

a pension to Sarah E. Helpman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Joseph V. Stevenson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Silas S. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Katherine Decker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Hylas S. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to George A. Havel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Orville J. Hammond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to George R. Gunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Capt. James R. Ambrose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS: Petition of the San Francisco Planing Mill Owners' Association, that manufacturers of the Pacific coast be given the preference over Eastern manufacturers in performing Government work on public buildings on the Pacific coast—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Fur Sealers' Association of the Pacific Coast, asking the repeal of the act of December 29, 1897, relative to pelagic sealing—to Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 20, 1902.

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

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

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

GAZETTEER OF PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the Secretary of War, which was read:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 16, 1902.

SIR: There has been prepared in the Division of Insular Affairs of this Department during the course of the last year a Gazetteer of the Philippine Islands, containing information relative to the different islands and provinces, civil and military governments, facilities of transportation, cable and postal stations, and general information concerning all localities, compiled from all available official and other sources.

If this book could be printed it would probably be acknowledged as a valuable addition to the literature upon this subject, and its importance at this time might warrant its general distribution as a Congressional document rather than that the cost of its publication be charged to the limited allotment available for printing by the War Department.

Very respectfully,

ELIHU ROOT,
Secretary of War.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication will be referred to the Committee on the Philippines, and printed.

Mr. LODGE. I think it had better go to the Committee on Printing. I understand that it transmits the Gazetteer of the Philippine Islands, which has been prepared. That is a work of considerable magnitude, and I think the Committee on Printing ought to report upon it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

SURPLUS WATERS OF LAKE TAHOE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 18, 1901, certain information relative to the cost of land and the construction of a dam controlling the waters of Lake Tahoe, in the States of California and Nevada; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, and ordered to be printed.

CAMP M'DOWELL, ARIZ.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of correspondence relating to the securing of lands within the Camp McDowell Military Reservation, in Arizona, for the Mohave Apache Indians, together with a draft of a bill providing for the desired legislation; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS BY COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, trans-

mitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the court in the cause of Louise H. Patterson, sole heir of Nancy Eddins, deceased, v. The United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the court in the cause of Caroline Wolfson, executrix of Jacob A. Wolfson, deceased, v. The United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the court in the cause of Z. Toy Holman, administratrix of Clementina H. Holman, deceased, v. The United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

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

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and law and the opinion of the court filed under act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings of the court relating to the vessel brig *Dolphin*, Samuel Miller, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings of the court relating to the vessel schooner *Clarissa*, Benjamin Raynes, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings of the court relating to the vessel brig *Sabatus Neptune*, Samuel Moulton, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings of the court relating to the vessel schooner *Esther*, William Hooper, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings of the court relating to the schooner *Mary*, Tilley Wentworth, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. MCKENNEY, the enrolling clerk of the House, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2044) to increase the amount of the official bond to be furnished by the United States marshal for the District of Alaska in certain cases.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. R. 15) to encourage the holding of the South Carolina Interstate and West Indian Exposition in the city of Charleston, county of Charleston, State of South Carolina, during the years 1901 and 1902.

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

A bill (H. R. 53) for the protection of cities and towns in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 2008) to authorize the city of Duluth, Minn., to construct and maintain, or cause to be constructed and maintained, a car transfer over the Duluth Canal, and for that purpose to occupy certain lands in the United States.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of West Grove Council, No. 273, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of West Grove, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress anarchy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Newark,

N. J., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the International Association of Machinists, American Federation of Labor, of Trenton, N. J., praying that an appropriation be made to supply the deficiency existing in the ordnance fund of the Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Charlotte Emerson Brown Club, of East Orange, N. J., and a petition of sundry citizens of Orange, East Orange, and South Orange, N. J., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Loyalty Council, No. 144, of Monmouth Junction; of Rutherford Council, No. 110, of Rutherford; of Pride of Loyal American Council, No. 100, of Hoboken; of Pride of Marcus L. Ward Council, No. 79, of Newark; of Pride of Home Council, No. 32, of Barnegat; of Pride of Olive Branch Council, No. 89, of Paulsboro; of Molly Pitcher Council, No. 68, of Manasquan, and of Rockview Council, No. 130, of Dunellen, all of the Daughters of Liberty; of councils Nos. 206, 261, 177, 4, 30, 156, 154, 225, 181, 183, 31, 202, 73, 268, 196, 26, 184, 153, 172, 102, 188, 252, 174, 256, 224, 209, 28, 162, 22, 8, 207, 38, 20, 277, 52, 258, 92, 137, 185, 66, 75, 118, 113, 126, 157, 91, 45, 7, 23, 116, 246, 15, 150, 169, 260, 21, 204, 231, 222, 27, 10, 232, 242, 115, 32, 59, 132, 163, 187, 236, 254, 221, 48, 61, 217, 63, 103, 5, 109, 77, 127, 215, 17, 24, 18, 208, 193, 173, 25, 229, 264, and 72, all of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, in the State of New Jersey, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented a petition of Federal Labor Union, No. 181, of Laramie, Wyo., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act, so as to exclude Japanese workmen and all servile Asiatic labor; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of Huntington Lodge, No. 104, International Association of Machinists, of Huntington, W. Va., praying that an appropriation be made to supply a deficiency in the ordnance fund of the Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation extending the coastwise laws of the United States to the Philippine Islands by January 1, 1903; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of Phil Kearny Post, No. 7, Department of Washington, Grand Army of the Republic, of Toledo, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress anarchy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Trades Council of Tacoma, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made to supply the deficiency existing in the ordnance fund of the Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kelso, Wash., praying for the continuance of the present anticanteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the board of county commissioners of Whatcom County, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the mouth of the Nooksack River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 470, of Tacoma, of Typographical Union No. 193, of Spokane, and of the Pressmen's Union No. 81, of Spokane, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Washington, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of Stationary Engineers' Union No. 16, of Boston; of Boiler Makers and Iron Shipbuilders' Union No. 214, of the Central Labor Union of Lawrence; of Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 218, of East Boston; of Carpenters' Union No. 821, of Winthrop; of Printing Pressmen's Union No. 89, of Lawrence; of Stove Mounters and Metal Pattern Workers' Union No. 41, of Chelsea; of Cigar Makers' Union No. 324, of Gloucester; of Chandelier Workers' Union No. 18, of Boston; of Typographical Union No. 120, of Lynn; of Metal Polishers and Buffers' Union No. 107, of Lowell; of Stationary Firemen's Union No. 88, of Worcester; of the Central Labor Union of Haverhill; of Carpenters' Local Union No. 625, of Malden; of Local Union No. 228, of Norwood; of International Typographical Union No. 276, of New Bedford; of United Brewery Workmen's Labor Union No. 28, of Boston; of Hardwood Finishers' Union No. 109, of Boston; of Carpenters' Union No. 441, of Cambridge, and of Carpenters' Union No. 49, of Lowell, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of 403 members of Allegheny Council, No. 23, Daughters of Liberty, of Allegheny, Pa., and a petition of the Past Councilors and Active Workers' Association of Lycoming County, Junior Order of American Mechanics, of Montgomery, Pa., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of 58 citizens of Altoona, 41 citizens of Harrisburg, 30 citizens of Washington, 65 citizens of Slippery Rock, 45 citizens of Pleasant Unity, 60 citizens of Latrobe, 42 citizens of Harrisburg, and 16 citizens of Wellsboro, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GAMBLE. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, favoring the cession of that part of the Rosebud Indian Reservation within the limits of Gregory County, S. Dak., to the Government, and opening the same to free homesteads. I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of South Dakota, Secretary's Office:

I, O. C. Berg, secretary of state of the State of South Dakota, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of joint resolution No. 6, as passed by the seventh legislative assembly of South Dakota, as the same appears of record in this office, and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre, this 27th day of February, 1901.

[SEAL.]

O. C. BERG,
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution No. 6, a joint resolution and memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to treat with the Indians for the cession and opening for white settlement and free homestead entry all that portion of the Rosebud Indian Reservation lying within the boundaries of Gregory County, S. Dak.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the legislature of South Dakota, the senate concurring: Whereas there is in the organized portion of Gregory County, S. Dak., about 6 Congressional townships, said tract being too small in area, population, and assessed valuation to successfully maintain a county government without causing such government to become unduly burdensome; and

Whereas there is also within the boundaries of said Gregory County, S. Dak., about 23 Congressional townships of agricultural land which forms a part of the Rosebud Indian Reservation, and upon which are living a few Indians who have all taken their allotments in severalty; and

Whereas it is understood that the Indians are willing for a reasonable compensation to cede all that portion of the reservation herein mentioned to the Government; and

Whereas the ceding of said portion of the reservation to the Government would still leave a sufficiently large and suitable territory to meet all the requirements of an Indian reservation, while at the same time the ceding and opening to white settlers of all that portion of said reservation above referred to would add to the productive farming land of the State, enlarge the area of Gregory County to a proper and desirable size, and greatly lessen the expense of maintaining the government of said county: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States to treat with the Indians at the earliest practicable date for the cession of all that portion of the Rosebud Indian Reservation lying within the boundaries of Gregory County, S. Dak., and that said tract be open to free homestead entry by white settlers; and be it further

Resolved, That we hereby request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their best efforts to effect the object prayed for in this memorial; and the secretary of state is hereby instructed to forward copies of this memorial to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Mr. GAMBLE presented resolutions adopted by the Educational Association of South Dakota, favoring the establishment of a national university at the city of Washington, D. C.; which were referred to the Committee to Establish the University of the United States.

He also presented the petition of John C. Thomas and 38 other citizens of Brookings, S. Dak., and the petition of Mrs. E. F. Pierce and 154 other citizens of Brookings, S. Dak., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURROWS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Reading and Petoskey, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented papers to accompany the bill (S. 1946) granting a pension to Lillie Mancha; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WETMORE presented petitions of Painters and Decorators' Union No. 195, of Providence; of Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders' Union No. 219, of Newport, and of Westerly Branch, of Westerly, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of sundry citizens of Somerville,

Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Rachel Wendover Council, No. 7, Daughters of Liberty, of Boston, Mass., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of Wood Workers' Local Union No. 24, of Boston; of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers' Union No. 362, of Newton; of Lasting Machine Operators' Local Union No. 260, of Lynn; of the Mule Spinners' Union, of Lawrence; of Plumbers' Union No. 77, of Lynn; of Carpenters' Local Union No. 443, of Chelsea; of Bartenders' Union No. 77, of Boston; of the Central Labor Union, of Haverhill; of Stationary Firemen's Union No. 88, of Worcester; of Metal Polishers and Buffers' Union No. 103, of Lowell; of Carpenters' Union No. 441, of Cambridge; of Carpenters' Union No. 49, of Lowell; of Printing Pressmen's Union No. 89, of Lawrence; of United Brewery Workmen's Local Union No. 29, of Boston; and of Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 218, of Boston, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. DUBOIS. I present a memorial of the legislature of Idaho, relating to the guns captured at the battle of Santa Ana, Philippine Islands, by the Idaho Volunteers. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
SECRETARY'S OFFICE, STATE OF IDAHO.

I, C. J. Bassett, secretary of the State of Idaho, hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 7, by Worthman, relating to guns captured at the battle of Santa Ana, Philippine Islands, by Idaho volunteers, which was filed at this office the 14th day of March, A. D. 1901, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State.

Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 5th day of December, A. D. 1901.

[SEAL.]

C. J. BASSETT, *Secretary of State.*

Senate joint memorial No. 7, by Worthman.

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

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that at the battle of Santa Ana, Philippine Islands, on the 5th day of February, 1899, the First Regiment of Idaho Volunteer Infantry captured two Krupp field guns from the enemy, and your memorialists, desirous of perpetuating in a fitting manner the memory of the gallantry of the Idaho regiment on that memorable day, respectfully and earnestly pray that such steps may be taken by Congress as will enable the present custodians of said Krupp guns to transfer them to the State of Idaho, to the end that they may be properly mounted at the State capital for the purpose above indicated, and, as in duty bound, your memorialists will ever pray.

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 8th day of March, 1901.

THOMAS F. TERRELL,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 12th day of March, 1901.

GLEN P. MCKINLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This senate joint memorial was received by the governor on the 12th day of March, 1901, at 10 p. m. o'clock, and approved on the 12th day of March, 1901.

FRANK W. HUNT, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial No. 7, relating to guns captured at the battle of Santa Ana by Idaho volunteers, originated in the senate of Idaho during the sixth session.

W. A. BROADHEAD,
Assistant Secretary of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Boise City, Idaho.

Filed this 14th day of March, 1901.

C. J. BASSETT, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. McMILLAN presented petitions of Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders' Union No. 269, of Ionia, and of the Adrian Federal Labor Union, No. 9087, of Adrian, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Reading and Petoskey, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented petitions of the Prairie Creek Co-operative Creamery Company, of Prairie Creek, and of the Carlisle Creamer, of Carlisle, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of Prospect Lodge, No. 1, of Elkhart; of Eureka Lodge, No. 14, of Indianapolis; and of Tried and True Lodge, No. 361, of Worthington, all of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, in the State of Indiana, praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SPOONER presented a memorial of the Leaf Tobacco Merchants' Association of Janesville, Wis., remonstrating against any reduction being made in the duty on Cuban tobacco or cigars manufactured in Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Welsh Christian Endeavor Society, of Caledonia, Wis., praying for the continuance of the present anticanteen law, and for a similar law to apply to the Soldiers' Homes of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Good Templars of Milton, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to native races in the Pacific islands; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PATTERSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Sugar City, Loveland, Longmont, Niwot, Berthoud, Fort Collins, Timnath, Windsor, Farmers Spur, Greeley, and Eaton, and of Union Grange, No. 145, Patrons of Husbandry, of Larimer County, all in the State of Colorado, remonstrating against any reduction being made in the duty on sugar imported from Cuba; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Palmyra, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to native races in the Pacific islands; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the American Historical Association, praying for the construction of the proposed hall of records, wherein documents no longer needed may be kept; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented the petition of Edwin Eno and 21 other citizens of Cass City, Mich., praying that no reduction be made in the present duty on sugar; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor, praying for the establishment of a light-house at Pollock Rip Shoals, in the State of Massachusetts; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Maritime Association of the port of New York, praying for the establishment of a harbor of refuge for shipping at Charleston, S. C.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National League of Commission Merchants of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to give the Interstate Commerce Commission power to enforce their findings; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present an argument of Edmund Woog in support of the bill (S. 900) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Woog. I ask that it be received and referred to the Committee on Pensions, to accompany that bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The paper will be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of 24 citizens of Susquehanna County, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Turtlecreek Council, No. 28, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Turtlecreek, Pa., and of Conemaugh Council, No. 137, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Conemaugh, Pa., praying for the repeal of the Chinese-exclusion law; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of Glass Blowers' Local Union No. 47, of Sheffield; of Arch Terra Cotta Workers' Union No. 76, of Philadelphia; of Tub Molders Helpers' Union No. 7452, of New Brighton, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State

of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of 25 citizens of Harrisburg, 74 citizens of Slippery Creek, 108 citizens of Latrobe, 33 citizens of Washington, 19 citizens of Harrisburg, 16 citizens of Wellsboro, and 17 citizens of Dauphin, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SALE OF LIQUORS IN THE ARMY IN THE PHILIPPINES, ETC.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I present the annual report of E. C. Dinwiddie, legislative superintendent of the American Antisaloon League at the sixth national convention, held in Washington, D. C., December 5, 1901, including extracts from hearings held before the Senate and House committees, relating to the Army canteen and the sale of liquors in the Philippines, the Pacific islands, etc. The report contains very valuable information, and I ask that it be printed as a document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the paper presented by him be printed as a public document. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Does the Senator desire the reference of the paper to any committee after it shall have been printed?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I think, Mr. President, it ought to lie upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The paper will be printed and lie upon the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2562) granting a pension to Emma R. Pawling, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2806) granting an increase of pension to Laura S. Picking, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 708) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Evanston, in the State of Wyoming, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1802) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia E. Wright, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WETMORE, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 16) authorizing the issue of duplicate medals where the originals have been lost or destroyed, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2928) for the relief of Leonard I. Brownson, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (S. 2063) granting a pension to Ida S. McKinley;

A bill (S. 2441) granting an increase of pension to Ziba S. Woods; and

A bill (S. 9) granting a pension to Mourse R. Adams.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2700) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Couch, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2468) granting an increase of pension to Horatio N. Francis; and

A bill (S. 2701) granting a pension to Thomas G. Foster.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8581) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TURNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1630) granting a pension to Ella R. Graham, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (S. 2445) to provide for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station on one of the Mile Rocks, San Francisco Bay, California;

A bill (S. 2450) to establish a fog bell and lens-lantern light on the southeastern end of Southampton Shoal, San Francisco Bay, California;

A bill (S. 2446) to establish a light and fog signal at a point on Karquines Strait, California, opposite that now occupied by the Selby Smelting Works;

A bill (S. 2447) to provide for the construction of a light-ship for Blunts Reef, Pacific Ocean, off Cape Mendocino, California; and

A bill (S. 2449) to establish a fog signal at Fort Winfield Scott, Fort Point, Cal.

Mr. SIMON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1015) granting an increase of pension to Israel A. Benner;

A bill (S. 1940) granting a pension to Frances Fuller Victor; and

A bill (S. 2406) granting a pension to Arthur I. Nicklin.

Mr. QUARLES, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 110) to provide for the erection of a public building at Greeneville, Greene County, Tenn., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MCCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2440) granting an increase of pension to John W. Gregg, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2008) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Monfort, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1026) to fix the compensation of district superintendents of the Life-Saving Service, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 219) for the relief of Mary Chambers, widow of Thomas Chambers, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FAIRBANKS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2735) to increase the limit of cost of the post-office, custom-house, and court-house building at Cleveland, Ohio, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 238) for the relief of Arthur R. Henderson, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on the Philippines I report back with sundry amendments the bill (H. R. 5833) temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, and I submit a written report thereon.

I desire to give notice that I shall move to take up this bill tomorrow at 2 o'clock; and after the bill has been taken up and read I shall make a brief statement to the Senate in regard to it.

I will take this opportunity to state that this is a bill which, in the judgment of the committee, requires immediate attention, and I shall hope to bring it before the Senate from day to day as the unfinished business until it is disposed of. I have no desire to press the bill unduly, and I know there is no desire among those who are opposed to the bill to obstruct a vote, but there is a very proper wish to debate the subject thoroughly. I only ask that when the bill is made the unfinished business of the Senate and is before the Senate for debate, Senators desiring to speak upon it will be prepared to follow in the debate from day to day, so that time may not be wasted in dealing with it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed upon the Calendar.

Mr. LODGE. I ought to add that the minority of the committee will offer a substitute bill; and I told the minority members of the committee that I would give notice of their wish to file a minority report.

Mr. RAWLINS. In behalf of the minority members of the Committee on the Philippines, consisting of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON], and myself, I offer a substitute for the bill which has just been favorably reported. I ask that the proposed substitute be read, printed, and that it lie upon the table. I also give notice that upon the conclusion of the remarks to be made to-morrow by the chairman of the committee I shall submit some remarks in support of the substitute which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah desire to have the substitute read?

Mr. RAWLINS. Yes, I should like to have it read now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed amendment will be read.

The Secretary read the proposed substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed at the request of the Senator from Utah and lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. As the substitute bill offered by the minority has been read, and very properly, I ask that the bill with the amendments reported by the committee be read also, so that both measures may stand together in the RECORD.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the committee's bill appear in the RECORD, preceding the substitute.

Mr. LODGE. Very well; let it appear first.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks for the present reading of the bill reported favorably from his committee. It will be read.

The bill (H. R. 5833) temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, was read, as follows:

[Amendments of the committee; Omit the part in brackets and insert the part printed in italics.]

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of an act entitled "An act to revise and amend the tariff laws of the Philippine Archipelago," enacted by the United States Philippine Commission on the 17th day of September, 1901, shall be and remain in full force and effect, and there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles coming into the Philippine Archipelago from the United States the rates of duty which are required by the said act to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles imported from foreign countries into said archipelago.

SEC. 2. That on and after the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles coming into the United States from the Philippine Archipelago the rates of duty which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles imported from foreign countries.

Provided, That upon all articles the growth and product of the Philippine Archipelago coming into the United States from the Philippine Archipelago there shall be levied, collected, and paid only 75 per cent of the rates of duty aforesaid: And provided further,

That the rates of duty which are required hereby to be levied, collected, and paid upon products of the Philippine Archipelago coming into the United States shall be less any duty or taxes levied, collected, and paid thereon upon the exportation thereof from the Philippine Archipelago, as provided by the act of the United States Philippine Commission referred to in section 1 of this act, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, but all articles the growth and product of the Philippine Islands now admitted into the ports of the United States free of duty and exported from said islands for use and consumption in the United States shall be hereafter exempt from any export duties imposed in the Philippine Islands.

SEC. 3. That on and after the passage of this act [the], in addition to any tonnage dues or taxes now imposed by the government of the Philippine Islands, same tonnage taxes shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all foreign vessels coming into the United States from the Philippine Archipelago or engaged in traffic between the ports of the Philippine Archipelago which are required by law to be levied, collected, and paid upon vessels coming into the United States from foreign countries: *Provided, however,* That until otherwise provided by law, the provisions of law restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from one port of the United States to another port of the United States shall not be applicable to foreign vessels engaging in trade between the Philippine Archipelago and the United States, or between ports in the Philippine Archipelago.

SEC. 4. That the duties and taxes collected in the Philippine Archipelago in pursuance of this act, [less the cost of collecting the same] and [the gross amount of] all [collections of] duties and taxes collected in the United States upon articles coming from the Philippine Archipelago and upon foreign vessels coming therefrom, shall not be covered into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States, but shall be held as a separate fund and paid into the treasury of the Philippine Islands, to be used and expended for the government and benefit of said islands.

SEC. 5. That when duties prescribed by this act are based upon the weight of merchandise deposited in any public or private bonded warehouse, said duties shall be levied and collected upon the weight of such merchandise at the time of its entry.

SEC. 6. That all articles manufactured in bonded manufacturing warehouses in whole or in part of imported materials, or of materials subject to internal-revenue tax and intended for shipment from the United States to the Philippine Islands, shall, when so shipped, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, be exempt from internal-revenue tax, and shall not be charged with duty except the duty levied under this act upon imports into the Philippine Islands.

That all articles subject under the laws of the United States to internal-revenue tax, or on which the internal-revenue tax has been paid, and which may under existing laws and regulations be exported to a foreign country without the payment of such tax, or with benefit of drawback, as the case may be, may also be shipped to the Philippine Islands with like privilege, under such regulations and the filing of such bonds, bills of lading, and other security as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, prescribe.

That where [imported] materials on which duties have been paid are used in the manufacture of articles manufactured or produced in the United States, there shall be allowed on the shipment of said articles to the Philippine Archipelago a drawback equal in amount to the duties paid on the materials used, less 1 per cent of such duties, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

SEC. 7. *Merchandise in bonded warehouse or otherwise in the custody and control of the officers of the customs, upon which duties have been paid, shall be entitled on shipment to the Philippine Islands within three years from the date of the original arrival, to a return of the duties paid less 1 per cent, and merchandise upon which duties have not been paid may be shipped without the payment of duties to the Philippine Islands within said period, under such bonds and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.*

Substitute intended to be offered by Mr. RAWLINS in behalf of the minority members of the Committee on the Philippines for the bill (H. R. 5833) to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes:

A bill to promote the prosperity and establish the independence of the Philippine Islands.

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the provisions hereinafter set forth, the United States of America hereby relinquish all claim of sovereignty over and title to the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands.

That from and after the passage of this act said archipelago shall be foreign territory, and all goods entering the United States therefrom shall be subject to the same duties, customs, and imposts as are now, or may here-

after be, prescribed by law for goods entered from other foreign countries; *Provided,* That during the temporary occupation of said islands, as hereinafter provided, all trade between the same and the United States shall be free.

That the United States shall continue to occupy and govern said archipelago until the people thereof have established a stable government, and until sufficient guaranties have been obtained for the performance of our treaty obligations with Spain, for the safety of those inhabitants who have adhered to the United States, and for the maintenance and protection of all rights which have accrued under their authority.

That as soon as these results have been accomplished it is declared to be the purpose of the United States, which the President is directed to carry into effect, to withdraw from said islands and leave the government, control, and sovereignty thereof to the inhabitants of the same, retaining only such military, naval, and coaling stations as may be designated by the Government of the United States.

That until the people of the islands shall establish a government, as hereinbefore provided, all laws, rules, and regulations now in force for the government of the islands and the raising of revenue therefor shall be in force except as the same may be in conflict with this act.

CODIFICATION OF CRIMINAL LAWS.

Mr. HOAR, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the report of the Commission to Revise and Codify the Criminal Laws of the United States, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws of the United States; which was agreed to.

THE SHIPPING BILL.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1348) to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and the common defense, to promote commerce, and to encourage the deep-sea fisheries, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VEST subsequently said: Mr. President, has the shipping bill—the subsidy bill—been reported to the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was reported to-day.

Mr. VEST. The fact escaped my attention. I desire to state, on behalf of the Democratic Senators on that committee, that we dissent from that report and ask leave to file a minority report hereafter. I also submit certain amendments in my own behalf to that bill and ask that they be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received.

Mr. VEST submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1348) to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and the common defense; to promote commerce, and to encourage the deep-sea fisheries; which were ordered to be printed.

MRS. IDA S. MCKINLEY.

Mr. MASON. I report back favorably, without amendment, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, the bill (H. R. 3239) providing for the free transportation of all mail matter sent by Mrs. Ida S. McKinley; and I ask that the bill be placed upon its passage.

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

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

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

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 449) providing for the free transportation of all mail matter sent and received by Mrs. Ida S. McKinley, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 2964) granting an increase of pension to James K. Brooks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2965) granting an increase of pension to Jacob T. Wise; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2966) for the relief of George W. King; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2967) to require cases of typhoid fever occurring in the District of Columbia to be reported to the health department of said District; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2968) granting a pension to Roxanna N. Wilford; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 2969) granting a pension to Fred Sturm; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2970) granting a pension to George

W. Hasley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HEITFELD introduced a bill (S. 2971) granting an increase of pension to Silas D. Strong; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 2972) to provide for the building of a water dock at the channel at Ship Island, Mississippi; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2973) for the relief of Stephen Bird, executor of John Bird, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying affidavit of Stephen Bird, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2974) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Boyer; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the affidavit of E. R. Bullock, M. D., of Eldorado Springs, Mo. I move that the bill and accompanying paper be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2975) granting an increase of pension to Levi Hatchett; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition of Levi Hatchett, Company B, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, verified by his affidavits and affidavits of Thomas B. Turnbaugh, M. D., M. V. Cline, and C. C. Bass. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2976) granting an increase of pension to Edward Thompson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2977) authorizing the Missouri and Meramec Water Company to take water from the Missouri River, and to construct and maintain a dam or other devices for that purpose; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 2978) to define the status of officers of the United States Army who have served as commissioned officers in military or semimilitary organizations in the insular possessions of the United States or in Cuba; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CLARK of Montana introduced a bill (S. 2979) to ratify an agreement with the Indians of the Crow Reservation in Montana, and making appropriations to carry the same into effect; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 2980) for the relief of the estate of William A. Nally; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2981) granting an increase of pension to William T. Hord; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CARMACK introduced a bill (S. 2982) to extend and enlarge the post-office building at Memphis, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2983) granting a pension to Susan Bryant; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2984) for the relief of the estate of Robert Edwards, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2985) to carry into effect a finding of the Court of Claims in favor of Charles O. Spencer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 2986) making an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Interior to remove the Wenatchi Indians to the Colville Reservation, Wash.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2987) to prevent the transportation of deleterious foods and drinks, and for the appointment of a dairy and food commissioner; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to state that this bill was sent to me by some very good men, and I suppose it is a proper bill, but I do not know. I therefore do not give my assent to it except to introduce it for consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To what committee does the Senator from Illinois desire to have the bill referred?

Mr. CULLOM. To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I presume.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so referred.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington introduced a bill (S. 2988) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served during the Spanish-American war and beyond the period of their enlistment; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2989) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Fairmont, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. QUARLES introduced a bill (S. 2990) for the relief of Nora G. Hazlett; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 2991) for the relief of F. C. Boucher; and

A bill (S. 2992) to ratify an agreement with the Sioux tribe of Indians of the Rosebud Reservation in South Dakota, and making appropriation to carry the same into effect.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 2993) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to condemn and turn over to the State of Idaho two Krupp field guns captured from the enemy by the First Regiment Idaho Volunteer Infantry at the battle of Santa Ana, Philippine Islands, February 5, 1899; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 2994) to remove the charge of desertion against George W. Posey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 2995) granting an increase of pension to Charles Wil-lauer;

A bill (S. 2996) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Hazen;

A bill (S. 2997) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Smith;

A bill (S. 2998) granting an increase of pension to William Campbell;

A bill (S. 2999) granting an increase of pension to Preston P. Brady;

A bill (S. 3000) granting an increase of pension to William Eastin;

A bill (S. 3001) granting an increase of pension to John M. Phifer;

A bill (S. 3002) granting an increase of pension to John E. Pichard;

A bill (S. 3003) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Barber;

A bill (S. 3004) granting a pension to Catharine Cooper;

A bill (S. 3005) granting an increase of pension to Adam H. Constant;

A bill (S. 3006) granting an increase of pension to Horace C. Derr;

A bill (S. 3007) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Whitley;

A bill (S. 3008) granting a pension to Theodore Lyon; and

A bill (S. 3009) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Clayton.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 3010) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Lister; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MASON introduced a bill (S. 3011) for the relief of F. E. Coyne; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3012) granting an increase of pension to William O. Osgood; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3013) granting an increase of pension to Silas W. Morrison; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3014) to remove charge of desertion against Andrew L. Grungett; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3015) for the establishment of a food bureau, and for preventing the adulteration and misbranding of foods in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and for regulating interstate commerce therein, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. TURNER introduced a bill (S. 3016) to increase limit of

cost of light-house and fog signal at Browns Point, State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

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

A bill (S. 3017) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Hige;

A bill (S. 3018) granting an increase of pension to Henry Blake;

A bill (S. 3019) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah Bradford;

A bill (S. 3020) granting an increase of pension to Eliza E. Littlefield;

A bill (S. 3021) granting a pension to India Stewart; and

A bill (S. 3022) granting an increase of pension to Michael McDonald.

