scrutiny of the gentleman unless the original construction of it was authorized by law.

Mr. CANNON. I do not want to deceive my friend. I am just going to see in a moment. I think it is in excess of the authorization; and I know my friend does not want to make fish of one and fowl of another. [After a pause.] It is correct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tender for the Sixteenth light-house district: For completing steam tender for the inspector Sixteenth light-house district, \$30,000.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word; just to say a word about these tenders, and then I am done. I think the committee first and last, on the question of construction of tenders—and I think they only recommended, perhaps, one in five or six that were originally insisted upon—must have spent three or four days and put in laborious, careful work, which, I think, was pretty fair for a sailor of the prairie. But my friend from Pennsylvania is a little to be congratulated upon his points of order. He has in his State the great city of Philadelphia, reaching over the Delaware down to the seaboard, and near by the great city of New York. I am not in mourning, my friend. I would not have said a word. It seemed to me that pleasantly he seemed to



be rather gratified with the success he had on the points of order. The items have been discussed in this House, and the ruling of the Chair has been made as to the provisions, and I approve it. I am not spited by it a particle any more than anyone else is.

Mr. MERCER. In what State is the Thirteenth light-house district, and the Sixteenth light-house district?

Mr. CANNON. I will tell the gentleman. The southern boundary of Oregon, the line between British Columbia, all the navigation between Oregon and Washington, with the Columbia and Willamette rivers, the Straits of Juan de Fuca, Puget Sound, and Alaskan waters.

Mr. MERCER. And the Sixteenth?

Mr. CANNON. The Sixteenth is the river district—on the Mississippi River from Cairo to New Orleans, the Red River, and so on.

Mr. OLMSTED. If I may be permitted, in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, I simply desire to state that in making these points of order I have not the slightest knowledge of what State or Territory any one of these districts may be in. Certainly I had no spite against my friend. On the contrary, I was simply following his teachings, because in every appropriation bill of which he is not in charge I have observed him following line upon line, making a point of order wherever it could be made. I thought it was right, because it seems to me that when we are appropriating so much money for so many different purposes and there is so much demand for economy, if there is an urgent necessity for these tenders it has not been shown. I assume that there are tenders at each of these places.

If there is a necessity for new tenders, it certainly has not sprung up in a day that we should have seven or ten tenders at a cost of nearly a million of dollars; but if there is a necessity let a bill be offered and go to the proper committee; and if that committee reports that it is necessary, why, then, no one will be quicker than myself to vote for it, if it is necessary for the good of the service. At the present time we have no report from any committee at all upon this subject. I had been led to believe that the learned and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations thought money ought not to be appropriated except for construction previously authorized by law, as laid down by the rules of the House and by its practice, so often invoked by the gentleman himself, and particularly where the amount involved is so large as in this case, and where the urgent necessity for it has not been shown, nor, indeed, any necessity at all. The report of the Committee on Appropriations does not even touch upon the question of such necessity.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word or two in regard to these tenders. I know the gentleman wants information—

Mr. OLMSTED. I need it as bad as anybody that I know of.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the Government machine is so complicated it is impossible for any of us to understand it thoroughly. In the first place, I desire to say that no one of these tenders is to be stationed in the part of country from which I come; but I invite the attention of the gentleman to the necessity of one of these light-house tenders. Particularly off the coast of Texas, there was such a condition that twice the inspector of that district put out to sea and twice he had to come back.

The inspection of the Light-House Service had to stop until the Government could obtain some other vessel, so that its inspector could go to the relief of those people who are in charge of the light station. I should be very glad if it could be said that this was a matter of legislation and could be taken up by some appropriate committee, but the practice has been otherwise. Let gentlemen see the situation of the Representatives from Texas and Alabama, who are interested in this appropriation. For ten years—for fourteen years it has been a custom to rely upon the sundry civil bill for the provision of tenders. They knew of no other way of getting them; they knew of no other committee that could consider the subject. They knew of no committee to which a bill could be referred, because there was no practice of referring such bills to any committee except the Committee on Appropriations.