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a bill (S. 3023) entitling veterans of Indian wars to admission to the Soldiers' Homes in the United States on the same terms as veterans of the late war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3024) for payment of balance unpaid on Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war claims for suppression of Indian hostilities in 1855 and 1856, as found due by commission appointed by Secretary of War, consisting of Gen. Rufus Ingalls, Capt. A. J. Smith, and Hon. L. F. Grover, pursuant to act of Congress, and disallowed by Third Auditor of the Treasury, as per his report of February 7, 1860; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3025) providing for the payment of claims arising out of the Cayuse Indian war in Oregon in 1847 and 1848; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 3026) granting an increase of pension to Marie U. Nordstrom; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 3027) for the relief of the estate of Jesse Hollingsworth, deceased;

A bill (S. 3028) for the relief of Mrs. Harriett Mallory;

A bill (S. 3029) for the relief of the estate of Andrew C. Kerr, deceased; and

A bill (S. 3030) for the relief of Chester Bethel.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 3031) granting extra pay to certain officers and enlisted men of the United States Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3032) granting a pension to Samuel J., Christopher, and Jane Vickers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 3033) authorizing the appointment of an additional adjutant and inspector, three additional quartermasters, and the filling from civil life of vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying letter from the Secretary of the Navy, which was ordered to be printed as a document, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3034) for the relief of the owners and officers of the brig *Olive Frances*, and others on board said brig; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

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

A bill (S. 3035) granting an increase of pension to Elias Brewster; and

A bill (S. 3036) granting an increase of pension to Jason Leighton.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 3037) to remove the charge of desertion against Daniel Sherar; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 3038) granting an increase of pension to Frank K. Nye; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 3039) for the relief of Mrs. A. McD. Morris (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3040) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Boyle, deceased.

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

A bill (S. 3041) granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Shilling;

A bill (S. 3042) granting a pension to John A. Reilley;

A bill (S. 3043) granting a pension to William Penn Mack;

A bill (S. 3044) granting an increase of pension to John I. Fleming; and

A bill (S. 3045) to restore to the pension roll the name of Henry M. Stiffler (with an accompanying paper).

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

A bill (S. 3046) to remove charge of desertion from the military record of Herman E. Colby;

A bill (S. 3047) to authorize the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion and issue to William H. Fairlamb, deceased, Company D, Eighty-eighth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, an honorable discharge;

A bill (S. 3048) to correct the military record of James S. Coyle;

A bill (S. 3049) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John R. Scaggs;

A bill (S. 3050) to correct the military record of Joseph H. Richards; and

A bill (S. 3051) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John C. Carroll, alias John T. Johnson (with accompanying papers).

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 3052) granting an increase of pension to Emily Martel; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 38) to provide for the celebration of the semicentennial anniversary of the construction of the original ship canal at the falls of St. Marys River, in the State of Michigan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 39) recognizing the able and gallant services of Capt. Francis Tuttle, Revenue-Cutter Service, his officers and men of the *Bear*; also the heroic services of Lieuts. David H. Jarvis, Ellsworth P. Bertholf, and Dr. Samuel J. Call, composing the overland expedition to Point Barrow, Arctic Ocean, for the relief of imperiled whalers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 40) for the relief of the heirs of Capt. W. W. Withenbury, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 41) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain, allow, and pay the claims of the several States for all moneys by them actually paid to aid the General Government in maintaining the national defense when carrying on the war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PROTECTION OF SALMON FISHERIES OF ALASKA.

Mr. BARD submitted the following resolution; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the report of Howard M. Kutchin, special agent of the Treasury Department, on the "Protection of the salmon fisheries of Alaska" be printed, and that 750 additional copies be printed and bound in paper covers for the use of the Treasury Department.

HAMILTON H. BLUNT.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate a copy of all records and papers bearing upon the court-martial and military services of Hamilton H. Blunt, late captain of Forty-ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.

PHILIPPINE CUSTOMS TARIFF.

Mr. CULBERSON. I offer a resolution of inquiry, and ask that it shall be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read. The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate copies of all suggestions, statements, criticisms, and correspondence between the War Department, or any official thereof, and any person or corporation, and between the War Department, or any official thereof, and the Philippine Commission, relating to the customs tariff affecting the Philippine Islands which culminated in the tariff adopted by the Philippine Commission September 17, 1901.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SPOONER. Let it be printed and go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the resolution goes over under the rule.

THE SHIPPING BILL.

On motion of Mr. FRYE, it was

Ordered, That there be printed, in addition to the usual number, 1,500 copies of each of the following named documents, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 500 copies for the use of the Committee on Commerce, viz: Senate bill 1348, known as the shipping bill, as reported to the

Senate; the report thereon, synopsis of the report, and Senate Document No. 101, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, with corrections.

MESSENGER FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COAST DEFENSES.

Mr. MITCHELL. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read. The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Coast Defenses be, and it hereby is, authorized to employ a messenger, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, it is perhaps ungraciously to suggest that the clerical and other official force of the Senate is being very rapidly increased, and that without the consideration of any committee as to whether it should be so increased. We have had in the last few weeks several resolutions—I think four or five—appointing additional messengers to committees. Such resolutions are referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. That committee thinks it has no jurisdiction to determine whether such officers should be appointed, but simply the question as to whether there is money enough in the contingent fund with which to pay them. I suppose it to be a fact that the clerical and other official force of the Senate costs more money than the salaries and mileage of Senators. I do not know in reference to the necessity which exists as to this particular resolution, but I do feel that it is my duty to make these suggestions here, so that the matter may be scrutinized, at least, as to the necessity for such appointments.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the resolution be again read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be again read.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks on the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be first read.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. Has that resolution just been introduced, or has it been reported by a committee?

Mr. MITCHELL. It is simply introduced now for reference to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. And not reported this morning?

Mr. MITCHELL. Not at all. The resolution was simply introduced by myself this morning for reference to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is all I want to know.

Mr. MITCHELL. I only desire to say, in answer to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], that I regret he did not see his way clear to put in the suggestion he has now made against this resolution a little earlier in the session when divers resolutions of the kind have been introduced and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I join with the Senator in expressing the hope that the Committee on Contingent Expenses, as I have no doubt they will, may carefully scrutinize the resolution and do just what they think is right in the matter.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I should not have made the remarks I did if I had not been told by a member of the Committee on Contingent Expenses that that committee did not consider the propriety or the necessity for the appointment of additional clerical and official force when such resolutions were referred to them; that they thought that was beyond their jurisdiction; that the only question they considered was whether there was sufficient money in the contingent fund to provide for the payment of the additional officers. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], who is on the Committee on Contingent Expenses, can tell me whether I am right or wrong about that.

If the Committee on Contingent Expenses would take jurisdiction of these resolutions and determine whether there is such a necessity for the appointment of new officers that it ought to be done, of course I should have nothing to say about it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I did not hear the resolution read, but I presume it is in the usual form, providing for an additional clerk or messenger or some official connected with a committee.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] is partly right and partly wrong, so far as any utterance of mine is concerned. In the matter of investigations I have insisted that such propositions should first go to the committee having jurisdiction over the particular subject, and if the committee, as a committee, thought it was desirable that an investigation should be had, then the resolution should go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Con-

tingent Expenses of the Senate, so as to present to us only the question as to whether or not there was money sufficient in the contingent fund to provide for the investigation. I think it would be wise if the same position was taken in reference to additional clerical help; that instead of one Senator asking for it, the particular committee should in some way make known to the Senate that the additional help was required.

Not being chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and occupying the position of acting chairman only in the absence of the chairman, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES], I do not feel like stating to-day how much of a burden is already imposed upon the contingent fund in the matter of additional clerks and messengers to committees. I have held that it was a grievance, and that there ought to be some remedy for it; but others have not agreed with me; the Senate has not agreed with me, certainly, and so I shall not raise that question to-day, but I think we ought to weigh very carefully the question of the necessity of additional help whenever it is asked for. I venture to repeat that I think the committee itself, rather than the chairman or any individual member of the committee, should ask for such additional help.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to ask the Senator if the Committee on Contingent Expenses considers it a part of its duty, upon the reference of such a resolution, to consider the necessity for the additional force, or whether it confines itself simply to the question of whether, after an examination of the accounts, the contingent fund is adequate for the payment of the additional employees?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will say frankly that my individual view has been that the responsibility of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate ceased when it determined the simple fact as to whether or not there was money enough to meet any charge that was placed upon the contingent fund by virtue of a resolution passed by this body.

Mr. SPOONER. Do the Senator and the committee intend that the Senate shall understand that when a resolution of this character is favorably reported it covers the two points, first, whether there is adequate money in the contingent fund, and, second, that upon the merits of the proposition the resolution should be adopted, or only the first point?

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has me at a disadvantage, inasmuch as I am not chairman of that committee; but I think I am safe in saying that during my service on that committee the committee has had very few sessions; it has been called to meet as a committee very few times. The chairman of the committee has rather taken upon himself this matter, oftentimes conferring on the floor with other members of the committee; but I do not know precisely what attitude the chairman would assume on the question raised by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

I have not felt that it was the function or the duty of this committee to enter into any investigation as to the necessity for a particular expenditure after the Senate had sent a resolution to that committee. We have sometimes made inquiry—I have myself—of chairmen of committees who are asking for additional help, and we have taken the word of the chairmen that the help was needed. That is as far as I can go in answering the Senator's question.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will permit me, I suppose if a similar resolution were introduced as to every committee of this body and the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate found there was sufficient money in the contingent fund of the Treasury the resolution would be reported back favorably?

Mr. GALLINGER. In view of what has taken place in this body during the past few years, I will say to the Senator and to the Senate what I have said in my individual and private capacity, that, in my judgment, the time is rapidly approaching when every committee of this body will ask for additional help, and that burden will be imposed upon the contingent fund. There has been no denial of any such request yet made so far as I know.

Mr. SPOONER. I have no purpose at all to antagonize the resolution introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL]. I know him very well, and I know him well enough to believe—he is an old Senator of great experience and great ability—that he would not introduce such a resolution unless he thought his committee needed the services; but I agree entirely with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] that such resolutions should not be passed as a matter of course simply upon the finding of the committee, of which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is a member, that there is adequate money in the contingent fund of the Senate. I think there ought to be some committee of this body—that question having been determined—to pass upon the merits of the proposition, otherwise we shall have every committee, large and small, important and unimportant, with a messenger added to the rolls of the Senate.

I believe it is true that the Senate as a body has considered a

report by this committee as covering both propositions; and I believe it is true also, from what the Senator from New Hampshire says, that the merits of the question, the necessity for the additional employee, has not been considered by this committee. I think the Senator from Connecticut is altogether right; and unless the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is to consider it a part of its duty to pass not only upon the question as to whether there is sufficient money in the contingent fund, but is also to consider and pass upon the merits of the proposition, I shall move that such resolutions be referred, before they are acted upon by the Senate, to the Committee on Rules or some other committee.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I think the present method of dealing with this subject is exactly the proper one. These are propositions which already come from a committee. They say they want a messenger. I understand practically the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] represents his committee in his resolution. I do not think, if any committee wants a messenger, that the question should be referred to some other committee of equal, but not superior, dignity, or that it should go to the Committee on Rules without any consideration by the Senate. They make their report, as I understand, not undertaking—I will not say not presuming to undertake—to review the judgment of the committee by whom the request is made. Then the matter is up before the Senate, and is to be discussed upon its merits. Suppose the Judiciary Committee or the Committee on Appropriations should want an additional messenger, I do not see how the Committee on Rules would have any better judgment than the committees immediately concerned as to what is wanted.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will permit me, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] stated that this resolution and similar resolutions were not reported from a committee, but were introduced by the chairman of the committee, by a Senator, as other resolutions are.

Mr. HOAR. That is, I suppose, a mere formality. I take it, as a matter of course, the chairman of a committee asking for a messenger for that committee is presumed to represent that committee's desire.

Mr. GALLINGER. A single additional word, Mr. President. I regret that the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is not present to speak for himself.

Mr. JONES of Nevada entered the Chamber.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand the chairman of the committee is now present, but I presume he is not informed of what has transpired here. I rose, however, to make an observation in a somewhat different line, which is that for the most part the law in providing messengers and assistant clerks for committees has placed the amount of their salaries at \$1,440. That is what the assistant clerks in most large committees of the Senate are getting. Recently Senators have introduced resolutions asking for assistant clerks, naming the amount of \$1,800 a year; and such resolutions have been passed by the Senate. We have that absurdity, as I look upon it—a provision in the law for assistant clerks at \$1,440, properly provided by statute, and a provision for an assistant clerk, to be paid out of the contingent fund, passed upon a Senator's resolution at \$1,800 a year. I have tried to remedy that discrepancy, but have not succeeded. I think the position which the committee has taken for the most part has been that if a chairman of a committee asks for additional help the presumption is that the committee needs the help, and it is granted.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is nothing really before the Senate for debate.

Mr. MITCHELL. My resolution has been under discussion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to say a word.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No objection being made, the Senator will be heard.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, as my resolution has got something of a black eye before its reference to the committee, without any intention, as a matter of course, upon the part of any Senator to give it a black eye, I simply desire to make a remark, so that that may also go to the committee.

There are some of us new Senators who are not so fortunate as some of the older Senators. We are located at a disadvantage to a certain extent—I refer to our committee rooms. Some of us—not myself, however, but some of my associates—are located in the Maltby Building, separated some distance from the Capitol. In company with some other equally good Senators, I am located in the cellar, as I call it—the terrace. That room, although a very nice room, is somewhat inconvenient; and so in communicating with the Sergeant-at-Arms, with the Postmaster, and with

the various other officials, it is necessary, it seems to us, that we should have a messenger for our committee. That is all we ask. The committee as at present organized has no messenger. If we desire to send for a book or to send a telephonic or telegraphic message, we have to wait an unnecessarily long time. So it has occurred to myself, as well as to other members of the committee with whom I have discussed the matter, that we perhaps ought to have one messenger.

Now, I ask that the Committee on Contingent Expenses shall consider the matter. So far as the Committee on Rules is concerned, I do not think they have jurisdiction of it, with all due respect to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], the chairman of that committee. I think it is a matter which rests entirely with the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. If they should think, under the circumstances, that our committee is not entitled to a messenger, of course we shall make no complaint; it will be all right; but if they should agree with us in believing we ought to have a messenger, that would be all right.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 53) for the protection of cities and towns in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 2008) to authorize the city of Duluth, Minn., to construct and maintain, or cause to be constructed and maintained, a car transfer over the Duluth Canal, and for that purpose to occupy certain lands in the United States, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ISTHMIAN CANAL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report of the Isthmian Canal Commission upon the proposition of the New Panama Canal Company to sell and dispose of all its rights, property, and unfinished work to the United States for \$40,000,000.
THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, January 20, 1902.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the message will be printed and referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to hear read the report which accompanies the message, if it is not too long.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is pretty long. It would occupy nearly an hour to read it, the Chair would think, from the looks of it.

Mr. STEWART. Then let it be printed in the RECORD, so that we may have an opportunity to examine it. There is a great deal of anxiety to see it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada ask that the report be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. STEWART. I should like to have it printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COCKRELL. What is it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the report of the Walker Commission on the Panama Canal route. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada that it be printed in the RECORD? The Chair hears none.

Mr. COCKRELL. It ought to be printed in the RECORD and as a separate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request that the message of the President and the accompanying report be printed as a Senate document? The Chair hears none. The order to print will be made; and the message and accompanying report will be referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

The report is as follows:

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President a copy of a letter from Rear-Admiral John G. Walker, United States Navy, president of the Isthmian Canal Commission, transmitting a report of the Commission upon the proposition of the New Panama Canal Company to sell and dispose of all its rights, property, and unfinished work to the United States for \$40,000,000.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN HAY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, January 20, 1902.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1902.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a report of this Commission upon the proposition of the New Panama Canal Company to sell all of its rights, property, and unfinished work to the United States for \$40,000,000.

I am, sir, with great respect, your obedient servant.

J. G. WALKER,
President of Commission.

The SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington, D. C.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1902.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

SIR: The Isthmian Canal Commission has the honor to submit the following report upon the proposition of the New Panama Canal Company to sell and dispose of all its rights, property, and unfinished work to the United States for \$40,000,000.

At a meeting of the stockholders of the New Panama Canal Company held on the 21st of December last full power was given to the board of directors of the company to negotiate for the transfer of its property, concessions, and unfinished work to the United States, its action to be subject to formal ratification by the stockholders. In accordance with this action the board indicated its desire, through its representative in this city, to offer a proposition to make such transfer to the United States for the price mentioned. Thereupon by your oral direction the president of the Commission conferred with Mr. Edouard Lampre, secretary-general of the New Panama Canal Company. He also received several cablegrams from Mr. Marius Bo, the newly chosen president of the company in Paris. The results of these conferences and communications have been considered at a meeting of the Commission called for that purpose.

The first cablegram was dated in Paris on the 4th of January, and it stated that the company was ready to transfer to the United States its property and concessions for \$40,000,000, and that the offer would remain open until the 4th of March, 1903. As it was not clear whether this offer included all the property of the company, further correspondence ensued, and it was made clear that the proposition was intended to cover the entire property of the company upon the Isthmus of Panama, all the stock of the Panama Railroad Company held for its use and benefit, and the maps, plans, archives, and records in Paris.

A communication and explanatory documents, duly certified, containing a fuller statement than is embraced in the cablegrams, but to the same effect, are on their way to the United States by mail, and copies of them have been deposited with the ambassador of the United States in Paris, who has acknowledged their receipt by cable to the Secretary of State.

The cablegrams received are as follows:

PARIS, January 4, 1902—8.53 a. m.

BEUFVÉ, Washington:

Inform Admiral Walker immediately, and without awaiting Lampre's arrival, that the company declares itself ready to transfer to the Government of the United States, on payment of \$40,000,000, its properties and concessions, estimated at that amount by the Isthmian Canal Commission in its last report, page 103, in conformity with the terms and conditions of the estimates of said report.

BO, President of the Board.

PARIS, January 9, 1902—4.07 p. m.

Admiral WALKER,

President Isthmian Canal Commission,
Corcoran Building, Washington:

The New Panama Canal Company declares that it is ready to accept for the totality, without exception, of its property and rights on the Isthmus the amount of \$40,000,000, the above offer to remain in force up to March 4, 1903.

BO, President of the Board.

PARIS, January 11, 1902—4.17 p. m.

Admiral WALKER,

President Isthmian Canal Commission,
Corcoran Building, Washington:

Offer of sale of all our property applies also to all maps and archives in Paris.

BO, President of the Board.

PARIS, January 14, 1902—9.45 p. m.

Admiral WALKER,

President Isthmian Canal Commission,
Corcoran Building, Washington:

We send by mail letter confirming cable 11th January, and, under registered package, judgment August 2, agreement with liquidator, and three extracts showing powers of board. All these documents are certified to by the United States consulate-general.

BO, President of the Board.

The "totality, without exception, of its property and rights on the Isthmus," mentioned in the cablegram of January 9, includes the following classes of property:

1. *Lands not built on.*—There are 53 parcels of land to which the title rests in the canal company, amounting to about 30,000 acres, which, with the lands belonging to the railroad company, cover nearly all of the ground required for the actual construction of the canal. Some additional land must be acquired for the construction of the lakes at Bohio and Albajuela and for the outflow from the Gigante Spillway, these additional lands being at present of little value.

Under the law of Colombia, dated December 10, 1890, the canal company became entitled to 250,000 hectares (about 625,000 acres) of the land grant provided for in the original Wyse concession. These lands have never been delimited and the company has not actually taken possession of them, but the right to them would pass to the United States. In case the United States should not wish to take and hold these lands, it might relinquish the right in favor of Colombia in the negotiations with that Government for new treaty rights.

2. *Buildings.*—There are scheduled 2,431 buildings, divided among 47 sub-classifications, used for offices, quarters, storehouses, hospitals, shops, stables, and miscellaneous purposes. Among them are two large permanent buildings in Panama, one used as the headquarters residence and the other as the general office, large general hospitals at Colon and Panama, and several important buildings at Colon. These buildings are furnished.

3. *Plant.*—There is an immense amount of machinery, consisting of floating plant (tugs, launches, dredges, etc.) and spare parts, with 24 sub-classifications; rolling plant (locomotives, cars, etc.) and spare parts, with 17 sub-classifications; stationary and semistationary plant (excavators, cranes, pumps, etc.), with 25 sub-classifications. The Commission does not attach much value to this plant for the reasons given in its report of November 16, 1901.

There are also many surveying and other instruments, office supplies and stationery, surgical and medical outfit, and miscellaneous supplies covering thousands of items.

4. *Work done.*—The excavation already accomplished upon the main canal line which will be of value in the plan recommended by the Commission was carefully computed and was found to be 33,682,965 cubic yards. As stated in the report of November 16, 1901, the amount of excavation which can be utilized in the Chagres diversion is 210,873 cubic yards and in the Gatun diversion 2,685,494 cubic yards. Adding these together, the total quantity of excavation which will be of value in the new plan is 33,586,332 cubic yards. A

temporary diversion of the Panama Railroad has been made at the Culebra cut, which also must be considered. Using the same classification of materials and the same unit prices as in the other estimates, with the 20 per cent added for contingencies, the value of the work done is found to be:

Canal excavation.....	\$21,020,386
Chagres diversion.....	178,186
Gatun diversion.....	1,396,456
Railroad diversion (4 miles).....	300,000
	22,895,028
Contingencies, 20 per cent.....	4,579,005
Aggregate.....	27,474,033

5. *Panama Railroad.*—Of the existing 70,000 shares of the Panama Railroad the canal company will transfer to the United States all but about 1,100 shares. These latter are held by a few individuals residing in various parts of the United States and in Europe. As it will not be the policy of the United States to so manage the railroad as to secure a large revenue, it is probable that the holders of these shares will in time find it to their interest to dispose of them at the price fixed by the Commission for the other shares, viz, their par value. At par the value of the 68,893 shares to be transferred to the United States by the canal company is \$6,889,300.

Against this property are mortgage bonds to the amount of \$3,439,000. Of this amount the company owns \$871,000, which it has pledged as collateral for its debt to the Panama Canal Company described below, and it also holds in its treasury \$1,064,000 subject to sale or cancellation, leaving outstanding in the hands of the public \$1,504,000. The bonds bear 4 per cent interest.

There are outstanding also \$996,000 6 per cent sinking-fund subsidy bonds, but this liability is an amortization of the annual payment of \$225,000 due the Colombian Government under its concession for the period ending November 1, 1910.

The railroad company owes \$986,918 to the Panama Canal Company, mainly on account of the construction of the pier at La Boca.

Its total liabilities, therefore, are \$2,490,918, not counting the sinking-fund subsidy bonds, for which the Colombian Government has received the benefit and for which it should make allowance to the United States in the negotiations for treaty rights.

Its cash assets January 15, 1902, were \$438,569.33.

It owns three passenger and freight steamers of American registry, the *Allianca*, *Advance*, and *Finance*, of approximately 2,000 tons net each, which, together with a chartered steamer, the *Orizaba*, run between New York and Colon on a weekly schedule. For the past year it has operated a line of chartered steamers of American registry between San Francisco and Panama. These steamers, owned or chartered, on the Atlantic and Pacific constitute the Panama Railroad Steamship Line.

The railroad company owns an undivided half interest in the islands of Naos, Culebra, Perico, and Flamenco in the Bay of Panama, the Pacific Mail Steamship Company being the joint owner.

Besides its right of way, terminals, wharves, and considerable areas of land, it owns nearly the whole of the town of Colon, the houses there being constructed under leases.

The railroad company has no operating contracts which can not be terminated in ninety days.

The work of constructing the canal will largely increase the business of the railroad, and will enable it to pay off its liabilities in a very few years. After the completion of the canal its commercial profits will probably cease, but it will have a value incidental to operating the canal.

6. *Maps, drawings, and records.*—The value of the maps, drawings, and records in Paris, on the Isthmus, or elsewhere, all of which are to be transferred to the United States, as stated in the cablegram of January 11, is placed at \$2,000,000.

Summing up the foregoing items, the total value of the property is found to be:

Excavation done.....	\$27,474,033
Panama Railroad stock at par.....	6,889,300
Maps, drawings, and records.....	2,000,000
	36,363,333
To which add 10 per cent to cover omissions.....	3,636,333
	40,000,000

the last item being intended to cover any buildings, machinery, railroad shares, additional excavation to date of purchase, and other assets which may be of value to the United States and have not been included in the other items.

In reciting its conclusions in the report dated November 16, 1901, this Commission stated that the selection of the most feasible and practicable route must be made between the Nicaragua and Panama locations, adopting a plan of canal with locks in each case. It concluded that the water-supply features were satisfactory on both lines; that both dams, by which the summit levels would be sustained, were practicable, the advantage being in favor of the Conchuda dam at Nicaragua; that the plan of regulating the summit level was practicable in each case, though less simple on the Nicaragua route than on the Panama; that the present means of transportation were inadequate on the Nicaragua route, while a well-equipped railroad was in operation along the entire length of the Panama route; that there are now no natural harbors at Nicaragua, while serviceable ones exist at both ends of the Panama route, and although with the completion of the harbors as planned one route would have little advantage over the other, the balance was probably in favor of Panama; that owing to the absence of harbors and railroads the period of preparation at Nicaragua would be twice that at Panama.

It was also the sense of the Commission that the total time required for the construction of the canal by the Panama route would be ten years, and eight years by the Nicaragua route, with a greater probability of exigencies causing delays on the latter than on the former.

The estimated cost of constructing the Nicaragua Canal is \$45,630,704 more than the cost of completing the Panama Canal.

The estimated annual cost of maintenance and operation is \$1,300,000 greater at Nicaragua than at Panama.

The Panama route would be 134.6 miles shorter than the Nicaragua route from sea to sea, with fewer locks and less curvature both in degrees and miles. The estimated time for a deep-draft vessel to pass through the Nicaragua Canal was placed at thirty-three hours, as against twelve hours for Panama, these estimates being the time of actual navigation and not including delays for winds, currents, or darkness.

If the passage were made without interruption, about a day could be saved by the Nicaragua over the Panama route by ordinary steamers handling commerce between our Pacific ports and all Atlantic ports, and about two days by steamers of the same class trading between our Gulf ports and North Pacific ports. The time advantage of the Nicaragua route would be less in the case of fast high-powered steamers, the use of which is increasing.

Between Atlantic ports and the west coast of South America the Panama route has the advantage of about two days, and between the Gulf ports and

the west coast of South America the Panama route has the advantage of about one day. The trade of the western coast of South America is a very important one, which has hitherto been in European hands.

The Panama route is an old highway of commerce, along which no considerable industrial development is likely to occur. During the construction of a canal on the Nicaragua route business relations would be established with Costa Rica and Nicaragua which would be likely to continue. Existing conditions indicate hygienic advantages at Nicaragua, though equally effective sanitary measures must be taken in both cases.

The offer received from the New Panama Canal Company to convey all its property, including all its interest in the Panama Railroad, to the United States will make the estimated cost of the two canals as follows:

Nicaragua	\$189,864,062
Panama	184,222,358

The transfer would give title to all the land now held by both the Panama Canal Company and the Panama Railroad Company, which covers nearly all lands required for the construction of the canal. The land held by private parties at Nicaragua must be acquired, and its acquisition may prove expensive.

The question whether the New Panama Canal Company can make to a purchaser a valid title to the property formerly belonging to the old company, its predecessor, has been considered and answered in the former reports of the Commission, but in view of its importance in connection with the present offer the results of the investigation made will be again presented.

The old company, in addition to its canal property acquired under its concession from the Colombian Government, owned nearly all of the shares of the Panama Railroad Company. By purchasing these it obtained the control of the concession under which the road had been built. The latter concession will continue in force until 1966; the canal concession is to run for ninety-nine years from the day on which the canal shall be opened for public service, and the date fixed for this in the concession, according to its latest extension, is October 31, 1910. When these periods expire the different properties are to belong absolutely to Colombia, without compensation, and the Government is under no obligation to extend either concession.

The canal company is absolutely prohibited to cede or mortgage its rights, under any consideration whatever, to any nation or foreign government under penalty of forfeiture. The contract with the railroad company contains a like prohibition, and declares further that the pain of forfeiture will be incurred by the mere act of attempting to cede or transfer its privilege to a foreign government, and such an act is declared absolutely null and of no value and effect.

But for the purpose of permitting the New Panama Canal Company to enter upon the negotiations which have resulted in the present offer, Colombia has waived these prohibitions and has authorized the company to treat directly with the United States, with a view to the use and occupation of the territory of, the former for canal purposes if our Government should select the Panama route for an isthmian canal.

After the old company failed a liquidator was appointed by the French court to take charge of its property and affairs. When the new company was formed he was authorized to contribute to it the rights, privileges, plans, documents, plant, and unfinished work in his hands and under his control, and in consideration of this grant he was to receive 60 per cent of the net profits of the enterprise after deducting all expenses, charges, and stipulated dividends to be distributed by him among the parties in interest.

This interest of the old company is still under the protection of the liquidator and he must be a party to any arrangement that may be entered into for a sale and conveyance of the property, and as he derives his authority from the tribunal that appointed him, his action requires the approval and confirmation of the court.

The papers before the Commission show that the liquidator has agreed to the proposition and that he is acting under judicial authority.

A deed to the property executed by the canal company and the liquidator requires the approval of the Government of Colombia because of the prohibition already referred to in the concessions and for the further reason that the Republic owns 50,000 shares of 100 francs each of the stock of the company, full paid, of which it can not be deprived without its consent.

Such a transfer of title thus approved would give to the United States the same right, title, and interest in the premises that the New Panama Canal Company now has, but that would not be sufficient. The existing concessions thus purchased would be valuable only because their ownership by the United States would remove the obstacles in the way of negotiations between the two Governments for the occupation of Colombian territory by the United States for canal purposes; but these concessions are unsatisfactory and insufficient, and a new arrangement must be made if an isthmian canal is to be constructed by our Government across the Isthmus of Panama.

The grant must be not for a term of years, but in perpetuity, and a strip of territory from ocean to ocean of sufficient width must be placed under the control of the United States. In this strip the United States must have the right to enforce police regulations, preserve order, protect property rights, and exercise such other powers as are appropriate and necessary. The business relations between the railroad and canal companies and the Colombian Government must also be settled, and the consideration to be paid by the United States for the privileges and rights to be exercised in the future must be agreed upon free from all embarrassment with reference to past transactions.

The Commission has no power to enter upon negotiations for the arrangement of these matters. They belong to the treaty-making power; but the acceptance of the terms offered by the New Panama Canal Company should be conditioned upon their satisfactory adjustment.

The advantages of the two canal routes have been restated according to the findings of the former report. There has been no change in the views of the Commission with reference to any of these conclusions then reached, but the new proposition submitted by the New Panama Canal Company makes a reduction of nearly \$70,000,000 in the cost of a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, according to the estimates contained in the former report, and with this reduction a canal can be there constructed for more than \$5,500,000 less than through Nicaragua. The unreasonable sum asked for the property and rights of the New Panama Canal Company when the Commission reached its former conclusion overbalanced the advantages of that route, but now that the estimates by the two routes have been nearly equalized the Commission can form its judgment by weighing the advantages of each and determining which is the more practicable and feasible.

There is, however, one important matter which can not enter into its determination, but which may in the end control the action of the United States. Reference is made to the disposition of the Governments whose territory is necessary for the construction and operation of an isthmian canal. It must be assumed by the Commission that Colombia will exercise the same fairness and liberality if the Panama route is determined upon that have been expected of Nicaragua and Costa Rica should the Nicaragua route be preferred.

After considering the changed conditions that now exist and all the facts and circumstances upon which its present judgment must be based, the Commission is of the opinion that "the most practicable and feasible route" for

an isthmian canal, to be "under the control, management, and ownership of the United States," is that known as the Panama route.

We have the honor to be, sir, with great respect, your obedient servants,

J. G. WALKER,
Rear-Admiral, United States Navy, President of Commission.
SAMUEL PASCO,
ALFRED NOBLE,
GEO. S. MORISON,
PETER C. HAINS,
Colonel, United States Corps of Engineers.
WM. H. BURR,
O. H. ERNST,
Lieutenant-Colonel, United States Corps of Engineers.
LEWIS M. HAUPT,
EMORY R. JOHNSON.

PRISONERS OF WAR IN BERMUDA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

In compliance with a resolution of the Senate of the 16th instant, I return herewith its resolution of the 15th instant in regard to "whether the British Government exact duties on goods intended for prisoners of war in Bermuda," etc.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, January 20, 1902.

Mr. HOAR. The resolution having come back, in accordance with the request of the Senate, I ask that the vote by which it was passed be reconsidered, and then that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the vote by which the resolution was passed be reconsidered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator further asks that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. In the absence of objection, the resolution will be so referred.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. MCKENNEY, the enrolling clerk of the House, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 2044) to increase the amount of the official bond to be furnished by the United States marshal for the district of Alaska in certain cases; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 15) to pay the expenses of the United States Government exhibit at the South Carolina Interstate and West Indian Exposition, in the city of Charleston, county of Charleston, State of South Carolina, during the years 1901 and 1902.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. NELSON. Is the morning business closed, Mr. President? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed, and the Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. MASON. Will the Senator yield to me a moment to make a personal statement?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I desire to make a personal statement to go into the RECORD, which is not customary so far as I am concerned, for, as a rule, I do not believe in encumbering the RECORD; but a large number of newspapers, in my State and elsewhere, have stated within the past few weeks that I, as chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, was opposing rural free delivery, and that, as chairman, I would oppose it. It is only fair to me to say, as I have no newspaper to edit and can only participate in this sparkling publication known as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, what my colleagues on the committee all know, that for years I have endeavored to increase and better that service, and am now urging the committee to report in favor of an increased appropriation.

Another statement is being made, which is not correct, a denial of which I desire this morning to enter as an editorial in the RECORD. The statement is to the effect that I had taken part against the laboring people by having printed a pamphlet on Chinese exclusion. I did in that case as every Senator does. I looked through the pamphlet, and I saw in a general way there were letters and communications signed by ex-Presidents and others. I was informed by my correspondent that it was an argument against continued Chinese exclusion, and as I favor now, as I have favored in the past, the continuance of the present law—for I do favor the continuance of the present law, unless some better one or one more just and equitable for the benefit of this country be passed—and desiring that the committee of which I am a member should have the advantage and benefit of all the views upon both sides of the question, in the usual and customary way, I introduced the paper and asked to have it printed and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Of course I favor the continuance, as I said before, of the present

Chinese law, unless some better and fairer law can be enacted; but of course in the interest of fair play I desired both sides to be heard before the committee of which I am a member. For that reason I had the paper printed and referred to the committee.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of the bill (S. 569) to establish the department of commerce.

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

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I desire this morning briefly to correct some misapprehensions which seem to exist in reference to this bill.

When the bill was first called up for consideration I did not apprehend that there would be any serious objection to it from any direction, but from remarks which have been made by some Senators while the bill has been up, I have been led to believe that there are some parts of the measure which are not fully understood.

We find, on looking over the Executive Departments of the Government, that the only industrial interests of the country which are under the administration, guidance, direction, and protection, if I may use that phrase, of an Executive Department are our great agricultural interests. They have for years had the Department of Agriculture, which has looked after the agricultural interests of the country in a very practical, useful, and comprehensive manner.

I have no doubt it is the consensus of opinion in this country that that Department has performed a most useful and necessary function for our agricultural interests.

Now, if we look abroad in other directions, through the industrial fields; if we look at our commerce, foreign and inland; if we look at our great manufacturing industries, our shipping industries, and our fishing industries, and all through the great industries of the country, we find that those several industries and interests have no governmental department to which they can look for guidance, advice, and administrative care.

In every other country of any consequence, with but few exceptions, even among the smaller countries, there is a department similar to that proposed in this bill. Every country has felt the need and the necessity for such an administrative department to look after its commercial and industrial interests. One of the latest countries to act on this principle is Russia. Until two years ago the administration of the commercial, manufacturing, and industrial interests of Russia was a part of the finance department of that country, which is the same as the Department of the Treasury in this country.

In addition to this there has been a greater demand throughout the industrial and commercial world for the establishment of such a department and for this legislation than there has been for any other bill I can recall which has been pending before Congress. The Committee on Commerce have been overwhelmed with resolutions, petitions, and memorials from commercial bodies, manufacturing bodies, shipping interests, and other industrial interests all over this broad land, East, West, North, and South. I have had some little experience in legislation, although not so much as many other Senators here, and yet I can say that in my experience I know of no bill which has had such hearty support and such great interest taken in it throughout the country as has this great bill.

Now this bill aims—and that is its purpose—to establish an executive department, the duty of which shall be to foster, promote, and develop commercial manufacturing, fishery, shipping, and all other great industries of this country. We find on looking through the several departments of this Government that there are some bureaus, divisions, and branches of the service scattered around in a heterogenous manner that are in part devoted to some of the work involved in this bill, but they are scattered around in such a manner that they can not work in unison or in harmony or to a common purpose and end.

It is intended by this bill to equip the proposed department with all those bureaus and branches of the public service that relate to these subjects—that relate to the commercial interests of the country; that relate to the manufacturing interests of the country; that relate to the shipping interests of the country; that relate to the labor and immigration interests of the country; and that relate to the fishing industry of the country.

Now, it has been said that the effect of this bill will be to withdraw a great many bureaus from other departments and to overload the proposed department and to make it the great department of Government. Mr. President, that is founded on a misapprehension and a misunderstanding of the case. The two great departments of the Government which to-day are overcrowded and have more work than they ought to do, and work of a disconnected and inharmonious character, are the Treasury Depart-

ment and the Interior Department. A year ago, when I carefully looked up the subject by making inquiries at the Department, the Treasury Department had a force of 4,881 employees, while the Interior Department had 4,440 employees. When I speak of employees, I mean the employees who are working in the several bureaus in Washington. The other departments have but a minor force—the Department of Justice only 141, the Navy Department 324, the State Department 95, the Post-Office Department 697, the Agricultural Department 804, the War Department 1,787—while each of the other departments, the Treasury and the Interior Department, has a larger force than all the other departments combined.

Now, look at the character of those departments. Take, for instance, the Treasury Department. The chief scope and purpose of that Department is to take charge of the fiscal and financial operations of the Government; to collect the revenue from customs and internal revenue; to disburse that revenue for all public purposes; to take charge of our currency, of the coinage, of our national debt, and of all that pertains to the fiscal and financial operations of the Government. As its name implies, it is the Treasury Department, or what they call in other governments the finance department, of the Government.

Now, in the course of time that Department has been lumbered up with a lot of matters foreign to its main purpose. The Department of the Treasury has attached to it the Life-Saving Service, the Light-House Board, the Marine-Hospital Service, the Steamboat-Inspection Service, the Bureau of Navigation, the United States Shipping Commissioners, the Bureau of Immigration, the Bureau of Statistics, and the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Now, all these branches of the public service, the titles of which I have read, have no relevancy to or bearing upon the financial or fiscal administration of the Government. They have charge of matters each and all of which peculiarly appertain to commerce and navigation, to the industrial interests of this country, and they ought not to be attached to a department charged with the fiscal affairs of the Government.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAIRBANKS in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Maine? Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I perceive the force of the suggestion which the Senator from Minnesota is making. It has struck me in reading over the list of these different bureaus in the Treasury Department—

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me, I could, before he asks the question, give him a little supplemental information which would make his question more germane, I think.

Mr. HALE. I was merely going to ask why all these branches should be taken out and put in a new department—the Light-House Service, the Steamboat-Inspection Service, the Shipping Commissioners, etc., while the Revenue-Cutter Service was left with the Treasury Department?

Mr. NELSON. My answer to that is this, and the Senator can see the force of it: The Revenue-Marine Service aids in the collection of our revenue on water. It pertains to the fiscal management of the Government. It is the duty of that service to look after smuggling by water. We have along our international boundary a lot of Treasury agents looking after smuggling by land, and the Revenue-Cutter Service is that branch of the service which looks after those matters on water, if I may use that expression. That is why. It appertains peculiarly to the collection of our revenue, and has to protect and preserve it from smuggling and other things. Hence we find that revenue cutters in all our ports and harbors frequently run out to sea and meet vessels coming into port, and revenue officers are immediately put on board the great Atlantic liners.

I think the Senator will agree with me, in view of the fact that this service has peculiar charge of the branch of the service which relates to the collection of the custom revenues, that it should belong to the department of the Government charged with that duty.

Mr. HALE. I agree with the Senator. I supposed that would be the answer given. But I think it applies also to some of the other services.

Mr. NELSON. I will take them up more in detail later.

Mr. HALE. But the Senator is going on, and I will wait until he is at leisure.

Mr. NELSON. Now, from a remark made by the honorable Senator from Maine the other day, I inferred that he thought there was very little left for the Treasury Department. I will call his attention, if he has the report of the committee, to page 4, where he will find the fact stated, that taking these bureaus and divisions out of the Treasury Department, as the bill proposes, the Treasury Department will still be left with the following

bureaus and divisions of the public service; and if the Senator will listen, he will see what a multitude they are:

Treasurer of the United States, Director of the Mint, Comptroller of the Currency, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Division of Public Moneys, Division of Loans and Currency, Secret Service Division, Comptroller of the Treasury, Register of the Treasury, Auditor for the Treasury Department, Auditor for the War Department, Auditor for the Interior Department, Auditor for the Navy Department, Auditor for the State and other Departments, Auditor for the Post-Office Department, national-bank redemption agencies, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Commissioner of Customs, and the Revenue-Cutter Service.

All those bureaus will remain in the Treasury Department, and it will have a great and immense force.

Now, let me call the Senator's attention to the character of the divisions of the service which it is proposed to transfer to the new department from the Treasury Department. We transfer, first of all, the Bureau of Navigation, because it relates to the shipping industries of the country. In connection with it we transfer the Life-Saving Service and the Light-House Board. Now, a mere inspection—and it needs no argument, for everyone can see at a glance—shows that the Life-Saving Service and the Light-House Board all pertain to our shipping interests. They relate to matters of navigation. They have no bearing on or relevancy to any of the chief duties vested in the Treasury Department. They have no bearing upon the financial or fiscal operations of the Government. They bear directly upon our shipping industries and indirectly upon our commercial interests so far as they are connected with our shipping industry.

The same is true of the Light-House Service and the Marine-Hospital Service. The latter service is charged with looking after the welfare of our sailors connected with our merchant marine. Why should that service remain with the Treasury Department? Why should not that be attached to the Department of Commerce and Industries?

Take the Steamboat-Inspection Service, engaged in inspecting our steamboats and seeing that they are safe—that they are properly licensed to navigate our waters. Why should the Treasury Department be charged with that duty, and is not that a duty which peculiarly pertains to the province of commerce and to our shipping industries? The same is true of the United States shipping commissioners, who have charge and look after the welfare of our sailors in their taking service on board of vessels.

Now, take the Bureau of Immigration. It does not relate to any of the fiscal and financial affairs of the Government, but to the industrial welfare of the nation. It has a bearing upon the interests of the laboring man. It has a bearing upon our manufacturing industries and all the industries of the country. There ought to be under the department of commerce, if anything ought to be under that department, the question of passing upon and executing our immigration laws and examining immigrants who come to our shores.

Mr. HALE. How about the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey?

Mr. NELSON. I have this to say about that department: The Coast and Geodetic Survey was established years ago, and it was, when first established, assigned to the Treasury Department. Then the question came up, and it has been a question off and on, as to whether it ought not to be assigned to the Navy Department. In 1843 Congress provided by act (March 3, 1843) for an examination and settlement of the matter. That act authorized a board to submit a plan for the approval of the President. The board consisted of the Superintendent of the Survey, two of his civilian assistants, four officers of the Army, and two of the Navy. This board resolved that inasmuch as the object and purpose of the survey of the coasts refer particularly to the commercial interests of the country it should be under the control of the Treasury Department. It provided that army and naval officers, as well as civilians, should participate in the work.

During the Mexican war all of the military officers who were connected with the work were withdrawn and sent to the front, and at the commencement of the civil war the same took place. All the military and naval officers were withdrawn from this service and sent into active service. The same took place during the Spanish war. We find, by looking at the record of the operations of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, that while they had officers of the Army and officers of the Navy participating in the work, every time there has been a war—the war with Mexico, the civil war, and the Spanish war—those officers have been withdrawn from the service and the work has been committed to civilian employees, and the work has been done well.

Now, what is the chief work of that Bureau? It is to examine the waters of our seacoasts as far as tidewater and to sound those and chart them and to prepare the charts for purposes of navigation. Our merchant marine is more interested in their work than is any other department of our industrial life, and the duties of the civilian employees are first of all to go in their boats along the coast and make soundings of the depths of the harbors and of the

entrance to harbors and of our coasts in the interests of navigation. Now, no one can dispute that civilians are as competent to perform that work as any naval man or military man. After that work has been done in the field, after the soundings have been made and the depths of our waters along the coast have been ascertained from an actual survey on the ground, then the work is platted and charted, and those charts are distributed to the different vessels in our merchant marine. There is no occasion, in my judgment, to put that upon, and it should not be put upon, the Navy Department of the Government.

The Navy Department, especially in time of war, has need for all of its naval officers for its work. They are educated for that purpose, and we need them for that work. Our experience in the past has demonstrated that whenever we had a war Army and Navy men connected with that work have been withdrawn from the service and have been put into the active service, and the work has been left to civilian employees. Inasmuch as this service pertains to our shipping and the welfare of our shipping interests and our merchant marine, I say appropriately and necessarily it belongs to the department of commerce.

I wish to call attention, further, in this connection to the fact that the Navy Department has an office called the Hydrographic Office, which was established originally as a depot for the collection of and the supplying of the Navy with charts and instruments. The main work of that office is to secure charts of surveys by foreign governments, and to reprint them and furnish them to our Navy. They have a work of their own. They do a work that the Coast and Geodetic Survey can not do. They gather information from foreign nations of surveys made in foreign harbors and along coast lines, get their charts, reprint those charts, and distribute them among our naval officers. So they are amply provided for in that branch of the service, and there is no occasion to make this department, which has nothing to do with that branch of it, a part of the Navy Department.

Mr. HALE. Is the Senator about to leave this particular subject?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, in part, but I am coming back to it afterwards.

Mr. HALE. When the matter was called up on Thursday I stated that I was getting some papers which would bear on the subject, and the Senator in charge of the bill said they had determined not to insist upon this remaining in the bill, but it would go back to the Treasury Department, so that the old controversy between that Department and the Navy Department might at any time be taken up as a separate measure. On looking the matter over I saw the force of that. I have no doubt the Senator proposes to do that. Therefore, I have not armed myself with the papers necessary if the contest were to be made for incorporating these duties into the Navy Department. If the Senator does that, then that controversy will be taken up hereafter between the two Departments as he indicated the other day.

Mr. NELSON. I may say, in this connection, if the Senator will allow me, that the committee as a committee took no action. Whatever I said and did the other day was rather more on my own responsibility; and after looking over the question carefully, I am satisfied in my own mind that the Coast and Geodetic Survey ought to belong to the department of commerce.

Mr. HALE. The Senator took the responsibility that a Senator does who is in charge of a bill. I wish he had told me that at the time, because he clearly made the proposition that he would move to strike that out and leave the service where it is and where it has been, and let the controversy come up afterwards. I supposed, of course, that that would be done, and have supposed so, and do now. I do not think the Senator will undertake to go back in any way upon the suggestion made at that time.

Mr. NELSON. The honorable Senator from Maine will remember that he at that time also indicated that he would move to amend and to attach this bureau to the Navy Department, so that the double question was, in a measure, pending.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly, technically pending, because the provision did not go out. That is what brought it up; but on the strength of the Senator's proposition I concluded not to go further and not to ask the Senate to consider the amendment, and I did not arm myself with the documents and papers. When the Senator got up this morning I supposed, of course, that he was going to move, as he did the other day, to strike that out. My amendment would go with it.

Mr. NELSON. I have taken some pains to ascertain the number of employees in the bureaus and divisions of the public service taken by this bill from the other departments and transferred to the department of commerce. I did this because it was claimed the other day that we were clipping the other departments and making this the great dominating department. I find, by looking up the records—and I will say to the Senator from Maine that I have taken the last legislative appropriation act in

order to get the figures correct—that the number is as follows. I refer simply to the employees in the Government bureaus in Washington and not to those in the field. In the Life-Saving Service there are 29 employees who are transferred to this department by the pending bill; in the Light-House Board, 32; in the Marine-Hospital Service, 29; in the Steamboat-Inspection Service, 7; in the Bureau of Navigation, 21; in the Bureau of Immigration, 7; in the Bureau of Statistics, 37; in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, 124. This makes a total of 286 employees taken from the Treasury Department out of a total force of 4,595.

Now, take the Interior Department.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President.

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

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. PETTUS. I understood the Senator to consent at the last meeting that the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey should be taken out of the bill. Is it not stricken out?

Mr. NELSON. No; it is not stricken out. It is still pending.

Mr. PETTUS. What is the status of the provision?

Mr. NELSON. The amendment is still pending. It was not disposed of.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Before the Senator from Minnesota speaks of the Interior Department, I wish to assure him that I am in favor of the creation of a department of commerce, but may I ask if there are not many officials outside of Washington who are connected, for instance, with the Immigration Bureau?

Mr. NELSON. Oh, yes; I have not taken them into account in the figures. I wish to say to the Senator that in figuring up the aggregate number of employees of the Treasury Department I only took the number of employees who are employed in bureaus in Washington.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. All the employees of the Immigration Bureau, whether employed here in Washington or elsewhere, would come under the control of the new department, would they not?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly; but I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in respect to the Treasury Department there are a multitude of collectors and deputy collectors and other agents outside of Washington, and so in the Internal-Revenue Service. Those have not entered into this count. So the count is as fair on one side as on the other.

Now, take the Interior Department. The aggregate number of employees in that Department here in Washington, and I do not include the agents they have in the field, is 3,835. The total number of employees in the Patent Office here is 605. I will state to the Senator from Connecticut that my statement is based upon figures that I got from the Department a year ago as the result of a direct correspondence with the Department.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. What is the number in the Patent Office?

Mr. NELSON. Six hundred and five here in Washington.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I think the number has somewhat enlarged, and that there are now between 600 and 700 employees.

Mr. NELSON. The number may have been enlarged. These figures were given a year ago.

Now, as to the Census Office, it is impossible to give the figures. I understand that that Bureau had somewhere in the neighborhood of 2,700 employees, exclusive of the enumerators. They had at the maximum something like 2,700 employees and a little over here in Washington. That force has been reduced. A month ago, I think, it was reduced to 1,700 or 1,800, and it is still being reduced. I apprehend at this time that there are perhaps not more than half of the original force in that Bureau, and it is likely that within the next year it will be largely reduced, perhaps reduced to 400 or 500 employees.

The Bureau of Foreign Commerce, which is the only Bureau transferred from the Department of State, has 10 employees. Then we have three departments, or bureaus, or divisions that are outside of any executive department. They exist by themselves independently. One is the Department of Labor, with a force of 78 employees. Another is the United States Fish Commission, with 38 employees, and in that I do not include any of those who are out at the different fish stations of the country.

I have also made a brief estimate of the additional force that I imagine would be necessary for this new department to start with, and the salaries, in addition to the force it gets by a transfer of these bureaus and divisions of the public service. First, secretary, with a salary of \$8,000; assistant secretary, \$4,000; chief of the bureau of manufactures, \$3,000. Those are the three principal offices for which salary is provided in the bill.

Then in the secretary's office I have estimated, after conferring with those who ought to know, that it would require in the first instance 1 chief clerk, 1 disbursing clerk, 1 clerk of class 4,

2 clerks of class 3, 2 clerks of class 2, and 6 of class 1. The aggregate salary of these would be \$18,800.

In the bureau of manufactures, which is a new bureau entirely, I estimate that the force in the first instance required would be a chief clerk, at a salary of \$2,000; 1 clerk of class 4, \$1,800; 2 clerks of class 3, \$3,200; 4 clerks of class 2, \$5,600; and 6 clerks of class 1, \$7,200; making a total of \$19,800.

The aggregate increase of salaries by this bill, as I figure it, would be \$53,600. This would equip the department, in the first instance, with a working force, in addition to the force gathered by a transfer from the different bureaus and divisions of the public service.

I submit the figures in detail and in tabulated form to be inserted in the RECORD.

The tables referred to are as follows:

List of employees and salaries in the several bureaus and divisions transferred to the department of commerce.

LIGHT-HOUSE BOARD.	
1 chief clerk	\$2,400
2 clerks, class 4, at \$1,800	3,600
2 clerks, class 3, at \$1,600	3,200
2 clerks, class 2, at \$1,400	2,800
4 clerks, class 1, at \$1,200	4,800
2 clerks, at \$1,000	2,000
10 clerks, at \$900	9,000
1 clerk	840
2 assistant messengers, at \$720	1,440
1 laborer	600
1 assistant civil engineer	2,400
1 draftsman	1,800
1 draftsman	1,500
1 draftsman	1,440
1 draftsman	1,200
32 Total	39,080
LIFE-SAVING SERVICE.	
1 General Superintendent	\$4,000
1 assistant superintendent	2,500
1 principal clerk	2,000
1 topographer and hydrographer	1,800
1 civil engineer	1,800
1 draftsman	1,500
4 clerks, class 4, at \$1,800	7,200
3 clerks, class 3, at \$1,600	4,800
3 clerks, class 2, at \$1,400	4,200
5 clerks, class 1, at \$1,200	6,000
2 clerks, at \$1,000	2,000
4 clerks, at \$900	3,600
1 assistant messenger	1,380
1 laborer	600
29 Total	42,780
THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.	
1 Supervising Surgeon-General	\$4,000
1 chief clerk	2,000
2 clerks class 4, at \$1,800	3,600
4 clerks class 3, at \$1,600	6,400
3 clerks class 2, at \$1,400	4,200
4 clerks class 1, at \$1,200	4,800
1 clerk and translator	1,200
1 hospital steward	1,200
6 clerks, at \$900	5,400
1 messenger	600
5 laborers, at \$540	2,700
29 Total	36,100
STEAMBOAT-INSPECTION SERVICE.	
1 Supervising Inspector-General	\$3,500
1 chief clerk	1,800
2 clerks class 3, at \$1,600	3,600
1 clerk class 1, at \$1,200	1,200
1 clerk class 1 (stenographer and typewriter)	1,200
1 messenger	440
7 Total	11,740
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.	
1 Commissioner of Navigation	\$3,000
2 clerks class 4, at \$1,800	3,600
Deputy Commissioner (one of above clerks)	400
1 clerk class 3	1,600
2 clerks class 2, at \$1,400	2,800
4 clerks class 1, at \$1,200	4,800
9 clerks, at \$900	8,100
1 assistant messenger	1,380
1 laborer	600
21 Total	26,280
BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION.	
1 Commissioner-General of Immigration	\$4,000
1 chief clerk	2,250
1 confidential clerk	1,200
1 statistician and stenographer	1,800
1 supervising immigrant inspector	1,600
1 messenger	600
1 assistant messenger	1,500
7 Total	12,410
BUREAU OF STATISTICS.	
1 officer in charge	\$3,500
1 chief clerk	2,250
1 statistical clerk	2,000
4 clerks of class 4, at \$1,800	7,200
3 clerks of class 3, at \$1,600	4,800

1 stenographer and typewriter	\$1,500
5 clerks class 2, at \$1,400	7,000
8 clerks class 1, at \$1,200	9,600
1 translator	1,200
6 clerks, at \$1,000	6,000
2 copyists	
1 messenger	
1 assistant messenger	4,020
1 laborer	
1 female laborer	480

37 Total 49,550

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

1 Superintendent	\$5,000
2 assistants, at \$4,000	8,000
1 assistant	3,200
5 assistants, at \$3,000	15,000
5 assistants, at \$2,500	12,500
1 assistant	2,400
8 assistants, at \$2,200	17,600
8 assistants, at \$2,000	16,000
3 assistants, at \$1,800	5,400
4 assistants, at \$1,600	6,400
3 assistants, at \$1,400	4,200
8 assistants, at \$1,200	9,600
6 aids, at \$900	5,400
23 aids, at \$720	16,560

78 Total 127,260

Office force.

1 disbursing agent	\$2,200
1 chief, division library and archives	1,800
2 clerks, at \$1,800	3,600
2 clerks, at \$1,650	3,300
4 clerks, at \$1,400	5,600
6 clerks, at \$1,200	7,200
3 clerks, at \$1,000	3,000
For chart correctors, buoy colorists, stenographers, writers, typewriters, and copyists, namely:	
2 at \$1,200	2,400
3 at \$900	2,700
1 at \$800	800
7 at \$720	5,040
1 at \$600	600
For topographic and hydrographic draftsmen, namely:	
1 at \$2,400	2,400
1 at \$2,200	2,200
2 at \$2,000	4,000
3 at \$1,800	5,400
2 at \$1,600	3,200
2 at \$1,400	2,800
1 at \$1,200	1,200
3 at \$1,000	3,000
2 at \$900	1,800
1 at \$700	700
For astronomical, geodetic, tidal, and miscellaneous computers, namely:	
2 at \$2,000	4,000
1 at \$1,800	1,800
4 at \$1,600	6,400
1 at \$1,400	1,400
1 at \$1,200	1,200
3 at \$1,000	3,000
Copperplate engravers, namely:	
3 at \$2,000	6,000
2 at \$1,800	3,600
2 at \$1,600	3,200
1 at \$1,400	1,400
2 at \$1,200	2,400
2 at \$1,000	2,000
4 at \$900	3,600
1 at \$700	700
Electrotypers and photographers, plate printers and their helpers, instrument makers, carpenters, engineers, and other skilled laborers, namely:	
2 at \$1,800	3,600
1 at \$1,600	1,600
9 at \$1,200	10,800
5 at \$1,000	5,000
1 at \$900	900
6 at \$700	4,200
Watchmen, firemen, messengers and laborers, packers and folders, and miscellaneous work, namely:	
3 at \$880	2,640
4 at \$820	3,280
2 at \$700	1,400
2 at \$640	1,280
4 at \$630	2,520
2 at \$550	1,100
1 laborer	550
2 laborers, at \$365	730

124 Total 145,240

PATENT OFFICE.