I make no complaint about it. I welcome the gentleman's criticism and scrutiny of this bill. I think it is the duty of every member to do just what the gentleman is doing, in regard to every bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations and other committees, but I call his attention to the condition in which he leaves this question—the condition in which he leaves the Representatives who represent the parts of the country where these tenders are needed. It is a service for no especial locality. The gentleman from Pennsylvania or I may be in a ship off the coast of Texas this summer. The Light-House Service does not benefit the people of Texas particularly, but travelers upon the water, whether they come from Massachusetts or Pennsylvania. It is maintained for the safety of human life.

The Committee on Appropriations have taken up the subject of tenders without any sectional feeling, without any appeal from

anyone except those charged with the public interest. We have done it because the subject-matter has been referred to us by order of the House. Many claims for other tenders than these for which we have appropriated were made. Many were recommended by the Light-House Board itself. We took up only those that seemed to us to be absolutely indispensable for the safety of the life of those who go upon the sea in ships.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to call the attention of gentlemen to the fact, according to my recollection, that the point of order was not made against the Texas item.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Oh, yes; not against the light-house but against the tender for the light-house district covering the Texas coast.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. My friend will remember that this tender service is from Galveston plumb around to Mobile, Ala., and that the tender there now is an unseaworthy vessel, so that that large section of the coast is now practically deprived of, and will be deprived of, the use of a tender to serve that district.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether it would be in order when the next paragraph is read, beginning line 7 and ending at line 16, to add the totals which have been stricken out on the points of order, so that provision can be made for the purchase of light-house tenders in connection with the purchase of lights, boats, and other materials authorized by this paragraph? While I have the floor I wish to say that I was very glad, if I may be permitted to make a statement at this time, to hear the remarks made by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY]. I think it is unfortunate that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should make a point of order against appropriations so worthy as the amounts carried in this bill for the construction of light-house tenders. If there are any appropriations which I feel are vital to the interests and welfare of the people of this country, they are the ones which make provision for the proper protection of the lives and property of our citizens upon the ocean. We should make every provision to properly safeguard the lives of our sailors and the sea-traveling public.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. Can the gentleman point to me any light-house in which the light will be extinguished because of the failure to get an appropriation in an irregular way, because of the failure to construct these tenders by money appropriated without a previous authorization of law?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I do not think I could answer the gentleman intelligently, neither do I think that any member of the House can answer him, because, as stated by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], the boat now in use in the Texas district is in an unseaworthy condition and can not go to the light-houses to find out whether or not they are in a proper condition. And yet here is the great Congress of the United States, which will spend \$780,000,000 this present session, yet we are putting ourselves in the position of making it impossible for the Government to determine whether its light-houses—the sole protection of the sailor and traveler in time of danger—are in a safe and sound condition.

Mr. OLMSTED. Is not the gentleman from Massachusetts one of those who are declaiming against these appropriations made in this Congress and criticizing them vociferously?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I have never criticised an appropriation, when made for a proper purpose, and I am always willing to vote liberal appropriations for the maintenance of all proper and necessary functions of the Government. I think the people of this country would regard appropriations for the protection of life and property on the sea with a greater commendation, with a greater appreciation, than they would the appropriations for any other purpose. Speaking about the difficulties of obtaining favorable legislation in this House in matters affecting the interests of the country, I wish to say that Boston has appealed for the last five years for a boat to do the customs service in and around the port of Boston.

The vessel we had was more than 25 years old and was a disgrace to the United States. It took us five years, and it was only by the permission of the Speaker, who the other day gave his consent to my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. ROBERTS, to call the bill up for unanimous consent, so that the appropriation might be made. I waited here in the House for ten days in succession, so that when Mr. ROBERTS would be recognized by the Speaker, if objection was raised on the Democratic side of the House, I might be able to influence the members to withdraw the objection. My patience was about exhausted before the Speaker recognized Mr. ROBERTS.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania knows full well that if an appropriation was asked after a bill had been reported favorably by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for the purchase or construction of one of these boats, it would be necessary for the member from that district to go to the Speaker and get his consent to be recognized for unanimous consent; and with 357

members in this House the gentleman knows how difficult this matter would be.