1 Commissioner of Patents	\$5,000
1 Assistant Commissioner	3,000
1 chief clerk	2,250
2 law clerks, at \$2,000	4,000
3 examiners in chief, at \$3,000	9,000
1 examiner of interference	2,500
32 principal examiners, at \$2,500	80,000
34 first assistant examiners, at \$1,800	61,200
38 second assistant examiners, at \$1,600	60,800
43 third assistant examiners, at \$1,400	60,200
52 fourth assistant examiners, at \$1,200	62,400
1 financial clerk	2,000
1 librarian	2,000
3 chiefs of division, at \$2,000	6,000
3 assistant chiefs of division, at \$1,800	5,400
5 clerks of class 4	9,000
1 machinist	1,600
6 clerks of class 3	9,600

14 clerks of class 2	\$19,600
50 clerks of class 1	60,000
1 skilled laborer	1,200
3 skilled draftsmen, at \$1,200	3,600
4 draftsmen, at \$1,000	4,000
25 permanent clerks, at \$1,000	25,000
1 messenger and property clerk	1,000
5 model attendants, at \$1,000	5,000
10 model attendants, at \$800	8,000
60 copyists, at \$900	54,000
76 copyists, at \$720	54,720
3 messengers, at \$840	2,520
20 assistant messengers, at \$720	14,400
45 laborers, at \$600	27,000
45 laborers, at \$480	21,600
15 messenger boys, at \$360	5,400

605 Total 692,990

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

1 Commissioner of	\$5,000
1 chief clerk	2,500
1 disbursing clerk	2,000
4 statistical experts, at \$2,000	8,000
4 clerks, class 4, at \$1,800	7,200
5 clerks, class 3, at \$1,600	8,000
6 clerks, class 2, at \$1,400	8,400
12 clerks, class 1, at \$1,200	14,400
10 clerks, at \$1,000	10,000
2 copyists	
1 messenger	
1 assistant messenger	
3 watchmen	8,880
4 laborers	
3 charwomen	
6 special agents, at \$1,600	9,600
10 special agents, at \$1,400	14,000
4 special agents, at \$1,200	4,800

78 Total 102,780

COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND FISHERIES.

1 Commissioner	\$5,000
1 chief clerk	2,400
1 stenographer (to Commissioner)	1,600
1 librarian	1,200
1 clerk, class 4	1,800
2 clerks, class 3, at \$1,600	3,200
1 private secretary	1,200
1 clerk	1,000
2 clerks, at \$900	1,800
1 engineer	1,080
3 firemen, at \$900	1,800
2 watchmen, at \$720	1,440
3 janitors and messengers, at \$600	1,800
1 janitress	480
1 messenger	240

22

Office of accounts.

1 disbursing agent	\$2,200
1 examiner of accounts	1,600
1 property clerk	1,600
1 clerk, class 1	1,200
1 bookkeeper	1,080

5 Total 7,080

Office of architect and engineer.

1 architect and engineer	\$2,200
1 draftsman	1,200
1 draftsman	700
1 clerk	720

4 Total 5,020

Division of Fish Culture office.

1 assistant in charge	2,700
1 superintendent of car and mess service	1,600
1 clerk, class 3	1,600
1 clerk, class 2	1,400
2 clerks, class 1, at \$1,200	2,400
1 copyist	720

7 Total 10,420

38 Total Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries 49,160

BUREAU OF FOREIGN COMMERCE.

1 chief	\$2,100
6 clerks	9,960
2 laborers	660
1 messenger	

10 Total 12,720

Total new salaries and new force involved in the department of commerce bill in the first instance.

1 secretary, salary	\$8,000
1 Assistant Secretary, salary	4,000
1 chief, bureau of manufactures, salary	3,000
13 force in secretary's office (see "A")	18,800
14 force in bureau of manufactures (see "A")	19,800
30 Total	53,600
Total force in department of commerce (see "B")	1,047
Total force left in Treasury Department (see "B")	4,595
Total force left in Interior Department (see "B")	3,835
Total force left in State Department (see "B")	85

"A."

New force of employees in the department of commerce.

Secretary's office:	
1 chief clerk	\$2,000
1 disbursing clerk	1,800
1 clerk, class 4	1,800
2 clerks, class 3, at \$1,600	3,200
2 clerks, class 2, at \$1,400	2,800
6 clerks, class 1, at \$1,200	7,200
13 Total	18,800
Bureau of manufactures:	
1 chief clerk	2,000
1 clerk, class 4	1,800
2 clerks, class 3, at \$1,600	3,200
4 clerks, class 2, at \$1,400	5,600
6 clerks, class 1, at \$1,200	7,200
14 Total	19,800

"B."

	Total employees.	Number of force transferred to department of commerce.	Force left.
Treasury Department	4,881		
Life-Saving Service, 29 (see page 759)			
Light-House Board, 82 (see page 759)			
Marine-Hospital Service, 29 (see page 759)			
Steamboat-Inspection Service, 7 (see page 759)			
Bureau of Navigation, 21 (see page 759)			
Bureau of Immigration, 7 (see page 759)			
Bureau of Statistics, 37 (see page 759)			
Coast and Geodetic Survey, 124 (see page 760)		286	4,595
Interior Department	4,440		
Patent Office (see page 760)		605	3,835
State Department	95		
Bureau of Foreign Commerce (see page 760)		10	85
Department of Labor (see page 760)		78	
Fish Commission (see page 760)		88	
Department of commerce, first instance		30	
Total department of commerce after transfers		1,047	

These figures are exclusive of the Census Office.

Mr. NELSON. Now, Mr. President, some question has been raised about the Census Office. I desire to say, in reference to the Census Office, that, as Senators know, that office deals exclusively with agricultural, commercial, manufacturing, and vital statistics of all kinds. By looking at the different departments we find that this matter of statistics is a good deal duplicated. They have a statistical bureau in the State Department known as the Bureau of Foreign Commerce. They have in the Treasury Department the great Bureau of Statistics. Then, in addition to that, we have the Census Bureau. Now, these different bureaus duplicate the work.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Is there not also a statistical division in the Agricultural Department?

Mr. NELSON. I was coming to that. That is an independent department. They have a statistical division there.

It appeared to the committee, and it so appears to me, and I think it will appear to any Senator who gives the subject reflection, that this duplication of statistical work is unnecessary and leads to needless expense. Hence we feel that it would be a good plan to attach the Census Bureau, the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, and the Bureau of Foreign Commerce in the State Department to the department of commerce.

Now, we do not undertake to do it at this time, but I think in time, after we get a secretary at the head of that department, and after he has considered and carefully digested the work of these three different divisions, he will be able to formulate a plan and present a programme to Congress by which all the statistical work can be done under one head and under one division, so that when we come to look up a matter of statistics we shall not have to go for some part of it to the bureau of foreign commerce, for another part to the Bureau of Statistics in the Treasury Department, for another to the Census Office, and for another to the Agricultural Department.

The matter of census statistics pertains, if it pertains anywhere at all, to our commercial and industrial development, and I think if Senators will reflect a moment they will all agree with me that this statistical work ought to belong to and be a part of the department of commerce.

Now, coming to the Department of Labor, that, we find, stands isolated and by itself. The purpose of that Department is to look after our laboring interests. That Department gathers and compiles a lot of statistics. It is the duty of that Department pecu-

larly to look after the interests of our laboring men. But our laboring men are vitally interested in our commercial and our industrial development, in our shipping industries, and in our fishery industries, and they are also vitally interested in the question of immigration, the Bureau of Immigration being attached by this bill to the department of commerce.

It is to far greater advantage to the labor interests of this country that their work can articulate and be in harmony with all these other interests and bear directly upon the welfare of the laboring men. The laboring men of this country are vitally interested in the immigration question. They are vitally interested in the shipping question and in a merchant marine. They are vitally interested in our manufacturing industries. They are vitally interested in our fishing industries. They are vitally interested in our commercial development. By gathering all these bureaus and departments into one whole, under one head, the department can work to better purpose and more efficiently for the labor interests, the manufacturing interests, and the commercial interests of this country.

I think if Senators will reflect they will see that it is for the interest of the laboring men to belong to a department where they can have something to say on the question of immigration; something to say on the question of shipping and our merchant marine; something to say in reference to the fishing industries; something to say in reference to our manufacturing industries and our manufacturing development, and the things which pertain to our great commerce, foreign and inland.

Instead of this being one of the largest departments, as was intimated the other day, I find, on figuring up the employees in the various departments and divisions of the public service, we would be taking 286 employees from the Treasury Department and, assuming that the Patent Office is taken, 605 from the Interior Department; from the State Department, the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, we would take 10; from the Department of Labor we would take 78; from the Fish Commission, 88, and, counting what I have estimated would be necessary in the first instance for the department of commerce as an additional force of 30 members, it would make the total operating force of this new department 1,047. The number would be 1,047, as compared with 4,595 who would still be left in the Treasury Department, 3,835 in the Interior Department, and in the State Department 85. I may state that in giving these figures I have not included the Census Bureau, for the reason that the force of that Bureau, under the present circumstances is a fluctuating force.

Now, in reference to the Patent Office, the committee were of the opinion that inasmuch as the great work of the Patent Office pertains largely to industrial inventions, inventions relating to commerce, manufacturing, shipping, and all that, it is more germane and has a closer connection and bearing upon the department of commerce than upon the Interior Department.

Now, what is the Interior Department, and what has that Department left? The Interior Department was established in 1849. I wish to call the attention of Senators to the fact that when that Department was established in 1849 it was established by transferring other bureaus and divisions from the other departments. The Patent Office business up to 1849 had belonged to the State Department, and it was transferred to the new Department of the Interior. The census work, carried on under the United States marshals, but under the charge of the State Department, was transferred to the Interior Department.

The Patent Office had up to that time been under the State Department, and it was transferred. The Indian Office was transferred from the War Department. The Land Office was transferred from the Treasury Department. The Treasury Department up to that time had charge of the sale of our public lands. The Pension Office was transferred from the War Department. There was a time in our history when the War Department and the Navy Department jointly exercised authority over naval and military pensions. It was afterwards vested in the War Department, and the War Department, until the Department of the Interior was established, in 1849, continued to have charge of the Pension Bureau.

If you look at the history of the departments you will thus see that the Interior Department, established in 1849, was established simply by a transfer from the other overloaded departments of the Government, bureaus, and divisions, and the part so transferred constituted the main and principal work of that Department. The congestion which had then occurred in the other departments leading to the establishment of the then new Department of the Interior exists now to a greater extent, especially in the Treasury Department. It seems that of later years almost everything new under the sun in reference to light-houses, the Marine-Hospital Service, and a lot of matters pertaining to commerce and navigation and immigration have been thrown into the Treasury Department, when as a matter of fact they did not pertain to the main and principal functions of that Department.

Mr. President, I feel that perhaps I have taken up the time of the Senate too long on this matter. I think there is a strong public sentiment throughout the country in favor of the establishment of this new department. I think we need this new department in order to put ourselves on a parity with the other great commercial and industrial nations of the world. We need this department in order to place our industrial development and our commercial development under governmental control, so that the various industries of this country, the commercial and manufacturing industries, and shipping industries, and our merchant marine, can have that governmental guidance and governmental assistance which are now so well performed by the Agricultural Department for the agricultural interests of the country.

I wish to say, further, in this connection about the bill, that personally I claim no credit for it. The bill was originally prepared by the worthy Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], who so ably presides over the deliberations of this body. He prepared the bill and, I think, reported it favorably in the Fifty-fifth Congress. The present bill is simply a slight elaboration and amendment of that bill. The idea came from the Senator from Maine originally, and the committee have now simply presented his bill to the Senate with some amendments and changes.

The public demand for this legislation has not only been so great as to call the attention of Senators to it, but it also called the attention of our new President to it. Senators will remember that in his annual message to Congress he highly recommended the establishment of this new department.

I have aimed to take up as little time of this body as possible. I wish to say in conclusion that I sincerely trust everyone who is in favor of this department of commerce will allow us to get to a vote on the bill to-day. Other matters of great importance are coming up; the Philippine tariff, the Cuban tariff, and other questions that will lead to great debate, and I shall be very glad if the Senate will allow a vote to be taken on this bill to-day.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. May I ask the Senator from Minnesota if he has considered the question, and whether he would be willing to agree to an amendment to eliminate the Patent Office from the bureaus which it is proposed to transfer to the new department.

Mr. NELSON. Speaking for myself—I am not authorized to speak for the committee—but personally I should have no objection. I think this department of commerce could do good work and exist well without the Patent Office. But I prefer, in the absence of instructions from the committee, to have the question submitted to the Senate.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I do not wish it to be understood that I am opposed to this bill because I suggest that it be amended by striking out the transfer of the Patent Office to this new department. I am certainly in favor of the bill. I think a department of commerce is needed and has been needed for many years. I think it can be made of immense value to the country and the industries of the country; its commerce by land and by sea; its manufacturing and other industries, which not only build up the country, but upon which the country depends for its prosperity.

I make these remarks in order that there may be no misapprehension on account of what I shall say about the Patent Office. I do not know that it is necessary that I should elaborate upon that subject. The Patent Office is nominally connected with the Interior Department. It is to a certain extent an independent bureau or department. The Commissioner of Patents reports by law to Congress.

The chief connection at the present time between the Patent Office and the Interior Department is that the Secretary of the Interior has a supervisory power over the administrative action of the Commissioner of Patents. I think that by statute all appeals from the Commissioner of Patents upon the issuance of patents, the issuance of trade-marks, in interference cases, and in all matters relating to the issue of patents, have been taken away from the Secretary of the Interior and jurisdiction has been vested in courts in the District of Columbia.

But the inventors of the country who do their business through the Patent Office have become accustomed to it where it is, and in connection with the Interior Department. There is quite a body of legislation which determines and specifies the connection which exists between the Patent Office and the Interior Department. It does not overburden the Interior Department, and I think is more properly connected with that Department than it would be with the new department.

The new department is specially and particularly to devote its attention to the commerce of the United States and to the articles which form the commerce of the United States. The connection between the granting of patents and the commerce of the United States is at least very remote. The Patent Office issues patents for inventions. They are in the nature of contracts between the Government and an inventor by which there becomes vested in him

the right to use his invention for a limited time. Invention and letters patent have no immediate relation to commerce. It is only when some article for which a patent has been granted is manufactured and then transported from the place of manufacture to the place of use that it comes at all within the jurisdiction of commerce.

Therefore, the relations between the Patent Office and the Interior Department having been long established, being well understood, it being no burden upon the Interior Department, and relating, if at all, only in the most remote degree to commerce, I hope the committee will agree to an amendment striking that clause out of this bill. If hereafter it should be thought wise to transfer it, that could be done, but perhaps I may express the opinion that it would be more for the interest of the new department, more for its practical organization and development, not to have too much work thrust upon it at the outset.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, after conferring with several of the members of the Committee on Commerce, such members as are here on the floor, I think I shall make no opposition to striking out of the bill the provision for the transfer of the Patent Office.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If it be in order, then, I would move that the words "the Patent Office," be stricken out from line 16 on page 3. I do not know that it is referred to anywhere else in the bill.

Mr. NELSON. No; nowhere else.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 16 of the new print on page 3 it is proposed to strike out the words "the Patent Office."

Mr. VEST. What are the words?

The SECRETARY. "The Patent Office."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to. It is agreed to. Are there further amendments?

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I wish to attract the attention of the Senator having the bill in charge to the language of the proviso on the seventh page, beginning at line 11:

And provided further, That all officers, clerks, and employees now employed in any of the bureaus, offices, departments, or branches of the public service in this act transferred to the department of commerce are each and all hereby transferred to said department at their present grades and salaries, except where otherwise provided in this act, and they shall continue in office and employment as if appointed under this act until otherwise provided by law.

Does not the Senator accomplish all that ought to be accomplished and eliminate a possible question by striking out all after the word "act," striking out the words "and they shall continue in office and employment as if appointed under this act until otherwise provided by law?"

Mr. NELSON. I can see no objection to striking out those words. I do not think it would militate against the purpose of the bill.

Mr. SPOONER. No; your purpose is to secure a transfer?

Mr. NELSON. I want a transfer made of these employees just as they are.

Mr. SPOONER. Without any provision of law which might be construed to continue them at their salaries and grade?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly. That was not my purpose at all.

Mr. SPOONER. I am satisfied it was not.

Mr. HALE. It would be better to let the clause go out.

Mr. NELSON. Yes; I will let it go out.

Mr. SPOONER. In line 17, after the word "act," I move to strike out the words "and they shall continue in office and employment as if appointed under this act until otherwise provided by law."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senate agree to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin?

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON. There is an amendment pending offered by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the pending amendment offered by the committee.

The SECRETARY. In section 4, line 11, page 3 of the new print, after the word "Statistics," the Committee on Commerce report to strike out the words "and the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey."

Mr. NELSON. Let that amendment be passed over for the present. There is another amendment, an amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], that is pending, to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert at the end of the bill the following, as a new section:

SEC. —. A person, to be designated by the Secretary of State, shall be appointed to formulate for the instruction of consular officers the requests of the secretary of commerce, and to prepare from the dispatches of consular officers, for transmission to the secretary of commerce, such information as pertains to the work of the department of commerce, and such person shall

have the rank and salary of a chief of bureau, and be furnished with such clerical assistance as may be deemed necessary by the Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment which has just been read.

Mr. NELSON. I want to explain to the Senator from Wisconsin, as he was not here at the time the amendment was offered—

Mr. SPOONER. I understand it and I do not like it. I can not say that I am satisfied with the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I do not object to the creation of a new bureau in the State Department for the purpose, under the direction of the Secretary of State, of carrying out the provisions of this act so far as they relate to the proposed department of commerce; but I think it is a very peculiar proposition that a subordinate in the State Department should be required by law to formulate instructions to consular officers based upon requests of the secretary of commerce upon the State Department for statistical information furnished by consuls.

It seems to me that the secretary of commerce, when he has occasion to communicate with the State Department, should communicate with the Secretary of State. I think there should be some elasticity in this bill in that respect, which would be wanting in it if this amendment were adopted.

The bill is well drawn, in the first place, without the amendment, in my opinion. It might be improved, probably, by adopting so much of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts as provides for an additional bureau. To that I have no objection whatever. But primarily a consul is a commercial agent; he is not a diplomatic functionary, although it is true that sometimes he does perform sub modo diplomatic or quasi-diplomatic functions. This bill, however, provides for reports by consuls to the secretary of the department of commerce only as to statistical information gathered having relation to our foreign commerce. It says:

And all consular officers of the United States, including consul-generals, consuls, and commercial agents, are hereby required, and it is made a part of their duty, under the direction of the secretary of commerce, to gather and compile, from time to time, useful and material information and statistics in respect to the commerce, industries, and markets of the countries and places to which such consular officers are accredited—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Where is the Senator reading from?

Mr. SPOONER. I am reading from page 5.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him right there?

Mr. SPOONER. In a moment. It proceeds—

and to send reports quarterly, or oftener if required, of the information and statistics thus gathered and compiled, to the secretary of the department of commerce.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say to the Senator he is reading from an earlier print of the bill. The bill was originally in that form.

Mr. SPOONER. How is it now?

Mr. NELSON. The bill was originally in a form that required all consular officers to make reports relating to commercial matters directly to the department of commerce. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], after conferring with the State Department, came to the conclusion that oftentimes in consular reports diplomatic matters, or matters of a quasi diplomatic character, were mixed with commercial matters, and, therefore, in order not to get the two confounded, those commercial reports from consuls should first be sent to the State Department and edited by that Department before being sent to the department of commerce. That is the object, and this amendment was drawn in harmony with that view.

As the bill has been amended, the paragraph from which the Senator has been reading reads as follows:

And all consular officers of the United States, including consul-generals—

Mr. SPOONER. Where does the Senator read from?

Mr. NELSON. From page 5 of the new print of the bill, commencing in line 10.

And all consular officers of the United States, including consul-generals, consuls, and commercial agents, are hereby required, and it is made a part of their duty, under the direction of the Secretary of State—

The words "under the direction of the Secretary of State" have been put in. Then the clause goes on—

to gather and compile, from time to time, upon the request of the secretary of commerce, useful and material information and statistics in respect to the commerce, industries, and markets of the countries and places to which such consular officers are accredited, and to send, under the direction of the Secretary of State—

There those words have been inserted again—

reports quarterly, or oftener if required, of the information and statistics thus gathered and compiled, to the secretary of the department of commerce.

The amendment now pending is supplemental to those changes. It is to provide somebody in the State Department to revise the commercial reports that come in from our consular officers and eliminate all matters of a diplomatic or quasi-diplomatic charac-

ter, so as to send only commercial matter to the department of commerce.

Mr. SPOONER. I am obliged to the Senator for calling my attention to the amendment. I was not aware of it. It has put the language in a form which makes it altogether acceptable to me, and as the Senate has already adopted the amendment which I had marked as proper to be made in the old draft of the bill, so far as that is concerned I have nothing further to say. I think, however, that the amendment proposing an additional section may be improved upon by making it a little more elastic. It reads:

A person, to be designated by the Secretary of State, shall be appointed to formulate for the instruction of consular officers—

That makes it by law the duty of this particular officer to formulate these instructions—

the requests of the secretary of commerce, and to prepare from the dispatches of consular officers, for transmission to the secretary of commerce, such information as pertains to the work of the department of commerce; and such person shall have the rank and salary of a chief of bureau and be furnished with such clerical assistance as may be deemed necessary by the Secretary of State.

Mr. NELSON. I simply suggest to the Senator that it would meet the objection by inserting there that the work shall be done "under the direction of the Secretary of State." Putting in those words will cover any objection the Senator might have on that point—that he shall do it "under the direction of the Secretary of State."

Mr. SPOONER. I think it would be better to amend the amendment so as to provide that for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 5 the Secretary of State is authorized to appoint some suitable officer, who shall have the rank and salary of a chief of bureau, and be furnished with such clerical assistance as may be deemed necessary by the Secretary of State. In other words, whoever is appointed there is to work under the direction and care of the Secretary of State, and his peculiar functions ought not to be prescribed by statute. The Secretary of State might have occasion to call upon some other bureau of the Department, or some other officer, and he ought to be left free-handed. I am perfectly willing that an additional person shall be appointed, or a bureau created, but I do not like the language of the amendment prescribing by law the particular duty of this person. I suppose the Secretary of State could change the heads of the various bureaus or make a redistribution of the functions of the different bureaus, and he ought, as far as possible in that respect, to be left free, just as any Secretary should be, I think. I will draft an amendment, if the Senator is not wedded to this proposition, which will accomplish the same thing.

Mr. NELSON. No; I am not wedded to any particular language. In view of the fact that the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] is not disposed to insist upon his amendment to transfer the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Navy Department, but is content to leave it under the Treasury Department, if no Senator from the Committee on Commerce is opposed to it, I shall be disposed to acquiesce in striking the Coast and Geodetic Survey out of this bill.

Mr. HALE. Let that be done; and if there is any controversy hereafter about it, it can come up by itself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. What is the request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To strike out the provision in relation to the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. NELSON. To leave the Coast and Geodetic Survey where it is, in the Treasury Department. We do not do anything with it.

Mr. BACON. Let the proposed amendment be stated.

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

The SECRETARY. On page 3, section 4, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "and the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that the word "and" be inserted after the word "Immigration."

Mr. NELSON. I will move that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, section 4, line 10, after the words "Bureau of Immigration," it is proposed to insert the word "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. I will move an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. In line 2, after the word "formulate," I move to insert the words "under his direction;" so as to read:

A person, to be designated by the Secretary of State, shall be appointed to formulate, under his direction, for the instruction of consular officers, etc.

Mr. NELSON. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. SPOONER. "To formulate" is very different from "to formulate, under his direction."

Mr. NELSON. That amendment makes the language in harmony with the other provisions of the bill.

Mr. PETTUS. As to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], he took great pains to prepare it, and as the bill is going over, I suggest that this amendment also go over with it.

Mr. NELSON. I have been hoping to get a vote on the bill to-day.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and I are in entire accord; and if he had not offered the amendment I should have done so. I have no idea that the Senator from Massachusetts, if here, would object to the proposed change. It is in line with what he and I had in view.

Mr. NELSON. There is no objection to it.

Mr. PETTUS. Is it proposed to vote on the bill now?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BACON. Oh, no.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the amendment of Mr. LODGE in line 2, after the word "formulate," by inserting the words "under his direction."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there are no further amendments, the bill will be reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I trust the Senator from Minnesota will not ask the Senate to vote upon this bill to-day. It is certainly a very important and far-reaching measure, one which the Senate would doubtless like to see in print and be given an opportunity to examine critically before passing upon it. It is a bill which creates a most important department of the Government, and I trust it may be found consistent with the wishes of the Senator that it may be put in print as it has been amended and go over until some future time.

Mr. NELSON. I appeal to the Senator from Georgia to allow us to take the vote on the bill to-day. I want to say to the Senator—I know he is disposed to do what is fair—that there have been no material amendments made to the bill to-day. I can explain them all in the bill as printed. One amendment has been dropped out about the Patent Office. That was agreed to the other day. We have dropped out the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and there has been a change in phraseology, suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], to avoid any possibility of any of the employees in the Bureau being transferred or continuing them in office outside of their present status. Then there has been a slight amendment made to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, which relates simply to consular reports. The Senator from Georgia will be doing me a great favor if he will allow the vote on the bill to be taken to-day. I appeal to him for this reason: I should have no objection to its going over, but the Senator is familiar with the proceedings in the Senate. The Philippine tariff bill will be called up to-morrow; it will lead to a great deal of discussion. And there are other important matters coming up which will also lead to a great deal of debate. So if this bill is now to go over its passage may be very much delayed.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, I will state to my colleague, with the permission of the Senator from Minnesota, that I think this bill has been most maturely considered by the Commerce Committee and by the subcommittee, and the amendments which have been adopted have been practically unanimously agreed to. I believe that my colleague, on a few minutes' investigation, will agree that the vote shall be taken on the bill to-day. I do not believe that anything can be lost by it. There has been practically no opposition to this bill in the Commerce Committee. In fact, I believe that the members of the Commerce Committee, with one or two exceptions, who were not present, voted for the passage of the bill. For my part, I have considered it maturely. I am in favor of the passage of the measure, and certainly it has commended itself to my favorable consideration. It provides for reports as to foreign markets and other matters, which, doubtless, will be of great benefit to the people of the United States. So I hope the Senator from Minnesota will be permitted to get a vote on the bill to-day, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], as amended on motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and my no less distinguished colleague [Mr. CLAY], it seems to me urge, without any very great reason for it, the immediate consideration of this bill with reference to its passage. The Senator from Minnesota appeals to me as a personal favor. Why, Mr. President, this is not a personal matter; this is not a matter which relates to the Senator personally in any

way, nor to his section or State, and therefore there is no ground upon which a personal appeal can be made. Nor, Mr. President, is there any suggestion of a reason which makes it imperative that this bill should be disposed of to-day. If there is practically no opposition to the bill, there is certainly no reason why there should be an apprehension of undue delay hereafter.

I think in a matter of this kind it is due to the Senate that such a bill, before it is put on its passage, should be in print, so that we may all see it and read it. I expect to vote for the bill, but at the same time I want to have an opportunity to examine it as it now stands. Some of these amendments have been made verbally. A number of amendments were made on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] the other day, not one of which was reduced to writing, but made verbally from his seat. They ought to be in print.

Mr. SPOONER. The bill has been reprinted.

Mr. BACON. That may be true; but the bill as it now stands has not been printed.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator allow me a word?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. The amendments of the Senator from Massachusetts, except the one amendment acted upon to-day, are incorporated in the bill as it was reprinted. I want to say further to the Senator that the bill has been under consideration on three different days, and the amendments which to-day have been made to the bill are simple amendments. I think the Senator can see the force of them at a glance. I hope he will agree that the vote may be taken to-day.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not oppose a vote at this time for the purpose of antagonizing the bill. I repeat, I expect to vote for it, but at the same time I desire to have the opportunity to see the bill as it will be when put upon its passage.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator agree that we may take a vote on the bill to-morrow at 2 o'clock?

Mr. BACON. I am perfectly willing that the Senate should agree to that. I do not know whether my special agreement would be of any advantage, but, if the Senator so desires, I have no objection to the Senator having an agreement of the Senate to that effect, if he can get it.

Mr. VEST. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill what was done in relation to the Coast and Geodetic Survey?

Mr. NELSON. That was dropped out of the bill.

Mr. VEST. And left in the Treasury Department?

Mr. NELSON. Yes; left in the Treasury Department.

Mr. VEST. What was done with reference to the Patent Office?

Mr. NELSON. That was dropped out, and the Patent Office is to be kept where it is, in the Interior Department.

Mr. COCKRELL. What about the Census Office?

Mr. NELSON. That is left in the bill.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, the other day—I could not hear distinctly on account of the talk that was going on all around me here—but in a colloquy which took place between the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] I understand there was some sort of an agreement that the Coast and Geodetic Survey should be transferred to the Navy Department. It seems now, however, as I am informed by the senior Senator from Maine, there was some sort of an agreement or understanding that it should be only left in the Treasury Department, where it is now.