In the name of all that is reasonable, when bills come here as they do from different States and from different seaports on our coast, proposing the erection of light-houses and light stations, how is this House going to make such appropriations unless it is to be done on a bill of this kind? I think the Appropriations Committee has done a very wise and useful service in bringing in these appropriations in this way; and I believe that Congress will receive the plaudits of the entire people of the country if we appropriate whatever sum may be necessary, however large, to afford proper protection for life and property on the sea. Nothing appeals to my sympathy so strongly as to picture a vessel with human beings on board floundering around in a storm without rudder or compass, and I will vote for any proper amount for light-houses or life-saving stations to give the utmost protection to this class of people.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### LIGHT-HOUSE ESTABLISHMENT.

Supplies of light-houses: For supplying fog signals, light-houses, and other lights with illuminating, cleaning, preservative, and such other materials as may be required for annual consumption; for books, boats, and furniture for stations, traveling expenses of civilian member of Light-House Board in attending meetings of board at Washington, and not exceeding \$300 for the purchase of technical and professional books and periodicals for the use of the Light-House Board, and for all other necessary incidental expenses, \$475,000.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman wish to raise a point of order on this paragraph?

Mr. OLMSTED. I do not wish to usurp the function of my friend from Illinois, who is accustomed to making these points. If he wishes to make a point of order against the paragraph I have no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I wished to call my friend's attention especially to the word "boats" in this paragraph, which, however, is on a par with the whole paragraph. I did not know but that my friend would desire to be consistent and to proceed along this line with his points of order. I think, if the other provision was subject to such a point, this is.

The Clerk read as follows:

Repairs of light-houses: For repairing, protecting, and improving light-houses and buildings; for improvements to grounds connected therewith; for establishing and repairing day marks and pier-head and other beacon lights, including purchase of land for same; for illuminating apparatus and machinery to replace that already in use; construction of necessary outbuildings, at a cost not exceeding \$300 at any one light station in any fiscal year; and for all other necessary incidental expenses relating to these various objects, \$655,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "dollars," in line 2, page 15, insert the following: "And so much of said appropriation as may be necessary is hereby appropriated for the repair and proper equipment of the light in the Bartholdi statue, New York Harbor."

Mr. CANNON. I think I must reserve a point of order on this amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. This matter was brought to my attention a few moments ago by a gentleman from New York. I remember that at the close of the last Congress—

Mr. CANNON. I will withdraw the point of order temporarily if the gentleman desires to submit some remarks.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I wish to make a statement.

Mr. CANNON. Then I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. A year ago there was quite an agitation in the newspapers of New York City in regard to the insufficiency of the light in the Bartholdi statue. Coming from Boston to Washington and returning from Washington to Boston, I go very frequently in the ferryboat from New York to Jersey City and vice versa, and on the boat I hear comments made repeatedly that the light in the Bartholdi statue is very inadequate.

This statue was presented to the United States Government by the French Republic, and the arm which bears the light points to New York as the gateway of commerce and the entrance to the greatest liberty-loving Republic in the world. It is justly called the "Statue of Liberty Enlightening the World."

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me a moment? I never saw the Bartholdi statue—

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Never saw it! Judging from the actions of the Republican party the past two years, most of them never heard of it.

Mr. CANNON. Is it under the Light-House Service?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I believe it is.

Mr. GAINES. The light there has become very dim since imperialistic ideas have held sway.

Mr. CANNON. Another county heard from. [Laughter.]

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that this statue is a part of the Light-House Service.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I believe it is.

Mr. CANNON. If that be the case, the amendment is not subject to the point of order. But the object sought by the gentleman's amendment is already covered by this clause; it covers the various lights.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I offered my amendment knowing that it would be acceptable to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. No, it is not acceptable, for the reason that if we adopt this amendment somebody may want to advertise a light on the Pacific coast, or my friend from Massachusetts may want to advertise one in Boston Harbor; and so we may have special provisions inserted for 5,000 different lights, and 50 or 100 pages of our bill may be occupied in that way. Yet the effect of this appropriation would not be changed by such specific appropriations. My object in rising was this: My friend having expressed his opinion that this light ought to be brighter, I ask that he now withdraw his amendment and let us go on with the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection ordinarily to acceding to any request of the gentleman from Illinois. But I can not see why he should object to this amendment. The people of the United States, regardless of locality, are interested in maintaining in a proper way the light in the Bartholdi statue. That statue is a present from the French Republic to the United States Government. The Light-House Establishment, in my judgment, has not given proper care and attention to this light, and I think it would be a very praiseworthy thing on the part of Congress, when the matter is brought to its attention, to vote unanimously for this provision.

Mr. GAINES. Tell them why that statue is put there?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. It is put there to symbolize the friendship of the people of the French Republic for the people of the United States. The French Government wished to show its appreciation of the American people in establishing upon this continent the greatest and freest republic in the world.

When this statue was presented the American nation was the embodiment of all that was good and noble. Like the light in the Bartholdi statue, our vision is becoming rapidly dimmed.

The CHAIRMAN (having put the question on agreeing to the amendment). The yeas appear to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I call for a division.

Mr. CANNON. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I insist on a division.

The committee divided; and there were—yeas 20, noes 48.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. No quorum.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I hope my friend will not make that point. I am going to move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the yeas are 20 and the noes are 48. The yeas have it, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. PAYNE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HOPKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 14018) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 5520. An act to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Utah—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. R. 157. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to remove from the files of the Department of the Interior certain letters, to be donated to the State of Iowa—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

And then, on motion of Mr. CANNON (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with certain correspondence, a letter from the Chief of Engineers relating to acquirement of sites for watchmen's quarters, Chippewa Indian Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for preparing for publication the twenty-third volume of Opinions of the Attorney-General—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.