I want to state this—and I have a right under the rules to state it—in the Committee on Commerce, from which the bill came, I voted for the bill with some reluctance, because, as a general proposition, I am opposed to multiplying offices. I reluctantly agreed to vote for it, because I remember a remark made at one time by Ben Hardin, of Kentucky, in my boyhood in regard to offices, which I have never forgotten. He said, "If you want to have more martins, put up more martin boxes." The proposition he was discussing was in regard to making the judiciary in Kentucky elective in the constitution of 1849. When you create more offices you will always, as a matter of course, find people to fill them.

There are occasions in which it is absolutely necessary to furnish instrumentalities for the business of the Government. We have arrived at a stage where it is absolutely necessary, in my opinion, to increase the Departments. Let me say as a corollary to that proposition, it is necessary to build new edifices for the accommodation of the Departments. We pay now annually over \$180,000 rent in this city for houses and rooms which are occupied by the Departments. When we are selling our bonds at 2 per cent interest, we pay these enormous rents directly in the teeth of all correct business principles.

I think there ought to be two more departments of the Government. We ought to have a department of commerce. In my judgment it is absolutely necessary. But when it comes to the question as to where the Coast and Geodetic Survey ought to be, I am unequivocally opposed to recognizing that it is now in the

proper Department. The Treasury Department in its special functions has no more to do with the Coast and Geodetic Survey than a steamer on the ocean has to do with the planting of a field of corn.

This Bureau ought to be taken out of the Treasury Department. The Treasury Department now, as every Senator knows, is overloaded to the verge of absurdity. The Interior Department, although we took one great bureau from it—that of Agriculture—is now four departments in one, and the want of accommodation in the way of room for these departments has become so apparent that no Senator here will rise and say that the accommodations of the officers of the Government in those departments are decent or comfortable.

If any Senator will point out to me how the Coast and Geodetic Survey is in any way cognate or appropriate in the Treasury Department, I shall be very much obliged to him. I understand the proposition now is to put it in the Navy Department. It seems to me the Navy Department is large enough now. We hear continued complaints that the building in which it is located is insufficient for the accommodation of the service. Then why should this Bureau, not connected with the Navy, not necessary to the functions of the Navy, be taken from the Department of the Treasury and put in that of the Navy?

I do protest against the putting of the Coast and Geodetic Survey with the financial department of the Government or putting it with that of the Navy.

Mr. BACON. I have not participated in the debate, although I have given attention to what has been said by the Senator in charge of the bill and by those more directly connected with it as members of the committee. I should like to know upon what theory the Census Bureau is to be put into the Department of Commerce. If it relates to it in any manner I confess my inability to see where that relationship is found, and I should like for the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to tell us upon what theory it has been deemed proper that a department of commerce should have charge of a census bureau.

Mr. NELSON. I think the Senator from Georgia was not in the Chamber or he would not have asked this question, for I covered that ground in my general remarks upon the bill.

On looking over the statistical work of our different departments we find it scattered. There is in the Department of State a statistical department, called the department of foreign commerce, which compiles statistics from our consular reports. Then there is in the Treasury Department a statistical bureau, and the Senator from Georgia is familiar with that.

The Census Office is wholly a statistical office, gathering and compiling vital statistics and statistics as to our commerce, our manufactures, our shipping, and everything that pertains to the industrial development of this country. It occurred to the committee, as it has to me, that there is a great deal of duplication in the statistical work, and that it would be better to get the statistical work all grouped in one department, to wit, the department of commerce, which relates to commerce and to our industrial development, manufacturing, shipping, and fishing interests. By getting the statistical bureaus together by and by some secretary of the department of commerce, after having observed the workings of the different bureaus, will be able to prepare and formulate a plan or programme for a future Congress by which the statistical work can be done under one head and as one work, so that when we come to look up statistical matters we can find them in one publication.

In the Department of Labor, which is to be transferred to this new department, there is a good deal of statistical work, and we have in the Agricultural Department a statistical division. Now, if we group all the statistical work together under one executive head, whether in the State Department, the Treasury Department, the Department of Labor, or the Census Office, we can by and by so adjust matters relating to statistics as to have our statistics taken as an entirety and to have our statistical work furnished us in one compilation. Then, when we come to look up foreign commerce we shall not have to look to the State Department for the publication. When we come to look up other statistical matters we shall not have to look to the Treasury Department. When we come to look up the matter of vital statistics and labor statistics and other commercial and industrial statistics we shall not have to look to the Census and Labor bureaus. I think if my friend from Georgia were at the head of the new department—and I should be glad to see a man of such ability at its head—one of the first things he would consider would be the work of these different statistical divisions, and he would endeavor to see if it were not possible to formulate some plan or programme by which they could work in harmony and in entirety, so as to give to Congress the results in one compilation and one publication instead of in a variety of publications.

Mr. BACON. I simply desire to ask the distinguished Senator whether the programme which he has outlined is one in anticipation in its completeness, or whether this bill endeavors to com-

plete it? In other words, does this bill provide for the transfer to this particular department of these various statistical divisions of the departments of the Government, or will the State Department still have its statistical bureau and the Treasury Department still have its?

Mr. NELSON. No; they are transferred. The Bureau of Foreign Commerce in the State Department, the Bureau of Statistics in the Treasury Department, and the Census Office are transferred to this new department, but we could not at this stage formulate any plan for united and harmonious work. That can only be done, or the programme for it outlined, when the three statistical bureaus or divisions are grouped together under one head and in one department, where their workings and their work can be considered and plans outlined for harmonious and united work.

I have no plan in view, and at this stage it seemed to me that all we could do was to transfer these bureaus at this time and group them under one executive head, and then let the future decide whether we could not get the statistical work into one harmonious whole, to the advantage of the Government in the matter of expense and the advantage of the Government and ourselves in the matter of securing information.

Mr. BACON. I desire to say, in justice to myself, that the Senator has made a very clear statement and has suggested to me a reason which had not occurred to me before. I think it is highly proper that the statistical bureaus should, to some extent or to a very great extent, be put under one general control. Whether that control ought to be under the department of commerce or under some other department, the Department of the Interior, for instance, I do not think makes any material difference, except so far as practicable to equalize the labors of the different great departments of the Government.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, in appealing a while ago to my colleague to permit a vote on this bill to-day, I thought he was in thorough sympathy with the bill and that he had considered it maturely. I did not know that he wanted more time to look into it.

Now, I agree with what the Senator from Missouri has said. I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce which made a favorable report on the bill. If Senators will examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they will find that when the Department of Agriculture was established members of the Senate stated on the floor that it would be an unnecessary expense, but I doubt if there could be obtained a single vote in this body to-day to repeal the law creating that Department. This country is growing all the time, and, as the Senator from Missouri has said, we need a department of commerce.

We looked into this matter most carefully. We found that the Treasury Department was overcrowded, and we took from that Department and brought into this new department such bureaus as ought, in our judgment, to be transferred. We likewise went to the Interior Department, Mr. President, and if Senators will take the fifth section of this bill and read it, which is the real gist of the whole bill providing for the establishment of a department of commerce, I can not possibly see how any Senator can oppose it. I ask unanimous consent that the fifth section be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The section is as follows:

SEC. 5. That there shall be in the department of commerce a bureau to be called the bureau of manufactures, and a chief of said bureau, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive a salary of \$3,000 per annum. There shall also be in said bureau one chief clerk and such other clerical assistants as may from time to time be authorized by Congress. It shall be the province and duty of said bureau, under the direction of the secretary to foster, promote, and develop the various manufacturing industries of the United States, and markets for the same at home and abroad, domestic and foreign, by gathering, compiling, publishing, and supplying all available and useful information concerning such industries and such markets, and by such other methods and means as may be prescribed by the secretary or provided by law. And all consular officers of the United States, including consul-generals, consuls, and commercial agents, are hereby required, and it is made a part of their duty, under the direction of the Secretary of State, to gather and compile, from time to time, upon the request of the secretary of commerce, useful and material information and statistics in respect to the commerce, industries, and markets of the countries and places to which such consular officers are accredited, and to send, under the direction of the Secretary of State, reports quarterly, or oftener if required, of the information and statistics thus gathered and compiled, to the secretary of the department of commerce.

I should not have appealed to my colleague to permit a vote on this measure to-day but that I thought he had maturely considered it. It has been before the Senate for several days; but, of course, if the Senator has not had time to examine the bill carefully, I would not appeal to him to allow a vote to-day. My reason for doing so was simply that I thought he thoroughly understood it.

Mr. BACON. I just simply admit that I do not thoroughly understand it, and I want to understand it before I vote on it. I am not the only Senator who occupies that position. I am in accord with the proposition that we should have an additional department. I expect to vote for this bill, but I desire to read it; and if I have the right so to do, I shall ask that a vote be not

taken to-day. I am perfectly willing that a vote shall be taken to-morrow. Of course I have no right to make an agreement of that kind; but if the Senate sees proper to make it, I shall have no objection.

Mr. PETTUS. I desire to inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill what is the exact meaning of the words on page 3, line 19, "The Department of Labor." What is the intention of those words?

Mr. NELSON. It is called a Department, but it is not an Executive Department. Let me call the Senator's attention to the Agricultural Department. It was called a Department for years, but it had only a Commissioner at its head. It was not until 1889 that it was made an Executive Department. Now, this is called the Department of Labor, but it is not an Executive Department. It is really an independent department, not belonging to any department, standing by itself.

Mr. PETTUS. It is an independent Department, standing by itself, called a Department?

Mr. NELSON. It is not an Executive Department.

Mr. PETTUS. I understand, but the purpose of this bill, so far as those words are concerned, is to transfer all the duties of that Department to the new one?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir; but leaving the work of the Department, as well as the force and everything else, undisturbed.

Mr. PETTUS. Had you not better have two words to mean different things? You have a department in a department. That does not sound very well.

Mr. NELSON. I know, but the misfortune is this, I will say to my friend, the Senator from Alabama: In the law it is to-day called a Department—the Department of Labor—but it is not an Executive Department, and the head of it is not a member of the Cabinet. It is technically really an independent bureau. Before the Commissioner of Agriculture became a Cabinet officer we had a Commissioner of Agriculture, and he presided over what we called in law the Department of Agriculture. It was called a Department long before we got a Secretary who was a member of the Cabinet. The law making it an Executive Department was enacted in 1889, if I remember it aright, when it was for the first time made an Executive Department and the head of it a Secretary. Before that he was called the Commissioner of Agriculture and the Department was called the Agricultural Department.

Mr. PETTUS. Then the purpose of this bill, so far as those words are concerned, is that the department of commerce shall absorb the Department of Labor?

Mr. NELSON. It shall absorb it in this way: It shall be like all these other divisions and bureaus of the public service—transferred to it under that executive head, but it does not contemplate the dismantling of the Department of Labor. It does not contemplate changing the functions of it or at all disturbing the force. The bill simply places it in the department of commerce so that its work relating to the labor interests of the country (and a good deal of its work is of a statistical character) may articulate and work in harmony with the other bureaus and divisions of the new department.

Mr. PETTUS. I do not desire to discuss the bill; I merely wanted that information for the present, but I do desire that the bill shall go over.

Mr. NELSON. In view of the request made, I ask unanimous consent that we may take a vote on the question of the passage of the bill to-morrow at 2 o'clock.

Mr. FORAKER. At what hour?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two o'clock.

Mr. PETTUS. I may as well say that I can not agree to that.

Mr. NELSON. Would any other hour to-morrow, or any other day, suit?

Mr. PETTUS. I do not see the necessity of pressing the pending bill in this way. Although it is a measure much favored, still I think it ought to take the ordinary course. When gentlemen want to discuss and examine a measure, there should be no attempt to press it to a vote in a few days. I want this bill to go over. I do not know that I shall vote against the bill as a whole, because I am in hopes there will be some amendments added to it which will make it palatable to some of us who do not like it in its present shape.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendments, the bill will be reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. PETTUS. There is an amendment pending which has not been acted upon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What amendment is that?

Mr. PETTUS. It is an amendment to strike out certain words in line 11 on page 3. A motion to that effect was made at the last session of the Senate, and it is so printed in the bill.

Mr. HALE. That has been voted on to-day.

Mr. NELSON. It has been acted on.

Mr. PETTUS. I have not heard it acted upon, and I have been here watching it all the time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Every amendment which has been proposed up to this time has been acted upon.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move, in line 15, page 3, after the word "Department," to strike out the words:

And that the Census Office and all that pertains to the same be, and the same hereby are, transferred from the Department of the Interior to the department of commerce, to remain henceforth under the jurisdiction of the latter.

I understand the Patent Office has already been stricken out. It leaves in the Census Office. I fail to see any reason on earth, above it, or beneath it, why the Census Office should be put under the department of commerce. It is an office which only once in every ten years takes the census of the living and of such things as may be prescribed by Congress, and it does it in obedience to the Constitution. Now, why should that be placed under the department of commerce, which has not a solitary thing to do with it? It primarily takes only the population and the necessary statistics in connection therewith, and it is not done annually; it is done only every ten years. It does not affect the project of the Senator from Minnesota to have all the statistical bureaus consolidated. The Census Office is not, in the strict sense of the word, a statistical bureau which gives information every year. It gives it only every ten years. Then it has to have a very large force, and as soon as the work is done the great bulk of that force is discharged.

Now, you put them together and consolidate a number of these offices, and the result will be that the first time the census is taken after the offices are consolidated the entire force of clerks put into it will be kept there, and it will add millions of dollars to the expenses of the Government. You can not avoid it. As it is now, every ten years the census is taken. The force is employed for two or three years, and then discharged. There is no further expense—that ends it. We have been limiting the operations of the Census Office. We limited it to three years. The present Director of the Census will complete the work within the time prescribed by Congress, and then the great body of clerks will be discharged, and there will be no necessity for this Bureau being under the department of commerce. You have already provided enough to keep the new secretary busy. You already have enough business before him to make the new department as great as any one of the other Departments, and why insist upon incorporating that which is not kindred in any of its labors or duties or the results of its labors. I hope the words will be stricken out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 15, page 3, section 4, after the word "Department" it is proposed to strike out the words:

And that the Census Office, and all that pertains to the same, be, and the same hereby are, transferred from the Department of the Interior to the department of commerce, to remain henceforth under the jurisdiction of the latter.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I hope the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri will be adopted. We have never heretofore made provision for the Census Office in any regular bill relating to a department. It is usual, and has been for many years, to prepare a separate bill each ten years in which it is provided how the census for the decennial period shall be taken. In those bills heretofore we have provided that the census shall be under the Secretary of the Interior. Now, when we come to deal with the census question, if it shall then appear that it is better to assign it to the new department, the department of commerce, there will be no objection. But it seems to me we have already provided very amply for this department without gathering into the bill creating it miscellaneous legislation which heretofore has been provided for only once in ten years. I suggest to my friend from Minnesota that he allow this to pass by and that it be provided for when we provide for taking the next census.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether it is not a fact that five-sixths of the work that is to be accomplished by this new department is work which is now being accomplished by the Census Bureau; and as to the statistics that we are supposed to secure from this new department, could we not to-day get nine-tenths of those statistics from the Census Bureau? It seems to me that the Census Office, as a single department, to-day is more important really than the new office which is about to be created; and we are asked to make that merely a department under the general department of commerce.

That being the case, it seems to me we are taking one of the old established departments and practically destroying it, placing it under another department as a mere wing; the more important made the least important in this bill.

Not only that, but I understand there is a feeling which has been expressed by members of the Senate as well as by members of the House that the Census Bureau should be made permanent; and if it is made permanent we would be able to get from that

department the statistics required, and it would be the proper department to go to. It would be the department which would have the gathering of statistics and facts concerning any matter from the very beginning, and would be the proper department to which to go to secure what information we desire. I myself can not see any good reason for swallowing up the Census Office practically in the new department of commerce.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, unless the debate is carried on so that we on this side can hear, we shall be under the necessity of asking that the matter go over until to-morrow, that we may read in the RECORD what Senators have said. I do not believe a Senator on this side of the Chamber has heard a word of what was said by the Senator who has just taken his seat. That was probably due to the noise and confusion in the Chamber.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I do not intend to reargue this matter. I simply wish to call the attention of Senators to the fact that the Census Bureau is now under one of the Executive Departments. It is a part of the Interior Department. In transferring it to this department, it was not our purpose at all to have anything to do with the other question which has been suggested here, as to whether the work of the Census Bureau should be made permanent. The census, as the Senator from Missouri has well said, is taken only once in ten years. That is the fact in the field, but the compilation and publication go on. I dare say some of the work of publishing the volumes and indexing them and delivering them to Senators will continue for one or two years longer, although I am not familiar with that subject.

The question whether or not the bureau shall be permanent never entered into my consideration or into the consideration of any member of the Committee on Commerce, I think. We simply looked at the question in the light of the fact that the great work of the bureau is of a statistical character. It is not all a matter of population. When it comes to the matter of population and vital statistics, of course our plan is to take those statistics once in ten years, but when it comes to other statistics, relating to our manufacturing development, our shipping interests, our navigation, our merchant marine, our commerce at home and abroad, those are statistical matters, which can be gathered from time to time. They are gathered, to a large extent, by the Bureau of Statistics from year to year.

Now, personally, for myself I am not tenacious at all about this or any other question before the Senate in reference to this bill. I am simply anxious to get a bill passed establishing a department of commerce, which shall have charge of our commercial and industrial interests. If Senators are of opinion that the work of the census is not more germane and pertinent to the department of commerce than to the Interior Department, I have nothing to say. I submit the question to the judgment of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to call the attention of the Senator who has this bill in charge to page 3, where it is provided that the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, now in the Department of State, shall be transferred to this new department. Then later, on page 4, there is this provision:

And the chief of said Bureau of Foreign Commerce shall be the assistant chief of the said Bureau of Statistics.

I want the Senator to tell me what is the object of providing that the head of one bureau shall be the assistant of another. It seems to me to be a remarkable provision, and one which it is not very safe to allow to go in. But if the Senator can give me a good reason, I will not move to strike it out.

Mr. NELSON. The reason is this, if the Senator will allow me: There is in the Department of State a statistical bureau which was called the Bureau of Statistics. I think one or two years ago the name was changed and it was called the Bureau of Foreign Commerce. The work of that bureau is mainly of a statistical nature, and it is confined to our foreign commerce. It consists to a large extent in compiling statistics and information gathered through our consular representatives abroad.

Now, it was the plan of the bill to consolidate that statistical work with the Bureau of Statistics in the Treasury Department, and it occurred to the committee that in transferring that work to the Bureau of Statistics, it being at the head of one branch of the statistical work, it was well to make him the assistant chief. Now, this does not intend to change the salary, or the scope of it. It simply makes him the assistant chief with the same salary he is getting now. It does not change his salary or his work in any material particular. It leaves him to work under the direction of the chief of the Bureau of Statistics, placing him as the next assistant, because of the fact that he brings to that Bureau all the work that appertains to our foreign commerce, and he is supposed to be more familiar with that particular branch of the work.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the Bureau of Statistics, which is now in the Treasury Department, is to be transferred to this department and then, according to the Senator's statement, the Bureau of Statistics in the State Department is to be transferred also, and we are to have the two bureaus in this new department. The trouble now with statistics in the United States is that we have a Bureau of Statistics in the Treasury Department and practically a bureau of statistics in other divisions as well as in other departments. We have a Bureau of Statistics under the Director of the Mint, which is in the Treasury Department. We have a Bureau of Statistics in the Agricultural Department and one in the Interior Department. In other words, we have just as many bureaus of statistics as we have departments, and some more; and I will guarantee that when these bureaus pass upon the same identical question no two of them have, in ten years, been able to agree to the same thing. You can find statistics on the same subject coming from the same department that will not agree within sometimes a million or two of dollars or within as many tons, if it is a question of tons or bushels or whatever it may be.

There is not any statistical bureau in this Government in the strict and proper sense of the term. The Statistical Bureau in the Treasury Department have no right to revise the statistics of the Interior Department, nor even of the Treasury Department under another bureau. The Director of the Mint puts out statistics that do not very often agree with the statistics of the Statistical Bureau of the Treasury.

I have not been impressed, as some Senators have, with the crying necessity for another department, but I have not felt like making any objection to it. About the only consideration that has reconciled me to it was that there might be such a thing as one statistical bureau that might be a bureau worthy of that name.

Now, it appears that the Senator from Minnesota proposes to transfer one statistical bureau from the State Department and to leave it still an existing statistical bureau; and that he proposes to transfer one from the Treasury and leave it a statistical bureau.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me to interrupt him there?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. The plan is not to leave them distinct bureaus. The Statistical Bureau from the State Department is to be consolidated with this other bureau.

Mr. TELLER. Not by the terms of this bill.

Mr. NELSON. Yes.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, no. It may be that that is what the Senator means, but that is not what is done. I will call the Senator's attention to it. I am not doing this in any hostility to the bill, but simply because we ought to make this measure as perfect as we can.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator allow me to call his attention to the language commencing in line 23, at the foot of page 3, following the semicolon?

That the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, now in the Department of State, be, and the same hereby is, transferred to the department of commerce and consolidated with and made a part of the Bureau of Statistics, hereinbefore transferred from the Department of the Treasury to the department of commerce.

Mr. TELLER. Well, it is still a bureau.

Mr. NELSON. No; it is consolidated and made a part of it. It is not to be a separate bureau any longer.

Mr. TELLER. If it is to be consolidated that bureau ought to be wiped out. The Senator still recognizes that there is to be a chief of the bureau that exists in the State Department, because that chief is to be the assistant of the bureau that is now in the Treasury Department. How there can be a head of that bureau and the head can be the assistant of the other bureau unless the two bureaus are still to exist I am unable to see. If the Senator means that it is not to continue as a bureau the language of the bill should be changed.

Mr. NELSON. I call the Senator's attention to another part of the language that I did not read:

And the chief of said Bureau of Foreign Commerce shall be the assistant chief of the Bureau of Statistics; and it shall be the duty of said Bureau—

The consolidated bureau—

Mr. QUARLES. Where is that found?

Mr. NELSON. I am reading on page 4—
and it shall be the duty of said Bureau—

That means the consolidated Bureau—

under the direction of the Secretary, in addition to the duties now prescribed by law, to gather, compile, classify and publish statistical information showing the condition of the foreign and domestic commerce, of the mining, manufacturing, shipping, and fishery industries, and of the transportation facilities of the United States.

It does not intend that there shall be two departments left. It is the aim of the bill to consolidate and avoid the duplication of work.

Mr. TELLER. I imagine, then, from what the Senator says,

that what he proposes is to legislate that chief, when he consolidated the bureaus, into the place of assistant, but that he does not do.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all.

Mr. TELLER. That is what he wants to do. He has not done it. There will still be two bureaus there. One comes from the Department of State and the other from the Treasury Department.

Mr. COCKRELL. And there will be chiefs of each of them.

Mr. TELLER. There will be chiefs of each of them, but one will have a dual relation, because he will be the chief of one bureau and the assistant chief of the other. Now, if the Senator means that there shall not be two bureaus, he must change the language and put it so that we shall not have two bureaus.

In addition to that, I supposed, from reading this language, that it was the intention to keep the two bureaus. So I had proposed an amendment of this kind, to strike out all in line 4, after the word "commerce," down to and including the word "Statistics," in line 6. That would do away with the proposition to make the chief of the bureau of foreign commerce an assistant in the other bureau; but if it is the purpose of the Senator to consolidate those two and make only one bureau, with one head, then he must change the language in some way. I do not know just how to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. NELSON. I will say to the Senator—

Mr. COCKRELL. I suggest to the Senator from Colorado that he move to strike out the words which occur there and to insert—

And shall constitute one bureau, with one chief and assistant chief.

Mr. NELSON. I will say to the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Missouri that it was certainly the purpose of this part of the bill to consolidate the two existing bureaus into one.

Mr. TELLER. If that is what the Senator wants to accomplish, I shall be glad to have the amendment offered, so that we may have a vote on it.

Mr. VEST. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Colorado has been Secretary of the Interior, and a very able one, I will say. How is it that we have a Statistical Abstract, which includes not only the statistics of the Treasury Department, but of all the other departments? I understand that to be the authoritative, general statistical abstract of the Government, and while it is true that the Director of the Mint and some bureau officers report a statistical abstract, they are repeated and sent out authoritatively from the general Statistical Abstract office of the Treasury Department?

Mr. COCKRELL. That goes from the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department.

Mr. TELLER. Yes; that is right.

Mr. VEST. It embraces the statistics of all the departments.

Mr. COCKRELL. But it is nevertheless compiled in the office of the Bureau of the Treasury Department and issued by that one office.

Mr. VEST. That is an authoritative publication for all of the departments, not of the Treasury Department. If I want information about shipping, or the land laws, or the number of fisheries, I simply go to the Statistical Abstract, which is the essence of the reports of all the bureau officers under the head of the Treasury Department.

Mr. COCKRELL. My colleague is exactly right. It is in the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department that it is compiled and published.

Mr. VEST. That is true.

Mr. COCKRELL. We have now about twenty-odd volumes that have been issued. It was about twenty-one or twenty-two years ago when the first Statistical Abstract was issued, and it has been kept up annually ever since.

Mr. TELLER. That is a very valuable document, and, as the Senator from Missouri says, it is issued under the control and direction of the Treasury Department. Some years ago, in making a speech, I quoted from the published report of the Director of the Mint and I was caught up by a gentleman who had the Statistical Abstract. It was on a question of the amount of precious metals produced in a country, and I found between two and three million dollars difference in the Statistical Abstract and in the published report. I had quoted without the book, but I happened to have with me the report of the Director of the Mint, and I turned to it and showed that the discrepancy existed in the published reports of the Government. My attention having been called to it, I found that to be the case in more than one instance.

We have never had, as a rule, a trained statistician in the Treasury Department. By the time we have got a man educated

in the Treasury Department, so that he knows anything about statistics, he is turned out and a new one put in. That has been the rule.

The present statistician in the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, I think—I say without any discredit to him—had no experience and no particular claim to qualifications to be placed there. He is a man of pretty good ability and industry, and by the time he gets ready to go out and some other person comes in he will be a good statistician. He has done some very good work. I am not going to criticize him at all, but the statistical bureau of the Government of the United States ought to have at its head a man who is a statistician by experience and by nature, because those things go with a man. Every man can not make a statistician of himself, and when he is there he ought to stay there. He should not be removed. It should not be a political office. Then whenever a man takes up a statistical statement, or any conclusion that he may see fit to draw from it, it will have the authority of experience, and, more than that, of learning.

I thought, if the Census Office was turned over to this new bureau, I could see some propriety in having a statistical bureau in the Census Office, and then if the census should be made, as I thought perhaps it would and I was in hopes it would, a permanent bureau, with a limited number of employees in it during the time they were not taking the national census, we could get a fair statistical report on every question.

I do not want to make these criticisms of the statistical work of the Government, which is not perfect by any means, without saying that in my judgment it is as good as the statistical work of any other government in the world. I have taken some pains and I have had some experience with the examination of the English statistics and the French statistics particularly.

I ought to say, in justice to the Statistical Bureau, that I believe our reports stand well abroad. But they are not perfect, by any means. They are not what we ought to have, and they are not what we can have if we go at it right. This bureau is in the place where it ought to be, but there ought not to be two bureaus there, nor ought a man who is at the head of one to be the assistant in another. The head of the bureau, I repeat, should be a trained statistician. The assistant should be a trained statistician. His employees ought to be trained statisticians. What is the use of putting a new man in a bureau like that, either at the head or at the foot, I do not care where you put him? You have got to have mathematicians. It is a work which requires the highest possible talent in the many particulars. I want to get that if we can, and I wish to have the bill so framed that there will be no misunderstanding on the subject, and so that it will be known that there is to be but one bureau of statistics there.

Now, you can not dispense entirely with what need not perhaps be called a bureau, but a statistical division in every other department. Every department should have its statistical division, which should be subordinate to the general statistical bureau, so that before the Secretary of the Interior is allowed to send out statistics they should go to the bureau of statistics for revision, and you never will have a proper statistical bureau and proper statistical statements until you get to that condition.

Now, if the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] will move his amendment we will at least accomplish that and have it settled that there is to be but one statistical bureau in the new department.

Mr. COCKRELL. In line 4, after the words, "the department of commerce," I move to strike out "and the chief of said bureau of foreign commerce shall be the assistant chief of the said bureau of statistics," and insert:

And the two shall constitute one bureau, to be called the bureau of statistics, with a chief of the bureau and one assistant.

Mr. QUARLES. Mr. President, I much regret that I was not in the Chamber when this debate originated. I can not help feeling that we are making a mistake in striking out the Census Bureau from the bill, and when it shall be in order, I shall move to reconsider the vote by which the Census Bureau was stricken out.

I concur most heartily in the suggestions just made by my distinguished friend from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]. I believe, sir, it is the common experience of Senators here that we are running mad on the question of statistics. Each bureau that we create starts immediately to develop and spread itself and extend its functions, and it begins to reach out directly after statistics, until every bureau that we have is now furnishing statistics that, in my judgment, are crude and, as the distinguished Senator says, unreliable. Statistics are worse than worthless unless they are accurate, because they are misleading.

Now, we have not far to look for the reason of the inaccuracy of statistics that these several bureaus are gathering. The reason is that they are gathered sometimes by volunteers, always by men without experience. They are brought together and collaborated not by trained statisticians, but by men who have

been selected simply as the head of a bureau, with specific duties imposed upon them. In my judgment, sir, we shall never have any statistics that are reliable until we organize one central bureau and keep it as a permanent organization, with trained men not only at the head but throughout every subdivision.

Now, how are we to arrive at that state of affairs so much to be desired? I venture to say, sir, that if these several statistical bureaus are left attached to the various departments you will never be able to consolidate them, because the minute you attack that bureau and undertake to combine it with something else you arouse jealousy, suspicion, and opposition, and the people interested in promoting that bureau come here and oppose the measure.

But I thought I saw, Mr. President, in this bill a convenient and appropriate method of arriving at the conclusion we all desire, namely, by having all these bureaus and the Census, whether it be made permanent or not, put into this new department, where we may place an organizer who will organize it, as we all desire, into one great, reliable bureau, destroying all jealousy and putting at its head men who are capable of furnishing us statistics which are accurate and reliable.

Now, it is the desire of the Committee on Census, of which I have the honor to be a member, in the near future to present to this body the reasons why there ought to be a permanent Census Bureau instead of having each ten years mere spasmodic work—emergency work. I did not suppose that the question would be anticipated or raised by this bill; but let me call your attention, Mr. President, to what we are doing. Now I ask Senators to look on page 4 of this bill, commencing at line 8.

Before I read this language, let it be remembered that under existing law the present Census Bureau is to complete by the 1st day of July, 1902, and publish, the reports on the four principal topics: Population, vital statistics, manufactures, and commerce. That immediately after that the Bureau is commissioned by law to obtain the statistics regarding mines and mining and report that, and then to take up the subject of crimes, pauperism, transportation, and many other topics that are still after that to be collected and published.

Now, commencing on line 8, let us see what we are asking this bureau to do.

Mr. TELLER. On what page?

Mr. QUARLES. On page 4. After taking the provision for the Census Bureau out of this bill, see how completely you are providing here for duplicating these statistics.

In addition to the duties now prescribed by law, to gather, compile, classify, and publish statistical information showing the condition of the foreign and domestic commerce, of the mining, manufacturing, shipping, and fishery industries, and of the transportation facilities of the United States.

That is precisely the work that you have devolved upon this Census Bureau, precisely the work that will engage the energies of that Bureau for the next four or five years.

Mr. COCKRELL. It will complete its work by next June.

Mr. QUARLES. My distinguished friend is certainly mistaken, because by the text of the bill it has until the 1st day of July, 1902, to publish the tables regarding four principal topics—population, vital statistics, manufactures, and commerce—four vital points. After that it takes up mines and mining, and is commissioned to make thorough investigation of mines and mining, the number of men employed, the amount of metal removed, and all that subject. After that it then takes up a dozen other topics, as to which it will consume two or three years to properly prepare the statistics.

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator allow a question simply for information?

Mr. QUARLES. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. Has not the Census Bureau already entered upon the work which the Senator speaks of as contemplated by the law after the four main subjects have been reported upon?

Mr. QUARLES. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. They are already engaged in that work at this time?

Mr. QUARLES. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. That is what I understood.

Mr. QUARLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow a suggestion?

Mr. QUARLES. With pleasure.

Mr. TELLER. I understand from perfectly reliable authority that there will be a large force necessarily retained in the Census Office for the next four years.

Mr. QUARLES. Certainly; for five years. If I had time to elaborate that, I think I could show the Senate that five years would not be an inadequate period within which to gather accurate statistics concerning the topics already assigned to this Bureau. Then it will require at least three years to prepare for taking the Thirteenth Census, a gigantic task, because there will probably be 100,000,000 people to be enumerated, an immense increase in all

manufacturing and industrial lines, our insular possessions also to come in, with all the great work involved in the preparation to enumerate those peoples over there, who speak a different language, who have different customs, with all the other difficulties that cluster about that work which will suggest themselves readily to any Senator thinking of the subject for a moment.

Mr. BACON. The distinguished Senator will pardon me a moment, if I do not interrupt him unduly?

Mr. QUARLES. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. The presentation the Senator makes of the necessity of a general central statistical bureau is certainly a very strong one. The suggestion I desired to make was this—it is rather an interrogatory—whether it would not be better, if we had this great central statistical bureau, that we should have one of its representatives in each of the departments for statistics relative to that department only, having a direct responsibility to the general head, the same as we now have in the Department of Justice—a representative in each one of the departments, who is none the less, while being in that department, a member of the staff of the Department of Justice.

Now, in order that I may not interrupt the Senator again, I wish to say in connection with that thought that it seems to me this presentation in this discussion demonstrates the fact that this bill is not ready for the action of the Senate, and if this particular feature of it has the importance which the debate here evidently discloses, it seems to me that instead of relegating it to the future we should deal with it now. If it is important that we should have this great central statistical bureau, then the scheme should be perfected, in order that the end the Senator so forcibly set forth as desirable should be accomplished, not in the remote but in the immediate future.

Mr. QUARLES. Mr. President, in answer to the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], I wish to say that the reason I am opposed to allowing statistics to be gathered piecemeal by several departments is that statistics subserve a different purpose to-day from what they did a few years ago. Formerly statistics were gathered to minister to pride or curiosity, but now, in the evolution of times, they have become a commercial and scientific necessity. Statistics have become a part of the scientific life and existence of all our industrial organizations.

In order to gather these statistics we must have trained men, not so much in the gathering of them as in the combination of the facts so that they may be utilized. In other words, we ought to have one central bureau of statistics, presided over by trained statisticians, so that we may have a photograph, if you please an instantaneous photograph, of the various activities of this nation. You can only secure that by having trained men.

I have taken occasion, Mr. President, to ascertain what course the nations of Europe have been taking in regard to this matter of statistics, and I find that, instead of having the gathering of statistics scattered through various departments, they almost uniformly have one central bureau, and the average term of employment of the statisticians in those bureaus of Europe is about twenty years, whereas in our country no attention has hitherto been given to this matter, as though it were a matter of very little importance. So I would say to my distinguished friend from Georgia the reason we do not want to leave the gathering of these statistics scattered in these several departments is that we want accurate statistics. We want them speedily gathered, because stale statistics are worthless, and I conceive that we would advance the interests of the business world, the industrial world, the scientific world, if we would keep the Census Bureau here in this department and bring all these other statistical bureaus under the same organizing head that we propose to put in charge of this new department. Then, without friction, without jealousy, simply with a view to the ascertainment of reliable results, organize one bureau that will do all the work and give us complete satisfaction with its results.

Mr. President, one word more. I want to say to Senators that at a later date it is the policy of your Census Committee to bring to the attention of this body another measure, which I think will be esteemed valuable by Senators. We think that this trained bureau, which we propose to have if the Senate shall agree with its committee, is destined to do a great work, and that it will be commissioned not only to furnish the statistics of population that are required by the Constitution, and these other statistics that are grouped with them, but that every year we shall require of that bureau accurate statistics, for instance, regarding the business of cotton ginning, regarding dairies, regarding certain other branches of industry which are required to be represented in these statistics. We shall urge as a reason for doing that, that statistics which are gathered once in ten years may not be reliable, because that particular year may be a year of great prosperity or it may be a year of great commercial depression. So the business interests of this country now require that they should have annually

accurate statistics regarding these great industries. There is a growing demand for them, and we have thought, Mr. President, when the time came, you would agree with us that that would be a very desirable thing to be accomplished.

I hope, therefore, Senators, you will not strike the Census Office out of this bill. Leave it in the bill. Do not let us go on duplicating statistics as we are doing now—\$100,000 a year paid for partial statistics in the Agricultural Department, \$150,000 a year paid for statistics in the Treasury Department, and so on ad infinitum. You have provided for a duplication of the very work that that Census Bureau is now performing. Mr. President, I presume it is not now in order to make the motion I propose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can demand a separate vote on that amendment in the Senate without moving to reconsider the vote by which it was adopted.

Mr. FORAKER. Would there not necessarily be that same duplication if you should leave the provision for the Census Bureau in the bill?

Mr. QUARLES. In reply to that, I will say that my understanding of the matter is this: If the Census Office remains in the new department, and these several statistical bureaus are also put in the new department, it will then become the duty of the head of that department to reorganize the bureaus and avoid all this duplication. I would have one central bureau of statistics.

Mr. COCKRELL. How can he do it without a law authorizing him to do it?

Mr. QUARLES. That is a question I hesitate to answer.

Mr. COCKRELL. It ought to be in this bill. That is the very thing we have been contending against. You have conglomerated these things without giving any authority to unite them and harmonize them, just as you did when you provided two chiefs of bureaus, one subordinate to the other. I want to amend that. That is a defect in this bill.

Mr. QUARLES. If that be true, I shall certainly urge upon my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] that he permit this bill to be reviewed. I care nothing about the method pursued, but it seems to me very desirable that we should deal with this matter in some proper way to arrive at this result.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I do not understand that any Senator is opposed to proper legislation in this bill that will consolidate this matter of obtaining correct statistics. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. QUARLES] is eminently right in what he has said as to the necessity for changing the present system in regard to obtaining correct calculations and correct statistics upon all these different subjects in which the people are interested. We have here developed in this discussion not the singular fact, but the evident fact, that Congress at some time vested the Statistical Bureau of the Treasury Department with general jurisdiction over all statistics. That unquestionably was done by authority, and if Senators will go back to the origin and the establishment of that bureau in the Treasury Department they will find that that general jurisdiction was given to it.

Mr. TELLER. No, they will not.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Colorado says they will not. I had occasion some twelve or fifteen years ago to examine that question, and my recollection is that that jurisdiction was conferred. If it was not conferred, then that bureau has been acting without authority and wasting the money of the people in publishing the Statistical Abstract, which has had authoritative force throughout the United States.

One other observation and I am done. The Senator from Wisconsin says it will take five years to complete the further work of the Census Bureau. My information is that three years will be sufficient, and that the force can be cut down to some four or five hundred. At any rate I am satisfied from what I have seen of the operations of the Census Bureau that the work will be well done and economically done, because there has never been a Director of the Census who has proved himself more competent than the present incumbent.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. QUARLES], who is very accurate in his statements, has unfolded to me in more detail than I was acquainted with before the objects of this bill. If one of the objects of this bill is, as now appears, to concentrate in a single department the statistics of the industries and occupations of the people of our own country, and also to gather within its folds statistics of the commerce and industries of all other countries, then I submit to my friend that this bill as now drawn is imperfect.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no question about that.

Mr. ALLISON. I quite agree with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. QUARLES] that it would be desirable to have, so far as possible, all statistical information concentrated in a single office; but I submit that this bill falls far short of that consummation. I also think that it will

require great care and be difficult to so unite this statistical information as to enable a single department to gather it.

We have now disclosed in this debate the fact that it will be the duty of the Director of the Census to gather statistical information of the mining industries of our country. That work is in process now, or will be in a short time.

We have had for twenty years—the Senator from Missouri in front of me [Mr. COCKRELL] will have more accurate information as to the exact number of years—but we have had in the Geological Survey a requirement for many years—

Mr. COCKRELL. About twenty years.

Mr. ALLISON. About twenty years—that there should be an annual publication of the mineral resources of the United States, and that publication has appeared annually. I have not had the opportunity of knowing whether that volume is now published, but I think it has been published.

Mr. COCKRELL. The volume for 1900 has just been issued.

Mr. GALLINGER. The report for 1900 is just out.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is just out. I got it yesterday.

Mr. ALLISON. I have been absent on a little vacation and have not had an opportunity of looking into it, but I undertake to say that the statistics of the mineral resources of the United States and of the productions of the mines of the United States are reasonably accurate. It is not possible, I will say, that we shall be able to secure absolutely accurate statistical information on all these subjects. It is not possible for us in collating statistics of the industries and occupations of our people to make them absolutely accurate. How are we going to ascertain exactly the number of tons of coal produced from all of the mines of the United States by a special bureau appointed for that purpose? There must be a corps of people who are not under oath, who are not officials of the Government, who must be relied upon to furnish the statistics respecting the coal production of the United States, and most of that must be voluntary. Those statistics will be sufficiently accurate to compare our coal production with the production of the other countries of the world.

How are we going to ascertain the number of bushels of oats or of wheat or of corn produced in all the States of this Union? That can only be done, I submit to the Senate, by what might be called expert estimates. We are trying in the State of Iowa, in which I live, to ascertain the number of bushels of corn raised in that State during the last year. We have a State statistician, whose duty it is to ascertain that, and who does ascertain it in the best obtainable way and at the least cost, but whether the production of corn in my State is 250,000,000 bushels or 251,000,000 bushels or 250,000,005 bushels can not be ascertained by any system of statistics that may be presented here or elsewhere.

Take the gold supply. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] mentioned a moment ago that he was led into a mistake by looking at the Statistical Abstract and finding that it did not exactly agree with the report of the Director of the Mint. While those who compile the Statistical Abstract in the Treasury Department avail themselves of every opportunity, as respects the foreign and domestic commerce and the productions of our country and of other countries, they must, in the very nature of things, avail themselves of the statistical information acquired from other departments and other bureaus. So that whoever compiles that Statistical Abstract in the Treasury Department undoubtedly avails himself of the information furnished by the Director of the Mint, who himself is gathering statistics regarding certain things which can be easily and more accurately ascertained by the Director of the Mint than by, probably, any other officer of the Government.

Mr. COCKRELL. He is confined to gold and silver principally.

Mr. ALLISON. His report is confined absolutely to gold and silver; but our Director of the Mint is in correspondence with the directors of all the mints in the world; he is in close correspondence from time to time with the experts in all countries who have information respecting the annual production of gold and silver. It is not necessary for this new statistician of this new bureau to undertake by original processes to ascertain these facts.

So with the Secretary of Agriculture. I do not know that the statistical division of the Agricultural Department gathers all its own statistics, but I do know that its statistics are as reasonably accurate as they can be made; and there is no bureau or department of the Government which can so well and so accurately ascertain the statistics necessary to be inserted in the general volume of our productions as the Department of Agriculture.

So it is that the Statistical Bureau of the Treasury Department now, instead of making original researches on this subject, go to the Agricultural Department, and embody in the annual abstract the things which the Secretary of Agriculture has been able to ascertain. Therefore, if I want to know the number of bushels of corn or wheat or oats produced, I would go to that Statistical Abstract and ascertain it. As now published, it may not be exactly accurate or within a million or two millions of bushels of the total

amount produced, but I can ascertain what it is in the aggregate sufficient for any commercial purpose or any industrial purpose.

Then, take another class of information to be sought here, and that is brought within the purview of this bill—that is, statistics of transportation. These are all at hand and can be obtained with reasonable accuracy. We have now in our Interstate Commerce Commission a special statistician, whose duty it is to report annually to Congress the statistics respecting the transportation interests of our country by rail, and these statistics are printed. The general statistician, as contemplated by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. QUARLES] and provided for in this bill, I now for the first time understand will, of course, seek these resources in order to ascertain these facts. They are well known; they are ascertained without great cost to the Government, and they are accurate because they are transcripts of the statements made by the great railways that transport our products by rail. So it is with our statistics as respects our commerce by sea and the interior rivers and waterways of our country.

Mr. President, I agree thoroughly with the general suggestion that there ought to be somewhere a place where these statistics can be collated, compiled, and published in a single volume. I supposed that was already done by the Bureau of Statistics in the Treasury Department, which is proposed by this bill to be transferred. That annual abstract is not only an abstract of the receipts of customs, of the amount of imports, and so on, but it embraces the entire range of our products and prices of commodities.

The honorable Senator from Wisconsin, the chairman of the Census Committee, proposes to transmute the law that we passed in 1899 into a law permanently establishing the Census Bureau, which otherwise would go out of existence by force of the law creating it when its work, which is now in hand, is concluded.

The Senator from Wisconsin, in his most excellent speech, has only confirmed me in the suggestion I made. He is proposing here to bring forward an elaborate scheme, which, if I understand it, I shall give my support to—a scheme to make the Census Bureau a permanent one, and a single line, when that comes here, will put it into this new law. If it is wise to put it there, and if we can so arrange this bill as hereafter to provide for all this statistical information to be embodied in this new department of commerce rather than in the Department of the Secretary of the Treasury, I shall not object; but I myself do not like to see a suggestion that here it is proposed to consolidate bureaus when in fact there is no consolidation. I look at the various bureaus that would be turned over to this new department, and I find that the Geological Survey is to be continued under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior. It is just as germane to the operation of that Department as to any other. So I find other things in the bill in the same direction.

Now it is proposed that this new department shall deal with the foreign commerce of our country, and shall also from year to year collect statistics of the industries of our country, and not only so, but that it shall promote our industries, so that it is to be given enlarged powers. I do not object to that, although I think our industries have been fairly well promoted during the last few years by private enterprise and the exercise of judgment as respects these industries by private citizens.

Mr. President, I should not have made these observations but for the fact that I understand the Senator from Wisconsin intends to endeavor to reinsert these provisions. If the Census Bureau is to be provided for by a provision in this bill, it should be inserted with a great many amendments; and I am not sure that I am in favor of the suggestion made by the Senator that this Bureau shall take into its hands the statistics relating to the mining industries of our country and that the Geological Survey shall be denuded of its force, although it has a force now, and a trained force, that has been there for more than twenty years. It has at its head one of the most accomplished men in our country as to mining statistics.

Mr. COCKRELL. Dr. Day?

Mr. ALLISON. Dr. Day. I do not know but that if the Director of the Census has the acumen I think he has, he has already availed himself of Dr. Day's skill and force and energy on the subject of mining statistics, because he has them all at hand and has been engaged for twenty years in publishing them in a valuable annual volume.

Mr. QUARLES. That is entirely true, as I understand.

Mr. ALLISON. It seems to me that the suggestion made first by the Senator from Colorado needs careful consideration, and perhaps the bill needs some further amendment. I should like, of course, for one, to see some modification in this particular amendment as respects our consular service.

It does seem to me that the only way whereby the statistics of foreign trade, prices, etc., can be ascertained economically is through our consuls and our consuls-general. They are under the State Department. It is true there is a sort of halfway trans-

fer of the jurisdiction of the State Department over these consuls, but it seems to me, in view of the work they have done in the past few years, that it would be wiser for this new department to avail itself of the work that the Secretary of State is doing in this direction, and then compile in its annual volume whatever information is procured.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me, is not that precisely what is provided for in section 5?

Mr. ALLISON. It may be.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is there provided that—

All consular officers of the United States, including consul-generals, consuls, and commercial agents, are hereby required, and it is made a part of their duty, under the direction of the Secretary of State, to gather and compile, from time to time, upon the request of the secretary of commerce, useful and material information and statistics in respect to the commerce, industries, and markets of the countries and places to which such consular officers are accredited.

And so forth.

It seems to me this bill takes care of that very clearly and very fully.

Mr. ALLISON. It may.

Mr. LODGE. That portion of the bill, I will say to the Senator from Iowa, was very carefully considered and amended the other day.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well. I merely call attention to it, not that I wish to interfere with it.

Mr. President, I have entered this discussion with hesitation, because I have been absent for some weeks and I have not had an opportunity of giving such attention to the bill as perhaps I should have given it. I am in favor of the establishment of the new department of commerce, and I am in favor of giving it whatever jurisdiction such a department should have, but I do not think it is wise at this time, by a single statute, to undertake to change great bureaus of our Government from one head to another, and with that change, to change so many officers without due consideration.

I heard with interest the suggestions of the Senator from Minnesota to-day as respects these various bureaus. I think some of them have no more relation to this new department than they have to the departments with which they are now allied. Mr. Wright, who is now the head of the Department of Labor, has nothing, it seems to me, that should be supervised at all by the head of a department. I think he is doing most excellent work. It is scientific work; it is educational work; it has no special relation to the new department or to any existing department. So with the Fish Commission. It is a scientific bureau. It is not now under any department, so far as I know. The head of that Commission, I believe, is doing very good work.

However, I do not care to discuss this matter further to-night, but I wish to say that if it is the object and purpose of the promoters of this bill, and especially the object and purpose of the honorable Senator from Wisconsin, who is chairman of the Census Committee, to endeavor to gather in under the direction of the census all these various statistical matters, I believe the whole question should be relegated to his bill when it comes in, and if he furnishes a comprehensive method whereby it can be done I shall favor it.

Mr. TELLER obtained the floor.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to ask a question, if I may, before the Senator from Colorado proceeds; but I will wait if he would rather proceed. I simply desire to ask—

Mr. TELLER. I was going to suggest that the bill would require more discussion, and I have been told that there is a desire to have an executive session.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to say that the debate to-day, I think, with the exception of the remarks of the Senator in charge of the bill, has been entirely in the hands of Senators who are not on the Committee on Commerce. I think the bill for that reason ought to go over, and I should myself like a few minutes at some time, being a member of the Committee on Commerce, to make some observations. I am going to try to persuade the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who usually is right, that the amendment he proposes is not necessary.

The consolidation of these statistical bureaus is made absolutely as clear in the bill as it now stands as it will be if the amendment is adopted. However, that is a matter of not very much consequence. I think the bill will have to go over.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President—

Mr. TELLER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts if I have the floor.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to take the floor from the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I supposed the Senator from Colorado had concluded his remarks.

Mr. TELLER. No.

Mr. HOAR. I merely wish to ask a question which I dare say may have been answered during the debate, as I have been obliged to be absent from the Senate Chamber nearly all the time.

What building or what quarters will be the home of this department? I suppose some time or other, of course, there will be a new building. I should like to inquire, because we can not tell what may get through the two Houses hereafter, whether the bill should not contain some provision, which it does not now contain, as to the right of the proposed new department to use rooms until the new building is completed? Perhaps that question has already been answered in debate.

Mr. GALLINGER. It has not been raised.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask what is the plan about that. We have certain buildings which by law are appropriated to certain departments of the Government. Now, we create a secretary, an assistant secretary, and some other officials, I believe, and then we say that hereafter certain enumerated bureaus and officials shall belong to the department of commerce. Do they retain by any law their right to remain in the Treasury building, for instance, or in the Interior Department building? Should not the bill have some provision for that? That is the point to which I wish to call attention. I do not wish to interfere at all with my friend's bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to submit a few observations, but I do not desire to do it to-night. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 21, 1902, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 20, 1902.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Robert W. Dowe, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Saluria, in the State of Texas, to succeed Claremont C. Drake, removed.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Charles Kingston, of Wyoming, to be register of the land office at Evanston, Wyo., his present term having expired. (Reappointment.)

Albert R. Museller, of Perry, Okla., to be register of the land office at Alva, Okla., vice Robert A. Cameron, term expired.

Emory D. Brownlee, of Oklahoma Territory, to be register of the land office at Kingfisher, Okla., his term having expired. (Reappointment.)

Frank D. Healy, of Oklahoma Territory, to be register of the land office at Woodward, Okla., his term having expired. (Reappointment.)

William E. Culkin, of Minnesota, to be register of the land office at Duluth, Minn., his present term having expired. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Jacob V. Admire, of Oklahoma Territory, to be receiver of public moneys at Kingfisher, Okla., his term having expired. (Reappointment.)

Herschel V. Cashin, of Alabama, to be receiver of public moneys at Huntsville, Ala., to take effect February 19, 1902, at the expiration of his present term. (Reappointment.)

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

Cavalry Arm.

Christian Briand, at large, captain in the Porto Rico Provisional Regiment of Infantry, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

Infantry Arm.

Edward H. Andres, at large, late first lieutenant, Thirtieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

William W. Bessell, at large, captain in the Porto Rico Provisional Regiment of Infantry, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

Joseph B. Caughey, of Illinois, late captain, Thirty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

De Witt W. Chamberlin, of Michigan, late first lieutenant, Thirty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

Charles E. Reese, at large, late captain, Thirtieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

POSTMASTERS.

Charles D. Morris, to be postmaster at Trenton, in the county of Grundy and State of Missouri, in place of Charles D. Morris. Incumbent's commission expires January 21, 1902.

C. A. Sweet, to be postmaster at Creighton, in the county of Knox and State of Nebraska, in place of Arthur A. Logan. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Henry C. Booker, to be postmaster at Gothenburg, in the county of Dawson and State of Nebraska, in place of Henry C. Booker. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

Charles V. Hay, to be postmaster at Weeping Water, in the county of Cass and State of Nebraska, in place of Charles V. Hay. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

Alfred E. Bean, to be postmaster at Berlin, in the county of Coos and State of New Hampshire, in place of Alfred E. Bean. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Charles E. Slate, to be postmaster at Winchester, in the county of Cheshire and State of New Hampshire, in place of Charles E. Slate. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Forrest W. Peavey, to be postmaster at Wolfboro, in the county of Carroll and State of New Hampshire, in place of Forrest W. Peavey. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

James Harris, to be postmaster at Englewood, in the county of Bergen and State of New Jersey, in place of James Harris. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1902.

Roger M. Bridgman, to be postmaster at Ridgewood, in the county of Bergen and State of New Jersey, in place of Roger M. Bridgman. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1902.

Albert Humm, to be postmaster at College Point, in the county of Queens and State of New York, in place of Albert Humm. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

Murray P. Brewer, to be postmaster at Bowling Green, in the county of Wood and State of Ohio, in place of Murray P. Brewer. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

Fred Yeager, to be postmaster at Perrysburg, in the county of Wood and State of Ohio, in place of Fred Yeager. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1902.

Norman K. Wiley, to be postmaster at California, in the county of Washington and State of Pennsylvania, in place of James I. McKenna. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

George W. Best, to be postmaster at East Brady, in the county of Clarion and State of Pennsylvania, in place of George W. Best. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

Robert D. Peck, to be postmaster at Lock Haven, in the county of Clinton and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Henry T. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Jacob R. Zuck, to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Jacob R. Zuck. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Daniel S. Knox, to be postmaster at Tionesta, in the county of Forest and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Daniel S. Knox. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

Albert L. Scott, to be postmaster at Dickson, in the county of Dickson and State of Tennessee, in place of Albert L. Scott. Incumbent's commission expires February 2, 1902.

Ellery H. Webster, to be postmaster at Barton, in the county of Orleans and State of Vermont, in the place of Ellery H. Webster. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Benjamin B. Weisiger, to be postmaster at Manchester, in the county of Chesterfield and State of Virginia, in place of Benjamin B. Weisiger. Incumbent's commission expires January 31, 1902.

William H. Faulkner, to be postmaster at South Boston, in the county of Halifax and State of Virginia, in place of William H. Faulkner. Incumbent's commission expires January 31, 1902.

James F. Harrison, to be postmaster at Piedmont, in the county of Mineral and State of West Virginia, in place of James F. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Joel L. Stewart, to be postmaster at Clintonville, in the county of Waupaca and State of Wisconsin, in place of Joel L. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1902.

John F. Cole, to be postmaster at Marshfield, in the county of Wood and State of Wisconsin, in place of John F. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1902.

Harry E. Munday, to be postmaster at Shepherdstown, in the county of Jefferson and State of West Virginia, in place of William A. Chapline, deceased.

William L. Jefferies, to be postmaster at Clarendon, in the county of Monroe and State of Arkansas, in place of William L. Jefferies. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

James Harden, to be postmaster at Bartow, in the county of Polk and State of Florida, in place of James Harden. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

John McDougall, to be postmaster at Tallahassee, in the county of Leon and State of Florida, in place of John McDougall. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

Charles R. Jackson, to be postmaster at Darien, in the county of McIntosh and State of Georgia, in place of Charles R. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

Hugh Cramer, to be postmaster at Hailey, in the county of

Blaine and State of Idaho, in place of Hugh Cramer. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

John W. Hancock, to be postmaster at Casey, in the county of Clark and State of Illinois, in place of George W. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Thomas G. Lawler, to be postmaster at Rockford, in the county of Winnebago and State of Illinois, in place of Thomas G. Lawler. Incumbent's commission expires January 20, 1902.

James B. Stetson, to be postmaster at Sheffield, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois, in place of James B. Stetson. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1901.

Willis L. McCampbell, to be postmaster at Middletown, in the county of Henry and State of Indiana, in place of Joseph O. Lambert. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

James H. Jones, to be postmaster at Newcastle, in the county of Henry and State of Indiana, in place of William R. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1902.

Oscar E. Lewis, to be postmaster at Shelbyville, in the county of Shelby and State of Indiana, in place of Thomas E. Newton. Incumbent's commission expires January 21, 1902.

James P. Davis, to be postmaster at Bonaparte, in the county of Van Buren and State of Iowa, in place of James P. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Roman C. White, to be postmaster at Glenwood, in the county of Mills and State of Iowa, in place of Roman C. White. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Frank H. McCabe, to be postmaster at Logan, in the county of Harrison and State of Iowa, in place of Frank H. McCabe. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

James T. Ellis, to be postmaster at Panora, in the county of Guthrie and State of Iowa, in place of James T. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Frank C. Labit, to be postmaster at Crowley, in the parish of Acadia and State of Louisiana, in place of Frank C. Labit. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1902.

William H. Merrill, to be postmaster at Salem, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in place of William H. Merrill. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

J. Winslow Richardson, to be postmaster at Winchester, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in place of J. Winslow Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Charles F. Brown, to be postmaster at Alma, in the county of Gratiot and State of Michigan, in place of Charles F. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

William H. Hosking, to be postmaster at Calumet, in the county of Houghton and State of Michigan, in place of William H. Hosking. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Freeman B. Dickerson, to be postmaster at Detroit, in the county of Wayne and State of Michigan, in place of Freeman B. Dickerson. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Melvin A. Bates, to be postmaster at Grayling, in the county of Crawford and State of Michigan, in place of Melvin A. Bates. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Calvin E. Houk, to be postmaster at Ironwood, in the county of Gogebic and State of Michigan, in place of Calvin E. Houk. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

Cary W. Vining, to be postmaster at Lakeview, in the county of Montcalm and State of Michigan, in place of Cary W. Vining. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Michael H. Kern, to be postmaster at Menominee, in the county of Menominee and State of Michigan, in place of Michael H. Kern. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

George W. Raff, to be postmaster at Traverse City, in the county of Grand Traverse and State of Michigan, in place of George W. Raff. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

John P. Waste, to be postmaster at Plainview, in the county of Wabasha and State of Minnesota, in place of John P. Waste. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

S. C. Johnson, to be postmaster at Rush City, in the county of Chisago and State of Minnesota, in place of Valora D. Eddy. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Robert D. Hamilton, to be postmaster at Kirksville, in the county of Adair and State of Missouri, in place of Charles A. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1902.