A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an additional appropriation for completion of Mahon Light, Delaware—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusion of fact and law in the French spoliation cases of the sloop *Cygnat*, James Hunt, master, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases of the vessel *Good Intent*, Nathaniel Gaddin, master, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of John Doyle against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3489) authorizing and empowering the Secretary of War to grant the right of way for and the right to operate and maintain a line of railroad through the Fort Ontario Military Reservation, in the State of New York, to the Oswego and Rome Railroad Company, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2886); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPERRY, from the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12551) to prevent the sale of firearms, opium, and intoxicating liquors in certain islands in the Pacific, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2887); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MARSH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred House Document No. 226, reported a bill (H. R. 14176) transferring a lot in Woodland Cemetery to the city of Quincy, Ill., accompanied by a report (No. 2888); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14144) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Pearl River at Monticello, Miss., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2889); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. CONNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4828) granting an increase of pension to Norman Stewart, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2855); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1756) to increase the pension of Oscar W. Lowery, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2856); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2153) granting an increase of pension to Jesse N. Dawley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2857); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3386) granting a pension to Catherine L. Taylor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2858); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7597) to restore Mary Welch to the pension roll, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2859); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5622) granting an increase of pension to Georgina M. Mack, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2860); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9951) granting a pension to Matilda Daugherty, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2861); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5586) granting an increase of pension to John F. Townsend, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2862); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CONNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 715) granting a pension to Fiddlar White, alias William Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2863); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13084) granting an increase of pension to Uriah S. Karmany, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2864); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5322) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Warren, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2865); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3935) granting an increase of pension to James Ryan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2866); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1065), granting an increase of pension to Bettie Lee Ward, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2867); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4985) granting an increase of pension to George C. Jarvis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2868); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5450), granting an increase of pension to Rachel J. B. Williams, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2869); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CONNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3653), granting an increase of pension to Henry Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2870); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3391) granting a pension to John Black, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2871); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13466) granting a pension to Ellen A. Plumley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2872); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5050) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Marsh, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2873); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CONNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2828) granting an increase of pension to Hippolyte Perrault, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2874); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4695) granting a pension to James Dorcey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2875); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4542) granting a pension to Jane W. Wood, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2876); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5201) granting a pension to Samuel F. Radford, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2877); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5007) granting an increase of pension to George N. Tarburton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2878); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5399) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Cragg, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2879); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5006) granting an increase of pension to John T. Comegys, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2880); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4772) granting an increase of pension to John W. Eichelberger, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2881); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3521) granting a pension to William P. Payne, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2882); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4938) granting an increase of pension to Esther Ann Grills, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2883); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3030) granting an increase of pension to Henry Guckes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2884); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5505) granting a pension to Kate M. Scott, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2885); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SOUTHARD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4248) for the relief of Andrew H. Russell and William R. Livermore, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2890); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. JETT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2440) to correct the military record of William B. Smith, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2891); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAPRON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10880) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Julius F. Hill, alias Franklin J. Hill, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2892); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1452) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to John C. Weckler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2893); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 14175) to amend section 4438 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARSH, from the Committee on Military Affairs: A bill (H. R. 14176) transferring a lot in Woodland Cemetery to the city of Quincy, Ill.—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 14180) for the erection of a public building in the city of Evanston, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 14187) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 14189) providing for extra pay for certain officers and men—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEVY: A resolution (H. Res. 415) relative to the use of books of religious songs or hymnals in the public schools of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By the SPEAKER: Resolutions of the legislature of Oregon, relative to the election of United States Senators—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the abolition of the United States tax on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOODY of Oregon: Resolutions of the legislature of Oregon, relative to the Chinese-exclusion laws—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the legislature of Oregon, relative to control of United States forest reserves—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of the legislature of Oregon, relative to adulterated and unwholesome foods—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the legislature of Oregon, relative to the Nicaraguan Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TONGUE: Resolutions of the legislature of Oregon, favoring an appropriation for Curry County, Oreg.—to the Committee on Claims.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 14177) for the relief of Edward Haile—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 14178) for the relief of Sol Bear & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 14179) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Church at Prospect, Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 14181) granting an increase of pension to Marie B. Flannery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14182) for the relief of Elizabeth A. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14183) for the relief of the heirs of Eliah Matheny—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 14184) for the relief of John Young—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14185) for the relief of William Ketland—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 14186) granting an increase of pension to Amanda W. Ritchie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 14188) granting a pension to Louise Poole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14190) for the relief of John D. Chadwick—to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petitions of the First Baptist Church and First United Presbyterian Church of Coraopolis, Pa., favoring the passage of the Gillett bill for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of Sanctuary Methodist Episcopal Church of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of the Gillett bill for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of grand jury of United States district court held at Ocala, urging Ocala, Fla., as the proper place for a public building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Petition of National Bank Cashiers' Association of Massachusetts, favoring the repeal of stamp tax on checks and drafts and the tax on banking capital—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOWLER: Petition of citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of New Jersey, favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of citizens of the Second Congressional district of Tennessee, in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.



Also, petition of citizens of South Knoxville, Tenn., relative to alcoholic trade in Africa, and to prevent the sale of opium, intoxicants, etc., to undeveloped and child-like races—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Petition of Women's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society of Boston, Mass., and Rockland (Mass.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring the passage of the Gillett bill for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Allegheny County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Allegheny, Pa., Mrs. H. H. Forrest, president, favoring the passage of the Gillett bill for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Westport, Mass., favoring the passage of the Gillett and Littlefield bills for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GROW: Petition of Mrs. Eliza Y. Henderson and others, of Philadelphia, Pa., and vicinity, favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Baptist Ministerial Union of San Francisco, Cal., and vicinity, favoring the exclusion of alcoholic liquor from countries inhabited chiefly by native races—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of F. M. Castetter, of Blair, Nebr., with reference to revenue reduction—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Resolutions of National Bank Cashiers' Association, Boston, Mass., against taxing bank capital and against stamp tax on bank checks—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Taggers' National Protective Association of Boston, Mass., for increase of salaries and other measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Petition of Elizabeth A. Smith, of Florence, Ala., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of John D. Chadwick, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of John Young, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of William Ketland, of Alexandria, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: Petition of Iron Molders' Union, No. 13, of Buffalo, N. Y., for irrigation of arid lands, and Government to give title to none but actual settlers on any public lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: Petition of Woman's Relief Corps, No. 5, Department of Idaho, Grand Army of the Republic, asking that a branch of the National Soldiers' Home be established at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 14, 1901.