John G. Grems, to be postmaster at Maryville, in the county of Nodaway and State of Missouri, in place of John G. Grems. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1902.

Stephen Manning, to be postmaster at Columbus, in the county of Columbia and State of Wisconsin, in place of Stephen Manning. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

George J. Kispert, to be postmaster at Jefferson, in the county of Jefferson and State of Wisconsin, in place of George J. Kispert. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

Joseph J. Schultz, to be postmaster at Kewaunee, in the county

of Kewaunee and State of Wisconsin, in place of Joseph J. Schultz. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

George N. Slaten, to be postmaster at Grafton, in the county of Jersey and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

John G. E. Carlson, to be postmaster at Essex, in the county of Page and State of Iowa. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

Mark Palmer, to be postmaster at Eskridge, in the county of Wabaunsee and State of Kansas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

Alonzo M. King, to be postmaster at Plainville, in the county of Rooks and State of Kansas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

George G. Witty, to be postmaster at Bardwell, in the county of Carlisle and State of Kentucky. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

Albert Bondurant, to be postmaster at St. Joseph, in the parish of Tensas and State of Louisiana. Office became Presidential October 1, 1901.

Judson M. Spore, to be postmaster at Rockford, in the county of Kent and State of Michigan. Office became Presidential October 1, 1901.

James L. Baker, to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Schuyler and State of Missouri. Office became Presidential October 1, 1901.

August Hauser, to be postmaster at Hicksville, in the county of Nassau and State of New York. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

Frank C. Wilcox, to be postmaster at Painted Post, in the county of Steuben and State of New York. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

Charles W. Penny, to be postmaster at Patterson, in the county of Putnam and State of New York. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

Fred M. Askins, to be postmaster at Schaghticoke, in the county of Rensselaer and State of New York. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

Rudolph Neiman, to be postmaster at Red Lion, in the county of York and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential October 1, 1901.

Sydney S. Trevvett, to be postmaster at Glenallen, in the county of Henrico and State of Virginia. Office became Presidential April 1, 1901.

Charles J. McGill, to be postmaster at Dawson, in the county of Fayette and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential January 1, 1900.

Dennis Eagan, to be postmaster at Jacksonville, in the county of Duval and State of Florida, in place of Dennis Eagan. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 20, 1902.

INDIAN AGENTS.

Harry D. Chamberlain, of Faulkton, S. Dak., to be agent for the Indians of the Crow Creek Agency, in South Dakota.

Robert H. Somers, of Chamberlain, S. Dak., to be agent for the Indians of the Lower Brule Agency, in South Dakota.

POSTMASTERS.

Elliott E. Barnard, to be postmaster at Delphi, in the county of Carroll and State of Indiana.

Albert S. Peacock, to be postmaster at Attica, in the county of Fountain and State of Indiana.

Chauncey D. Sherwin, to be postmaster at Goshen, in the county of Elkhart and State of Indiana.

Charles M. McDanel, to be postmaster at New Brighton, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania.

Ellis G. Darnell, to be postmaster at Lebanon, in the county of Boone and State of Indiana.

Andrew M. Willoughby, to be postmaster at Greensburg, in the county of Decatur and State of Indiana.

Andrew A. Laird, to be postmaster at Frankfort, in the county of Clinton and State of Indiana.

William H. Mallory, to be postmaster at Veedersburg, in the county of Fountain and State of Indiana.

Andrew Morrissey, to be postmaster at Notre Dame, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Indiana.

William C. Vance, to be postmaster at Noblesville, in the county of Hamilton and State of Indiana.

B. W. Scott Wiseman, to be postmaster at Culver, in the county of Marshall and State of Indiana.

Robert S. Potts, to be postmaster at Thorntown, in the county of Boone and State of Indiana.

William O. Protsman, to be postmaster at Vevay, in the county of Switzerland and State of Indiana.

John C. English, to be postmaster at Anaconda, in the county of Deer Lodge and State of Montana.

Robert W. Watt, to be postmaster of Mercur, in the county of Tooele and State of Utah.

Stephen W. Ross, to be postmaster at Lehi City, in the county of Utah and State of Utah.

James H. Powell, to be postmaster at Virginia City, in the county of Madison and State of Montana.

James E. Stevens, to be postmaster at Hamilton, in the county of Ravalli and State of Montana.

Thomas W. Jones, to be postmaster at Deer Lodge, in the county of Powell and State of Montana.

James P. Driscoll, to be postmaster at Eureka, in the county of Juab and State of Utah.

Charles A. Burg, to be postmaster at Livingston, in the county of Park and State of Montana.

Alonzo H. Foster, to be postmaster at Boulder, in the county of Jefferson and State of Montana.

Lulu M. Pearce, to be postmaster at Thomson, in the county of McDuffie and State of Georgia.

Alice C. Fall, to be postmaster at Senoia, in the county of Coweta and State of Georgia.

William H. C. Tate, to be postmaster at Dahlongega, in the county of Lumpkin and State of Georgia.

Thomas M. Ray, to be postmaster at Valdosta, in the county of Lowndes and State of Georgia.

John M. Duff, to be postmaster at Tifton, in the county of Berrien and State of Georgia.

John T. Stilwell, to be postmaster at Montezuma, in the county of Macon and State of Georgia.

Lou B. Winsor, to be postmaster at Reed City, in the county of Osceola and State of Michigan.

Olive E. Stout, to be postmaster at Fort Myers (late Myers), in the county of Lee and State of Florida.

James A. Gilmour, to be postmaster at Central City, in the county of Gilpin and State of Colorado.

Ellery A. Humphrey, to be postmaster at Okarche, in the county of Canadian and Territory of Oklahoma.

Thomas B. Woosley, to be postmaster at Mulhall, county of Logan and Territory of Oklahoma.

Robert L. Gillespie, to be postmaster at Graham, in the county of Tazewell and State of Virginia.

Charles P. Peterson, to be postmaster at Glenwood, in the county of St. Croix and State of Wisconsin.

Henry Marshall, to be postmaster at Bloomer, in the county of Chippewa and State of Wisconsin.

Monroe C. Litter, to be postmaster at Yukon, in the county of Canadian and Territory of Oklahoma.

William J. Blair, to be postmaster at Iron River, in the county of Iron and State of Michigan.

Frank A. Johnson, to be postmaster at Springvalley, in the county of Pierce and State of Wisconsin.

William J. Guetzloe, to be postmaster at Kiel, in the county of Manitowoc and State of Wisconsin.

Isaac J. Quick, to be postmaster at Thompsonville, in the county of Benzie and State of Michigan.

Eric Ericson, to be postmaster at Republic, in the county of Marquette and State of Michigan.

Blair F. Scott, to be postmaster at Lake City, in the county of Missaukee and State of Michigan.

Frederick W. Smith, to be postmaster at Cass Lake, in the county of Cass and State of Minnesota.

Nicholas B. Shank, to be postmaster at Biwabik, in the county of St. Louis and State of Minnesota.

William C. Spreen, to be postmaster at Watervliet, in the county of Berrien and State of Michigan.

Roy A. Richmond, to be postmaster at Wausa, in the county of Knox and State of Nebraska.

James M. Beaver, to be postmaster at Scribner, in the county of Dodge and State of Nebraska.

William Cash, to be postmaster at Niobrara, in the county of Knox and State of Nebraska.

James Wolfe, to be postmaster at Eaton, in the county of Weld and State of Colorado.

Jerry S. Olney, to be postmaster at Crested Butte, in the county of Gunnison and State of Colorado.

Albert N. Holland, to be postmaster at Scottsboro, in the county of Jackson and State of Alabama.

Floy Hinds, to be postmaster at Decatur, in the county of Morgan and State of Alabama.

John C. Bryan, to be postmaster at Plankinton, in the county of Aurora and State of South Dakota.

Henry Heintz, to be postmaster at Elkton, in the county of Brookings and State of South Dakota.

James B. Johnson, to be postmaster at Montrose, in the county of Montrose and State of Colorado.

William H. Davie, to be postmaster at Florence, in the county of Fremont and State of Colorado.

Charles Booth, to be postmaster at Prattville, in the county of Autauga and State of Alabama.

Samuel H. Bliss, to be postmaster at Farmville, in the county of Prince Edward and State of Virginia.

George Schlosser, to be postmaster at Sioux Falls, in the county of Minnehaha and State of South Dakota.

Frederic J. Brown, to be postmaster at Britton, in the county of Marshall and State of South Dakota.

Lawrence C. Whittet, to be postmaster at Edgerton, in the county of Rock and State of Wisconsin.

Edward Cleary, to be postmaster at Antigo, in the county of Langlade and State of Wisconsin.

Hamilton W. Kinzer, to be postmaster at Front Royal, in the county of Warren and State of Virginia.

Joseph Kelly, to be postmaster at Havre de Grace, in the county of Harford and State of Maryland.

Kirby Thomas, to be postmaster at West Superior, in the county of Douglas and State of Wisconsin.

Ambrose H. Woodworth, to be postmaster at Tomahawk, in the county of Lincoln and State of Wisconsin.

Frank J. Battersbee, to be postmaster at Crosswell, in the county of Sanilac and State of Michigan.

Erwin Eveleth, to be postmaster at Corunna, in the county of Shiawassee and State of Michigan.

John T. Owens, to be postmaster at Benton Harbor, in the county of Berrien and State of Michigan.

Charles S. Mitchell, to be postmaster at Alexandria, in the county of Douglas and State of Minnesota.

Robert G. Elliott, to be postmaster at Munising, in the county of Alger and State of Michigan.

Edward G. Folsom, to be postmaster at Mount Clemens, in the county of Macomb and State of Michigan.

Daniel Fichthorn, to be postmaster at Saint Peter, in the county of Nicollet and State of Minnesota.

Ida Erickson, to be postmaster at Canby, in the county of Yellow Medicine and State of Minnesota.

William M. James, to be postmaster at Breckenridge, in the county of Wilkin and State of Minnesota.

Timothy B. Calnon, to be postmaster at Lyons, in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska.

Henry Gietzen, to be postmaster at Humphrey, in the county of Platte and State of Nebraska.

Jacob Fisher, to be postmaster at Hastings, in the county of Adams and State of Nebraska.

Henry Harris, to be postmaster at Union Springs, in the county of Bullock and State of Alabama.

Thomas H. Tharalson, to be postmaster at Grafton, in the county of Walsh and State of North Dakota.

George W. Hope, to be postmaster at Raritan, in the county of Somerset and State of New Jersey.

James P. B. Veirs, to be postmaster at Rockville, in the county of Montgomery and State of Maryland.

William M. Schoolfield, to be postmaster at Pocomoke City, in the county of Worcester and State of Maryland.

Wesley H. Ogle, to be postmaster at Lake City, in the county of Hinsdale and State of Colorado.

Daisy A. Cone, to be postmaster at West Bay City, in the county of Bay and State of Michigan.

Elmer W. Hall, to be postmaster at Lawton, in the county of Van Buren and State of Michigan.

Nellie W. Krogman, to be postmaster at Ishpeming, in the county of Marquette and State of Michigan.

Edwin E. Tuttle, to be postmaster at Hastings, in the county of Dakota and State of Minnesota.

Josie Forde, to be postmaster at Graceville, in the county of Bigstone and State of Minnesota.

Brayton S. Buckingham, to be postmaster at Argyle, in the county of Marshall and State of Minnesota.

Walter S. Clark, to be postmaster at Aspen, in the county of Pitkin and State of Colorado.

Bessie Leach, to be postmaster at Auburn, in the county of Nemaha and State of Nebraska.

George M. Young, to be postmaster at Perham, in the county of Ottertail and State of Minnesota.

John C. Scott, to be postmaster at Sterling, in the county of Logan and State of Colorado.

John Alfred, to be postmaster at Leadville, in the county of Lake and State of Colorado.

Amelia Williams, to be postmaster at Glenwood Springs, in the county of Garfield and State of Colorado.

Allen N. Armstrong, to be postmaster at Cassopolis, in the county of Cass and State of Michigan.

Joseph E. Watson, to be postmaster at Bronson, in the county of Branch and State of Michigan.

John Mutchler, to be postmaster at Bangor, in the county of Van Buren and State of Michigan.

Alfred Cruse, to be postmaster at Iron Mountain, in the county of Dickinson and State of Michigan.

Eugene S. Upson, to be postmaster at Durand, in the county of Shiawassee and State of Michigan.

Samuel C. Kirkbride, to be postmaster at Clare, in the county of Clare and State of Michigan.

Walter R. Rudy, to be postmaster at Mount Airy, in the county of Carroll and State of Maryland.

Lucius S. Gray, to be postmaster at Attalla, in the county of Etowah and State of Alabama.

George B. Faxon, to be postmaster at Ovid, in the county of Clinton and State of Michigan.

Archibald N. Chisholm, to be postmaster at Hibbing, in the county of St. Louis and State of Minnesota.

Moses Emery, to be postmaster at Caledonia, in the county of Houston and State of Minnesota.

Irvin S. Catlin, to be postmaster at Barnesville, in the county of Clay and State of Minnesota.

John Schmelz, to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Brown and State of Minnesota.

James M. Peckinpaugh, to be postmaster at Olivia, in the county of Renville and State of Minnesota.

John Kolb, to be postmaster at Melrose, in the county of Stearns and State of Minnesota.

William T. Ager, to be postmaster at Beaver City, in the county of Furnas and State of Nebraska.

Edward F. Joubert, to be postmaster at Wheaton, in the county of Traverse and State of Minnesota.

John P. Mattson, to be postmaster at Warren, in the county of Marshall and State of Minnesota.

Frank P. Corrick, to be postmaster at Cozad, in the county of Dawson and State of Nebraska.

Carl Kramer, to be postmaster at Columbus, in the county of Platte and State of Nebraska.

Dennis Tracy, to be postmaster at Cedar Rapids, in the county of Boone and State of Nebraska.

Cyrus E. Hunter, to be postmaster at Wakefield, in the county of Dixon and State of Nebraska.

Alfred L. Brande, to be postmaster at Pierce, in the county of Pierce and State of Nebraska.

William W. Hopkins, to be postmaster at Oakland, in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska.

James Lewis, to be postmaster at Canton, in the county of Lincoln and State of South Dakota.

Andrew S. Ellingson, to be postmaster at Northwood, in the county of Grand Forks and State of North Dakota.

Percy R. Trubshaw, to be postmaster at Cooperstown, in the county of Griggs and State of North Dakota.

Jacob W. Dudley, to be postmaster at East Radford, in the county of Montgomery and State of Virginia.

Charles H. Stilwell, to be postmaster at Tyndall, in the county of Bonhomme and State of South Dakota.

Walter McKay, to be postmaster at Lead, in the county of Lawrence and State of South Dakota.

Charles P. Smith, to be postmaster at Martinsville, in the county of Henry and State of Virginia.

Elisha G. Darden, to be postmaster at Hampton, in the county of Elizabeth City and State of Virginia.

John M. Griffin, to be postmaster at Fredericksburg, in the county of Spottsylvania and State of Virginia.

May Mosby Campbell, to be postmaster at Warrenton, in the county of Fauquier and State of Virginia.

Fred Read, to be postmaster at Newport News, in the county of Warwick and State of Virginia.

Herbert B. Woodfin, to be postmaster at National Soldiers' Home, in the county of Elizabeth City and State of Virginia.

Frank E. Parker, to be postmaster at Rhinelander, in the county of Oneida and State of Wisconsin.

William F. Bishop, to be postmaster at Peshtigo, in the county of Marinette and State of Wisconsin.

Fred B. Kinsley, to be postmaster at Barron, in the county of Barron and State of Wisconsin.

James A. Henderson, to be postmaster at Cherokee, in the county of Cherokee and State of Iowa.

Adolphus L. Elliott, to be postmaster at New Paynesville, in the county of Stearns and State of Minnesota.

Henry Curran, to be postmaster at Stevens Point, in the county of Portage and State of Wisconsin.

Clinton L. Zollinger, to be postmaster at Ogden, in the county of Boone and State of Iowa.

John Tooley, to be postmaster at New Hampton, in the county of Chickasaw and State of Iowa.

Phil A. Boland, to be postmaster at Le Mars, in the county of Plymouth and State of Iowa.

August F. Bergman, to be postmaster at Spirit Lake, in the county of Dickinson and State of Iowa.

James W. Wilson, to be postmaster at Sac City, in the county of Sac and State of Iowa.

James J. Elliott, to be postmaster at Onawa, in the county of Monona and State of Iowa.

Jabez A. Felt, to be postmaster at Hennessey, in the county of Kingfisher and Territory of Oklahoma.

William B. Ellsworth, to be postmaster at Eveleth, in the county of St. Louis and State of Minnesota.

James A. Button, to be postmaster at Flint, in the county of Genesee and State of Michigan.

Annie L. Dillard, to be postmaster at Auburn, in the county of Lee and State of Alabama.

Peter E. Olsen, to be postmaster at Rice Lake, in the county of Barron and State of Wisconsin.

Samuel M. Yost, to be postmaster at Staunton, in the county of Augusta and State of Virginia.

Robert D. Thomson, to be postmaster at North Platte, in the county of Lincoln and State of Nebraska.

Conrad Huber, to be postmaster at Bloomington, in the county of Franklin and State of Nebraska.

Fred C. McCall, to be postmaster at Nevada, in the county of Story and State of Iowa.

George S. Copeland, to be postmaster at Havelock, in the county of Lancaster and State of Nebraska.

Stanley C. Reaver, to be postmaster at Taneytown, in the county of Carroll and State of Maryland.

Asa Hepner, to be postmaster at Sykesville, in the county of Carroll and State of Maryland.

William V. Roberts, to be postmaster at Fort Collins, in the county of Larimer and State of Colorado.

George Reed, to be postmaster at Arlington, in the county of Kingsbury and State of South Dakota.

Sterling P. Glasgow, to be postmaster at South Auburn, in the county of Nemaha and State of Nebraska.

Samuel D. Henry, to be postmaster at Coon Rapids, in the county of Carroll and State of Iowa.

John B. Hungerford, to be postmaster at Carroll, in the county of Carroll and State of Iowa.

Daniel E. Cooper, to be postmaster at Lamar, in the county of Prowers and State of Colorado.

T. F. Armstrong, to be postmaster at Lenox, in the county of Taylor and State of Iowa.

William F. Atkinson, to be postmaster at Laurens, in the county of Pocahontas and State of Iowa.

F. W. Meyers, to be postmaster at Denison, in the county of Crawford and State of Iowa.

Julius O. Becraft, to be postmaster at Dowagiac, in the county of Cass and State of Michigan.

W. M. Sindlinger, to be postmaster at Waterloo, in the county of Black Hawk and State of Iowa.

A. O. Ingram, to be postmaster at Mount Ayr, in the county of Ringgold and State of Iowa.

Thomas Connors, to be postmaster at Negaunee, in the county of Marquette and State of Michigan.

Aaron W. Cooper, to be postmaster at Fowlerville, in the county of Livingston and State of Michigan.

Milo B. Halliwill, to be postmaster at Flushing, in the county of Genesee and State of Michigan.

W. H. Edgar, to be postmaster at Beatrice, in the county of Gage and State of Nebraska.

Fred A. Woodruff, to be postmaster at St. Joseph, in the county of Berrien and State of Michigan.

Edith G. Morrow, to be postmaster at West Point, in the county of Clay and State of Mississippi.

Kersey O. Holmes, to be postmaster at Kearney, in the county of Buffalo and State of Nebraska.

Charles N. Phillips, to be postmaster at Exeter, in the county of Fillmore and State of Nebraska.

William H. Ketcham, to be postmaster at Crawford, in the county of Dawes and State of Nebraska.

Charles Miner, to be postmaster at Ravenna, in the county of Buffalo and State of Nebraska.

James L. Stewart, to be postmaster at Randolph, in the county of Cedar and State of Nebraska.

Jehiel H. Secor, to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Madison and State of Nebraska.

Martin N. Chamberlin, to be postmaster at Oakes, in the county of Dickey and State of North Dakota.

William H. McNeal, to be postmaster at Wayne, in the county of Wayne and State of Nebraska.

Delbert E. Sherman, to be postmaster at Valentine, in the county of Cherry and State of Nebraska.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 20, 1902.

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

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Without objection, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BURKE of South Dakota, indefinitely, on account of illness.

MINORITY VIEWS OF COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands a request is to be made for extension of time for the minority of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to file their views.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] if he does not wish to ask for an extension of time to file the views of the minority on the bill to maintain the legal tender of the silver dollar at parity with gold? I understand that the minority wish to file their views, and if the gentleman from Colorado does not ask for the extension of time I will.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut, that the minority of the committee have an opportunity to file their views on the bill reported from the committee to maintain the legal tender of the silver dollar at parity with gold, and to increase the subsidiary silver coinage?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I will make the request for two days, as I understand that will be ample time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will file the views of the minority to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MEMORIAL SERVICES ON DEATH OF THE LATE PRESIDENT.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the programme of the services on the occasion of the memorial services on account of the death of the late President.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the programme for the memorial services on the late President. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The programme is as follows:

The Capitol will be closed on the morning of the 27th day of February, 1902, to all except members and officers of Congress.

At 10 o'clock the east door leading to the Rotunda will be opened to those to whom invitations have been extended under the joint resolution of Congress by the presiding officers of the two Houses, and to those holding tickets of admission to the galleries.

The Hall of the House of Representatives will be opened for the admission of Representatives and to those who have invitations, who will be conducted to the seats assigned to them, as follows:

The President and ex-President of the United States and special guests will be seated in front of the Speaker.

The Chief-Justice and associate justices of the Supreme Court will occupy seats next to the President and ex-President and special guests, on the right of the Speaker.

The Cabinet officers, the Lieutenant-General of the Army and the Admiral of the Navy, and the officers of the Army and Navy who, by name, have received the thanks of Congress, will occupy seats on the left of the Speaker.

The chief justices and judges of the Court of Claims and the chief justice and associate justices of the supreme court of the District of Columbia will occupy seats directly in the rear of the Supreme Court.

The diplomatic corps will occupy the front row of seats.

Ex-Vice-Presidents and Senators will occupy seats in the second, third, fourth, and fifth rows on east side of main aisle.

Representatives will occupy seats on west side of main aisle and in rear of the Senators on east side.

Commissioners of the District, governors of States and Territories, assistant heads of departments, and invited guests will occupy seats in rear of Representatives.

The Executive gallery will be reserved exclusively for the families of the Supreme Court, and the families of the Cabinet, and the invited guests of the President. Tickets thereto will be delivered to the secretary to the President.

The diplomatic gallery will be reserved exclusively for the families of the members of the diplomatic corps. Tickets thereto will be delivered to the Secretary of State.

The reporters' gallery will be reserved exclusively for the use of the reporters for the press. Tickets thereto will be delivered to the press committee.

The official reporters of the Senate and of the House will occupy the reporters' desk in front of the Clerk's table.

The House of Representatives will be called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock.

The Marine Band will be in attendance.

The Senate will assemble at 12 o'clock, and immediately after prayer will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The diplomatic corps will meet at half past 11 o'clock in Representatives' lobby, and be conducted by the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House to the seats assigned them.

The President of the Senate will occupy the Speaker's chair.

The Speaker of the House will occupy a seat at the left of the President of the Senate.

The Chaplains of the Senate and of the House will occupy seats next the presiding officers of their respective Houses.

The chairmen of the joint committee of arrangements will occupy seats at the right and left of the orator, and next to them will be seated the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House.

The other officers of the Senate and of the House will occupy seats on the floor, at the right and the left of the Speaker's platform.

Prayer will be offered by the Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The presiding officer will then present the orator of the day.

The benediction will be pronounced by the Rev. W. H. Milburn, Chaplain of the Senate.

By reason of the limited capacity of the galleries the number of tickets is necessarily restricted, and will be distributed as follows:

To each Senator, Representative, and Delegate, 2 tickets.

No person will be admitted to the Capitol except on presentation of a ticket, which will be good only for the place indicated.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate and the Doorkeeper of the House are charged with the execution of these arrangements.

J. B. FORAKER,
C. H. GROSVENOR,
Chairmen Joint Committee.

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. 1322. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hammond, in the State of Indiana—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 665. An act granting a pension to Kate Pearce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2128. An act granting a pension to Jane Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1622. An act granting an increase of pension to Theophilus Goodwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1621. An act granting an increase of pension to David Pollock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1805. An act granting a pension to Laura B. Wear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 692. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel T. Rose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 886. An act granting an increase of pension to Jonas M. McCoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 887. An act granting a pension to Sarah McCord—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 888. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 889. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Berger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 890. An act granting a pension to Catharine Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 891. An act granting a pension to Lucinda W. Cavender—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 143. An act granting a pension to Henriette Salomon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 18. An act for the relief of the legal representatives of Napoleon B. Giddings—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 19. An act for the relief of George A. Orr—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 1970. An act to provide an American register for the barkentine *Hawaii*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 20. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Carmack—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 21. An act for the relief of John S. Neet, jr.—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 22. An act for the relief of Ezra S. Havens—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 23. An act for the relief of Laura S. Gillingwaters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 24. An act for the relief of James W. Howell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 25. An act for the relief of Richard C. Silence—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 26. An act to correct the military record of Perry J. Knoles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 27. An act for the correction of the military record of James M. Crabtree—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 28. An act for the correction of the military record of John R. Leonard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 29. An act for the relief of M. E. Saville—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 31. An act for the relief of Charles Stierlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 33. An act to correct the military record of Ira J. Paxton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 32. An act to correct the military record of Albert S. Austin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 267. An act for continuing the establishment of additional light-house and fog-signal stations on the coast of the district of Alaska and appropriating funds therefor—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 938. An act making an appropriation for the construction of a light station at Cape Blanco, Oregon—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1141. An act to establish wind-signal stations at South Manitou Island, Lake Michigan—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1905. An act for the erection of a keeper's dwelling at Grosse Isle, North Channel Range, Detroit River, Michigan—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1906. An act for the erection of a keeper's dwelling at Grosse Isle, South Channel Range, Detroit River, Michigan—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 259. An act to establish a light-house and fog-signal station at Semiahmoo Harbor, Gulf of Georgia, Puget Sound, State of Washington—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 265. An act to establish a light-house and fog-signal station on Burrows Island, State of Washington—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 260. An act to establish a fog signal at Battery Point, State of Washington—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 646. An act for the purchase or construction of a launch for the customs service at and in the vicinity of Astoria, Oreg.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 946. An act to amend section 4400 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to a reciprocal recognition of boiler-inspection certificates between the several maritime nations having marine-inspection laws—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 937. An act making an appropriation for the construction of additional quarters for the accommodation of three keepers at Yaquina Head, Oregon, light station—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 193. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard W. Musgrove—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 199. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Eaton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1610. An act granting an increase of pension to Napoleon B. Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2131. An act granting a pension to Caroline N. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1892. An act to provide for the construction of a revenue cutter for service at the port of Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 89. An act to construct a road to the national cemetery at Dover, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 88. An act for the relief of parties for property taken from them by military forces of the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 2484. An act granting an increase of pension to Loren S. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1948. An act granting an increase of pension to Josefa T. Philip—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1094. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Gifford Dunbar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1464. An act to establish wind-signal stations at South Manitou Island, Lake Michigan—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1954. An act to authorize Capt. N. M. Brooks, superintendent of foreign mails, Post-Office Department, to accept a decoration tendered to him by the Emperor of Germany—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1959. An act granting permission to Capt. Stephen L'H. Slocum, United States Army, to accept a medal conferred upon him by the King of England—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1573. An act to authorize Commander James M. Miller, United States Navy; Surg. Oliver D. Norton, United States Navy, and Mr. Edwin V. Morgan, formerly secretary of the Samoan Commission and now secretary of the legation of the United States at Seoul, Korea, to accept presents tendered to them by His Majesty the Emperor of Germany—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1258. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of John Glass—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 452. An act for enlarging the public building at Dallas, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 946. An act to amend section 4400 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to a reciprocal recognition of boiler-inspection certificates between the several maritime nations having marine-inspection laws—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 325. An act for enlarging the public building at Portland, Oreg., situated between Morrison, Yamhill, Fifth, and Sixth streets in said city—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 1189. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at the city of Superior, in the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 301. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Huntington, in the State of West Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 188. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Nashua, in the State of New Hampshire—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

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 consideration of the urgent deficiency bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair, for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9315) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois will allow me, I would like to have some agreement with the gentleman in charge of the bill as to the time for general debate on this bill.

Mr. CANNON. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that ought to be done in the House; at the same time I am quite willing to have an understanding with the gentleman from Georgia about it. How much time does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am not prepared to say. I suppose it rests with the minority leader on the floor, Mr. RICHARDSON. I am perfectly willing to let it run along, and a little later on perhaps we can come to an understanding.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I think there will be no difficulty in reaching a conclusion. I suppose the gentleman from Illinois desires to occupy the floor, and at the conclusion of his remarks we can come to some agreement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to occupy the floor any considerable time upon this bill. This is a bill known as an "urgent deficiency bill," which is somewhat of a misnomer. While it cares for deficiencies in small amounts for former fiscal years, ascertained by the auditing of accounts, in the main it is in fact a bill for the service of the current fiscal year where the appropriations are not sufficient for the service; so that it is in fact a bill for the service of the current year, appropriations in the main not having been made.