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

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

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

### FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the clerk in the cause of Joel G. Higgins, administrator of Richard Higgins, deceased, vs. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

### ✓ EVENING SESSION ON DISTRICT CODE BILL.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate shall take a recess from 5.30 this afternoon until 8 o'clock this evening, the evening session to be for the purpose of reading the District code bill, no amendments or other matters to be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that at 5.30 the Senate shall take a recess until 8 o'clock, the evening session to be for the purpose of reading the bill known as the District code bill, no amendments to be acted upon and no other business to be transacted.

Mr. TELLER. I did not understand what is to be read this evening.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The District code bill.

Mr. TELLER. I thought it was read last night?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reading was not completed last night. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? 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 had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 854) for the relief of Lieut. Horace P. McIntosh;

A bill (S. 5023) to extend the privileges of the seventh section of the immediate-transportation act to New Bedford, Mass.;

A bill (S. 5364) to establish a light and fog station at Point Dume, Los Angeles County, Cal.;

A bill (S. 5404) to extend the privileges provided by an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880, as amended; and

A bill (S. 5814) to authorize the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River at Geneva, Ala.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6240) for the preparation of plans or designs for a memorial or statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant on ground belonging to the United States Government in the city of Washington, D. C.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 12258. An act granting a pension to John H. Doremus; and

H. R. 13058. An act granting an increase of pension to Ezra S. Pierce.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. QUARLES presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of the Pattern Makers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the hours of daily labor of workmen and mechanics, and also to protect free labor from prison competition; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. THURSTON presented sundry petitions of citizens of Wakefield, Blair, Alma, Linwood, Osmond, Waverly, Murdock, Cedar Bluffs, Danbury, Omaha, Westpoint, and Brock, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the repeal of the revenue tax on bank capital and bank checks; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Omaha, Nebr., and a petition of sundry citizens of Pender, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors, firearms, and opium to the inhabitants of the New Hebrides and other islands; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SIMON presented the following joint memorial of the legislature of Oregon; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD:

### Senate joint memorial No. 8.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the senate and the house of representatives of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that there exist throughout the United States persons, firms, and corporations engaged in the business of manufacturing adulterated and unwholesome foods, whereby the lives of our inhabitants are greatly endangered, and the consumption of the same has become a serious menace to the public health; and

Whereas it has become a difficult matter for the public to distinguish from appearances between articles of food composed of inferior and unwholesome materials and those of wholesome and healthful ingredients; and

Whereas, by reason of the fraud and deceit practiced on the public by the manufacture of said adulterants, the honest producers of pure and wholesome foods are unable to compete with said manufacturers, and an unfair advantage is thereby taken of them, and many branches of industry in the State of Oregon and various other States, are seriously affected by reason thereof:

Now, therefore, in the interest of the public health and the welfare of our people, and for the protection of honest production and manufacture of healthful and wholesome articles of food, we ask that the Congress of the United States shall pass, without delay, such laws governing and regulating the production and sale of articles of food as will accomplish the end sought by this memorial.

STATE OF OREGON, County of Marion, ss:

I, S. L. Moorhead, chief clerk, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the original now on file in the office of the secretary of state.

S. L. MOORHEAD, Chief Clerk.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of Cooper Lodge, No. 114, International Association of Machinists, of Owosso, Mich., praying that all the remaining public lands be held for the benefit of the