The bill carries in the aggregate \$16,701,445.34. The principal items are: For collecting revenues from customs, \$1,850,000. Gentlemen are aware that there is a permanent appropriation for the collection of customs of five and one-half millions of dollars, to which is added, as I recollect, fines and forfeitures; but for many years past, with the growth of the customs service, we have had to supplement that permanent appropriation, and the amount necessary to meet it for the remainder of this fiscal year is \$1,850,000.

For collecting the internal revenue, \$225,000. This is for a service which the law calls for, and would be performed substantially whether this appropriation was made or not, and provision would have to be made for it in the future.

Payment of rebate on tobacco tax, \$3,150,000. That is an amount rendered necessary by the enactment of the law at the last session of Congress reducing taxation. A rebate was provided to the manufacturers and jobbers, or those having original packages, as I recollect it, of the tax. It has been ascertained, substantially, that it will require this amount of money, \$3,150,000, to pay it. Most of it has been absolutely ascertained, and the money is due. While ordinarily the general deficiency bill, which would be enacted in May or June, would carry this item it was thought best to insert it in this bill. The money is due these people under the law, and they ought to have it. The Treasury is amply able to pay it, and, so far as the legitimate expenditures of the Government are concerned, it seems to your committee proper that we had better get this three millions out of the Treasury in payment of obligations absolutely due rather than to care for the sinking fund with the purchase of bonds to this amount.

The Bureau of Engraving and Printing, \$601,000. There is a kindred item which I have not the memorandum of here, but which the bill carries for an increase of force in the office of the Treasurer of the United States and a small increase in the division of loans and currency, the force in these two places being now on duty and paid for from the general appropriations for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. It was thought best to catch them up in the appropriate bureaus and divisions. It is in fact not an increase in force. In the course of the investigation we found that in years to come, as long as we have the existing

legislation touching paper currency, there will be from one hundred and twenty to one hundred and fifty million notes, not in the aggregate, but that many notes, mostly of \$10 value and under, that will have to be printed, and that explains the increase in labor and material in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; and also explains the authorization of the additional division which is now in fact in service in the office of the Treasurer of the United States.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I understand that the deficiency is caused by this extra bureau taking the printing of the money from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Mr. CANNON. The deficiency is caused by the great increase of service in the printing of United States notes, silver certificates, and greenbacks, the denominations printed being in the main \$10 and under; and the increase is so extraordinary that more paper, more labor, and more cognate force of counters, etc., in the appropriate office, that of the United States Treasurer, are required to handle this great output.

Mr. PAYNE. That has grown out of the currency bill that we passed in the last Congress?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; it has grown out of the passage of the currency bill, which I think I may safely say members on both sides of the House are very glad to have passed.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that at the present time the national banks are having their circulation canceled just as fast as they can?

Mr. CANNON. I think not, although that matter in no way affects this item. This increase of appropriation for labor and material in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the incidental increase in the Treasurer's office is for the purpose of handling exclusively Treasury notes which are issued in exchange for silver dollars, as well as United States notes of small denominations, and gold certificates.

Mr. CLARK. Does this bill contemplate the permanent appointment of three extra counters?

Mr. CANNON. No; because these counters are already in the service, and have been for over twelve months past. This bill catches them up and appropriates for them under the Treasury Department, where they are performing their duty by detail, and it thus relieves the general appropriations for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Mr. CLARK. What I want to get at is this: The statement was given out by the Treasury authorities not long ago that the national banks are having their circulation canceled as fast as they can under the law; that applications were already on hand for the cancellation of \$3,000,000 in January and \$3,000,000 in February, and that by the end of the year the amount canceled would equal the extraordinary amount issued under the act of 1900. Now, if that is true, what is to prevent the necessity for additional counters?

Mr. HILL. Let us call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to the fact that the statement he has made has no bearing on the present case, because the national banks pay for the redemption of their bills and the issue of new bills.

Mr. CLARK. But if they quit issuing the bank notes, then there is no use for three additional counters.

Mr. CANNON. I think I understand the question of the gentleman from Missouri, and will answer the query. If he had honored me with his close attention heretofore, I think it would not have been necessary for him to ask the question.

Here is the condition. Under the currency law passed two years ago greenbacks and silver certificates substantially are printed in denominations of \$10 and under and gold certificates are printed according to demand—ordinarily large certificates. Now, under the operation of that law the number of notes has increased from, say, about 75,000,000 to 80,000,000, that it has been necessary to issue annually, until now there are over 125,000,000—I do not mean the amount of money in the aggregate, I mean that many separate notes—that have to be printed. For these the paper must be furnished and handled, and it is perfectly apparent from our investigation that from this time on there will be some 140,000,000 to 160,000,000 different notes issued annually.

The lifetime of a note, if time is allowed to season the paper so that it may get thoroughly dry, is about four years. For the handling of this great increase there has been no corresponding increase in the number of counters, etc., so that either the Department must fail to handle this currency or counters, etc., must be appointed in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and detailed as the law permits to the office of the Treasurer. This is all strictly formal and legal, and we found on investigation that it was to be permanent. And I have no doubt that for the next fiscal year and the next there will have to be a further increase of these counters to handle the silver certificates, the United States Treasury notes, the gold certificates. But this has no more to do with the bank-note circulation than a duck has to do with mathematical astronomy. [Laughter.]

Now, this appropriation picks up those people who are employed, in fact, and paid, as I have described, from the general appropriation, in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and puts them where they perform the service required, namely, under the Treasurer of the United States.

As to what retirement of national-bank notes there will be I do not know. I do know, however, that it would be impossible, in the time indicated, to retire anything near the amount the gentleman from Missouri has specified. But let that be as it may, all that is done at the expense of the national banks and does not affect at all this matter of appropriation which I have been explaining.

Now I will go on to the next item:

Military posts at Manila, \$500,000.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield a moment right there? My understanding is that the Committee on Military Affairs has entire jurisdiction of establishing military posts, and there is no law establishing any such posts at Manila. This bill provides for the establishment of a post there and appropriates accordingly. I do not know that I want to raise any point of order on this item; but I wish to call attention to the question as to whether a deficiency bill can appropriate for posts not established by law, and at the same time, in same section, establish a new post.

My understanding is that a bill of this character, coming from the Committee on Appropriations, carries on the work of the Government provided for by law where Congress has not made ample provision in the regular or in the ordinary way for such service. And while in this case I recognize the necessity, as the gentleman has suggested, for the appropriation, it should have been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration and the establishment of a post before an appropriation could be made for it. That is the point I have been seeking to make.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, certainly; and my friend from Iowa, ordinarily so correct, if he had thought for a moment, would have discovered that he had found only a mare's-nest in this suggestion. Under the rules of the House the general deficiency bill is committed to the Committee on Appropriations for consideration and action. The general deficiency bill is a bill to care for the service for the current fiscal year where the regular annual appropriation bills fail to do so in full. So this bill, to the extent of \$16,000,000, sweeps all over the public service and makes up the shortages resulting from a nonappropriation or an insufficient appropriation in the regular bills, and meets for the current fiscal year all of the demands of the public service that are unprovided for between now and the 30th day of next June.

Mr. HULL. I do not think my friend from Illinois meets the point that I have suggested, exactly.

Mr. CANNON. I think I did. But in what way have I failed to do so?

Mr. HULL. My friend has not answered my question. My point is that on the establishment of a military post at Manila that question would naturally and necessarily come before the Committee on Military Affairs, be considered as a separate measure, and an appropriation would not be in order on the military appropriation bill, and until the Congress of the United States had first passed on the question whether it would establish a post at that point or not there can be no deficiency. If the Committee on Appropriations can establish a military post at Manila on a deficiency bill, or upon any other bill, they can establish it in any other part of the United States by the same means, and my point is that on the establishment of that post the legislation so providing ought to be first considered by the House and the Senate, and appropriation bills, as a matter of course, in the legitimate line of expenditure, would follow the action taken by the two bodies of Congress in that regard.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, Mr. Chairman, it is quite competent for the gentleman, if he desires to do so, to invoke the rule and make a point of order on this provision when we reach it under the five-minute rule.

Mr. HULL. I was only calling the gentleman's attention to the matter, and hoped he would be able to explain it so that a point of order would be unnecessary.

Mr. CANNON (continuing). And I shall have no possible objection, in the event that the point of order is made, and after being heard a short time I shall be ready to submit the matter to the Chair for a ruling. I have no anxiety about the matter one way or the other, except as the public service should be properly cared for.

This bill—with reference to the question that the gentleman has suggested, if the point of order is made—stands upon the same authority as the regular Army appropriation bill would stand, because it is a general deficiency bill, covering the whole line of the public service for the balance of the fiscal year. It is an Army bill, a Navy bill, a sundry civil bill, a deficiency bill, a legislative bill, a diplomatic bill, and runs through all of the

public service, bounded only by the needs of that service, from this date until the 30th day of June.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question, with his consent.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I did not hear the colloquy between the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope we will have order upon the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will be seated and public business will be suspended until order is restored.

Mr. CANNON. Now if the gentleman from Tennessee desires to ask a question, I shall yield to him with pleasure.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The report accompanying this bill is quite brief, although the bill carries a very large sum—an unusually large sum for a deficiency bill. On page 17 this provision for the establishment of a military post at Manila, \$500,000, is found. Is that in any sense of the word a deficiency, I would ask the gentleman?

Mr. CANNON. It is in every sense of the word a deficiency.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Is there any law providing for the post, making an appropriation for its establishment, heretofore passed by Congress?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, Mr. Chairman, that matter we will discuss under the five-minute rule if the gentleman from Tennessee sees proper to submit the point of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. But, Mr. Chairman, it is not, I think, inappropriate to discuss the question in general debate. That was my purpose in rising.

I ask the gentleman, therefore, is there a law establishing a military post at Manila for which an insufficient appropriation has been made?

Mr. CANNON. Is there any law? I will say to my friend that the military post in the city of Manila, which now accommodates nineteen hundred people in the Spanish posts and the private residences, is already in existence to that extent. And now I will play Yankee for a little while myself. [Laughter.] I will ask the gentleman if there is any law that would prohibit the maintenance of the post after it has been established there?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That is not the proposition. This is something new in the bill. Now, I ask if there is any law authorizing you to put this appropriation in the bill? It is called a "deficiency" here. Where is the original law?

Mr. CANNON. Well, that is a matter for the consideration of the House, if the gentleman chooses to invoke the point of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. But I want information from the gentleman from Illinois which may make it unnecessary to invoke the point of order. I ask the gentleman to state whether there is such a law or not.

Mr. CANNON. I say there is an Army of the United States. The Army is in service in the Philippine Islands. In the garrison at Manila are nineteen hundred soldiers, who are housed partially in the old Spanish barracks, partially, perhaps, in captured buildings, partially in rented buildings. The Army is there now under the law. It is necessary to clothe them and to subsist them, to house them, in some instances in temporary barracks, and they are using these buildings as permanent barracks. Now, in the operations of the Army, for the purpose of efficient operations, it is necessary, in the opinion of the President and of the War Department, to construct barracks about 6 miles out from Manila that will cost \$500,000. If there be any law under which this appropriation would be apt in any bill without legislation, it is the law that organizes the Army, that has placed it in the Philippines, and makes its necessary operations important to the public service.

Now, having disposed of the peddles—the technical points—I will go on and in a word speak of this matter upon its merits.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Now, will the gentleman pardon me? If I understand him, this provision is intended to make a permanent military post 6 miles from the city of Manila.

Mr. CANNON. In round numbers, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. And there now is no law and there never has been any law on our statute books establishing and locating an army post at that point.

Mr. CANNON. And there never has been any law upon our statute books establishing and locating a temporary post, and yet they exist by the score all over the islands.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Now, I will ask the gentleman if he does not know that this proposition is utterly obnoxious to the rule of the House which provides that there shall not be new legislation on a general appropriation bill?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman thinks so, he has his right, as every other member of the Committee of the Whole has, when the item is reached under the five-minute rule, to make the point of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I want the information.

Mr. CANNON. I could not prevent him if I would, and I would not if I could, provided he thought it his duty to do so.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman understands his duty far better than I do and I will not undertake to lecture him, because he has more experience and more ability in these matters than I have—

Mr. CANNON. Thank you.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. But as I understand it, it is the duty of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, having charge of these great bills carrying all these enormous sums of money, to give the House the information when we ask for it. The gentleman knows whether there is any law. All of us can not know that without a good deal of investigation. He knows at once. Yea or nay will answer the question which I have propounded, and it is an appropriate question to ask in debate; because I may not be here during the debate under the five-minute rule if there is law for this appropriation; while I would try to be here, possibly, if there is no law for it. Now, will the gentleman tell us, yea or nay, is there any law authorizing this army post?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman, and I do it courteously, recognizing his right, or the right of the gentleman from Tennessee, or the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], or of any other gentleman from any other State, to arise and courteously ask any possible question that will shed light upon this bill; and I think I never have failed, and do not believe I ever will fail to reply courteously to questions wherever they come from, or to candidly answer them. I think I have answered the gentleman's question, but I will answer it again. If the gentleman asks me if there has been enacted anywhere a law which reads, "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives, and so forth, that there be, and is hereby, established, 6 miles from the city of Manila in the Philippine Islands, a permanent Army post, and the limit of cost thereof shall be \$500,000," with or without an appropriation, I will say to him that I am not aware that any such act has ever been passed.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Now, then—

Mr. CANNON. Let me finish.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. All right.

Mr. CANNON. Now, as to whether, under the general organization of the Army in the field and in the service, this appropriation is in order without specific prior legislation authorizing it, that is a matter depending upon the decision of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, when he is invited to make his decision upon a point of order, and when reached it will be for him to pass upon. Now I have said all I care to say about that, and will await the five-minute rule to develop anything further.

Now, having answered the gentleman's question courteously and fully, I will speak of the necessity for this appropriation.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Before the gentleman does that will he allow me one further question?

Mr. CANNON. With pleasure.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman now having conceded that there is no law authorizing this appropriation—

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman must not put words in my mouth and undertake to commit me by my failing to respond.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. If the gentleman says there is a law, I will not say it. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. Go on.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will take it back if the gentleman says there is a law.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well; while the courts of the county of Vermilion thirty years ago did certify that I did practice law there [laughter], it has been almost thirty years since I attempted to practice law; and before I came to Congress and since I have been here I have grown to be a little doubtful of the legal learning of a gentleman that gets up and says "there is a law," or "there is no law," because sometimes I have found that wise men are mistaken on each side.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I am not going to press that question any further.

Mr. CANNON. Whether this appropriation is authorized under the rules of the House is a question for the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to pass on, subject to appeal when the point of order is made, and not for me to decide.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Well, I do not intend to press that question any further; it seems to be growing rather unpleasant to my friend from Illinois, and I am not inclined to put him in that category. But is there any other provision in this bill, carrying over 16,000,000, that is new legislation?

Mr. CANNON. I think so—one or two.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I think—if I may be pardoned for interrupting the gentleman further—that we ought to have our attention called in reports to new legislation. It is almost impossible when a bill is reported here one day and considered the next for members to inform themselves as to what is new

legislation and what is not new legislation. I know the gentleman is able, and do not mean to reflect upon him in any way; but we are entitled to have our attention called to what is new legislation.

Mr. CANNON. I said I thought there was. I have referred in the meantime an inquiry to one not a member of this House, in whose recollection I have great confidence, and I am inclined to think, after that inquiry, there is no provision carrying legislation upon the bill. Nobody can state that as an absolute truth, because possibly there may be some appropriation here or there not authorized by existing law; but to the best of my knowledge and belief, after having refreshed my recollection by the opinion of an expert, I am inclined to think there is not; and it is the practice of the Committee on Appropriations in its reports to call attention when changes in existing law are made by appropriations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have order.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please be in order.

Mr. CANNON. Gentlemen, I am quite sure, will bear with me, when they recollect the size of this Hall, that a little conversation about us makes it impossible for a member who is talking to even hear himself. Now, I will say further to the gentleman—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Before the gentleman goes any further, will he permit another question? I have not had time to examine as carefully as I would like, but how much of the \$1,376,831.08 for the War Department is for expenditures in the Philippine Archipelago?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will refer to the bill he will see that that is the only item that goes directly to the Philippines.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as a further proof that it is impossible for anybody to determine just how much express legislation there is upon many of these points, I think it entirely proper under the treaty with Spain, by which we acquired the Philippines, even if there was no other legislation, there is upon the United States certain duties toward the people of the Philippine Islands in the performance of which the use of the Army is temporarily necessary; and if so, all other things, including the establishment of a permanent post at Manila, would go as incidents. Now, then, I will refer to the necessity for this post upon its merits.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman permit an interruption for a moment?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand the gentleman to say that it will be necessary to have an Army post on account of our temporary military occupation of the Philippines.

Mr. CANNON. No; I did not say that. If so, I want to correct myself.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, the gentleman had a lapsus lingua.

Mr. CANNON. On account of our present occupation, temporarily active and absolutely indispensable, and even if permanent occupation, with a small force, precisely as we have it in New Mexico, in Kansas, on the Sound, in New York, and in Illinois.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The question which I wanted to ask the gentleman is this—it is twofold in its nature: Is it usual, in providing for an Army post, to use the language used in this bill in this connection—a permanent Army post?

Mr. CANNON. I think so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman think it wise at present to attempt to forejudge a great question that is pending before the American people by using that language?

Mr. CANNON. I think, under existing laws and obligations, from every standpoint it is wise to have a permanent Army post at Manila; just as wise and necessary as it is to have a permanent post in Illinois or in New York.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. One more question. Does not the gentleman think he could answer his purpose as well by just making an appropriation for an Army post at Manila, without either using the word "permanent" or "temporary," and not attempt to forejudge that question? If you could get that you would accomplish your purpose and disarm a great deal of the hostility to the appropriation, and get just what you wanted; you would get the Army post.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is quite competent to make a motion to strike out the word "permanent" when we come to the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule. I will say to him, however, that I assumed that the word "permanent" was in because my friend challenged it; but I am informed, and I see on looking at the bill, that the word "permanent" is not in it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In that connection I wish to say that I had not read the bill myself. I was told by a gentleman that it was in there, and I gathered from the language of the gentleman from Illinois that it was in, and for that reason I asked the question.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I am willing to shoulder up the word "permanent" as if it were there. In my judgment, if this ap-

propriation is made there will be, longer than I live or any man lives that listens to me, and ought to be, an Army post at Manila.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Illinois pardon me for another interrogatory?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Do I understand the gentleman from Illinois to urge now that there is the same necessity, or a like necessity, existing for the establishment of this Army post at Manila as there is for an Army post in the other Territories that he has mentioned?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; and more.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Did the gentleman ever know, in his long and able experience as a member of this House, of an Army post being established on an urgent deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. CANNON. I don't know that I ever did. They may or they may not have been so established, but what does that signify?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Your rule says that you shall not do it.

Mr. CANNON. The law says, in my judgment, that we shall do it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The law says that you shall not put it on an appropriation bill, and I can produce that law.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Tennessee is seeking to take my time—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Not at all. I will give you my hour.

Mr. CANNON (continuing). And to play upon words. But I want to say to the gentleman that if there were no other law—and I believe there is other law, which I will put it in later—I say that the treaty places upon us an obligation to protect life and property in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. CUMMINGS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Is it not now within the power of the general commanding in the Philippine Islands to establish a post there as a military necessity, if required?

Mr. CANNON. In my opinion it is not only in his power, but it is his duty to do everything that he can to properly forward the Army operations from every standpoint in the Philippine Islands, and I have in effect said that.

Now, having given almost half an hour's time to the buffeting of this little technical ball that was first kicked by the gentleman, chairman of Military Affairs, and then kicked by the leader of the minority, and then kicked by the gentleman, able as he is, from Mississippi, and having been switched off and given this thirty minutes' time to the pedoddes of the situation—whether you shall do it after you wash your hands or before you wash your hands; whether it should be blessed and baptized by immersion or sprinkling—having gone through that variety of discussion, I will get down to the merits and speak of the necessity for this appropriation. [Laughter.] Manila is the principal city in the Philippine Islands. Mr. Chairman, I will take my seat until gentlemen have brought their conversation to a close.

The CHAIRMAN. The point is well taken. The committee will please be in order, and those gentlemen wishing to converse will please retire to the cloakroom.

Mr. CANNON. The Army is in the Philippines, the United States is there, the flag is there. The treaty sends it there, and the law sends it there. We will stay there, in my judgment, for ever and a day.

But let this be as it may, while we do stay there we have got to so appropriate and administer the law so as to perform the functions of the Government of the United States.

Now, what is the fact? Nineteen hundred soldiers are quartered in the city of Manila, in captured barracks, in private houses, in abandoned public barracks, mixed all up with the civil population. This is not a good thing for the soldiers; it is not a good thing for the inhabitants; it is not a good thing for soldiers and inhabitants in the United States from the standpoint of discipline and every other consideration. Therefore in New York our soldiers are isolated. The case is the same in Illinois, and in every Army post in this country. Some years ago we abandoned the Army post in the city of Omaha and placed our troops at Fort Cook, 8 or 10 or 12 miles away.

Now, with these insufficient quarters in the city of Manila, being compelled to have that as a center of operation, the time has come to establish an Army post for the purpose of housing soldiers from time to time, as they are concentrated at that point. That is the whole story. It was believed by your committee that the expense ought to be borne by the Treasury of the United States and not from the insular revenues. One reason is that while these insular revenues are much larger than we expected and larger than they ever have been—I mean the revenues going into the insular treasury—yet there is so much to do there that ought to be done—

improvements of rivers and harbors, building of roads, building of schoolhouses, and carrying on the system of education, and a hundred other things—that we did not believe that at this time the insular revenues ought to be further weakened by the expense of constructing this Army post. Outside of that we believed that the United States should construct this post, which is to be a permanent post, from its own Treasury, and should have the title thereto in the same way as it has constructed the post in Illinois and every other Army post in the United States. Now, I will drop that matter right there.

We provide for a new Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn. We put a limitation where none now exists. After inquiry, we find that the post can be completed for \$1,150,000. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars has already been appropriated. We put a limit upon the cost, and we appropriate \$350,000. We have tried to contract for complete construction. After inquiry and consultation with at least a portion of the Tennessee delegation, we found that this provision was satisfactory to them and also meets the approval of the National Board of Managers.

Now I come to the next item:

Armor and armament for new naval vessels, \$4,000,000.

A great sum; and the whole story is told in three or four words—increase of the Navy heretofore authorized. The immediate matter that makes this great sum necessary is the fact that under the contract for armor plate, made in pursuance of the law which was passed almost a year ago, the armor plate is being more rapidly delivered than the Department supposed it could be, greatly to the gratification of the Department and greatly expediting the construction of our large battle ships.

Now, I come to another item:

Postal service, \$2,454,000.

This consists in part of deficiencies where the law calls for the service—inland transportation—railway transportation. The most important item in it, however—the most interesting, perhaps, to members of Congress—is \$220,000 for rural-delivery service. The amount appropriated for the current year was \$3,500,000—quite sufficient—as much as the Post-Office Department desired. During the last session of Congress many gentlemen were apprehensive that this appropriation would not be sufficient. But the postal agents and inspectors have become efficient and are doing more rapid work than they formerly did. Between this time and the 1st day of June next there will be 1,800 additional routes to be provided for. If we make this appropriation, they will be established in February, March, April, and May. If we do not make this appropriation of \$220,000, they will be established, a few in April, the remainder in May and on the 1st of June. That is all there is of this matter. It is a mere difference in the time of establishing the routes. We thought that as fast as they were ready the service ought to go on.

Mr. LACEY. Allow me a single suggestion. It seems to be necessary that there should be some increase in the compensation of the carriers in the rural-delivery service, whose yearly allowance now is only \$500. The expenses of their teams and their support has been very greatly increased. Has that question been considered in making up this deficiency?

Mr. CANNON. No; this deficiency does not cover that matter at all, because that would require legislation; and it was believed that if such legislation was to be had it should come from the appropriate committee—the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads. But I will say to my friend that I think it entirely likely that there ought to be some increase made in the compensation of rural-delivery carriers; but neither he nor I need lie awake at nights agonizing about this question.

This service has legs enough and is going to have carriers enough scattered all over the country to insure all necessary increases. That question does not bother me. What I am somewhat bothered about is the apprehension that they may reinforce the great army of employees elsewhere in the post-office service and possibly in the not distant future may require some increases which, from the standpoint of economy and perhaps efficient service, are not strictly necessary.

Mr. LACEY. The gentleman is no doubt aware that there are now constant resignations in this force on account of the inability of the carriers to live upon their salaries?

Mr. CANNON. Well, there is a constant reinforcement of the force. I will say to my friend, however, I am of the opinion that some small increase ought to be granted, but I will say further that \$500 or \$600, if that is the salary—

A MEMBER. Five hundred dollars.

Mr. BINGHAM. The amount of the salary is fixed by the Department. The appropriation is a lump sum.

Mr. CANNON. Five hundred dollars, while it is not a great sum, is more than the average man all over the United States earns by his labor and the use of his team.

I do not make these remarks for the purpose of opposing an in-

crease. When that question comes before the House in a proper way I shall advocate an increase.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman will allow me to suggest that these carriers get \$500 a year, and they furnish their own team—their own buggy or wagon, and their own horses—and they kill one horse every twelve months and are obliged to rebuy; they pay their own boarding and other expenses, and, as I know, at the end of the year, they have very little of the \$500 left.

Mr. LAMB. In my district each of these carriers, as a rule, has to furnish two horses, and the allowance of \$500 is altogether inadequate.

Mr. CANNON. I want to call the attention of my friend from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] to this fact: There are enough rural-delivery carriers scattered through the Democratic portions of the country and the Republican portions of the country and the Populist portions of the country, if there are any such portions [laughter]—there are enough of them to take care of themselves, as they touch various Representatives, and there is no danger that a due increase will not be made, and there is no danger that enough of us will not be instant, in season and possibly out of season, to convince them that their interests are being looked after.

Mr. LACEY. But I call my friend's attention to the fact that these letter carriers have not organized.

Mr. LOUD. Oh, yes; they have.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend from Iowa that it is not necessary for them to have been organized. They are scattered all over the country in the districts of every member, and that is itself a sufficient organization to bring the matter to the attention of their Representative and force action upon it by the pressure brought to bear upon members.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would like to interrupt the gentleman for just a moment at this point.

The Post-Office appropriation bill gave the full amount asked for and estimated for by the Department for the rural free-delivery service. I have full faith and confidence in the judgment of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and have no doubt that the increase in this paragraph, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, in the appropriation bill now being considered, was fully considered in his committee. But I simply desire to emphasize to the House this proposition—that when a department, after a full and thorough investigation, submits to Congress its estimate for the expenditure of that department, and Congress gives the full amount asked for, that then to come in six months afterwards and ask for an additional appropriation of \$200,000 or \$220,000 for that service in the way of a deficiency—although a total sum of some three and one-half million dollars was appropriated to that service—should be condemned not only in a deficiency bill but by the Committee on Appropriations.

If the Department does not see proper to live within the limits of the appropriation made by Congress, it must be because there is an emergency that has arisen or some exceptional condition in the administration of the Department which justifies the coming before Congress again for an additional appropriation of \$220,000 in the form of a deficiency.

Now, I am in perfect sympathy with the legislation covering rural free delivery; but I think the Department ought to operate within the appropriation when the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads gives all that has been estimated for or asked for by the Department.

Mr. CANNON. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, in answer to my colleague and friend on the committee, that two or three years ago—touching the general free-delivery service—the thing was done of which the gentleman speaks without ever calling the attention of Congress to it. The appropriation was so nearly exhausted by increases in the service in the great cities, and even in the smaller cities, that we were brought face to face with the fact that unless we appropriated for that service the free-delivery service in the cities would substantially cease on the 1st day of June.

Well, we gave the additional appropriation asked for by the Department. There was much of criticism, and undoubtedly just criticism, at that time because of the action then taken, and I wish to say to my friend from Pennsylvania that he misapprehends, I think, the situation here in the suggestion he has made. There is no deficiency in the true sense of the word. There is no necessity for any deficiency.

The Post-Office Department has frankly told us that its force of special agents and inspectors has now become practically more efficient day by day, and that between this and the 1st day of next June they will establish sufficient routes, so that if the service is put on them in February, March, April, May, and June, after it is ready to put it on, will require the whole of the appropriation. They tell us that it will cost \$220,000 more than the sum

already appropriated. They tell us that these routes are ready for the service. And they tell us that if, in the sense of Congress, this service, instead of being put on in February, March, and April, can be postponed to April, May, and June, then this \$220,000 is not needed. That is a perfectly plain proposition, and the service will not be crippled anywhere where it now exists. That is the simple proposition with which we have to deal.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois have such additional time as he may desire to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. The only question is whether on these new routes which have been established the service shall go into operation two or three months earlier or later.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The service is needed and wanted by the people.

Mr. CANNON. Now, your committee were of opinion that the service should be begun as early as possible, and therefore we report this deficiency.

Mr. CANDLER. That was the point I wanted to ask about.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER. Unless this appropriation is made I understand that the service would be stopped at its present limit and there would be no additional routes established.

Mr. CANNON. That is not quite correct. There would be some service established the 1st of February, some the 1st of March, and some in April and May; but on substantially 1,800 routes that the service has never gone on it would go two or three months earlier if we make this appropriation than it would if we do not.

Mr. CANDLER. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, we put on this bill a large amount for printing and binding—\$660,000. We are constantly increasing this work. That explains this appropriation in part. We increased the salaries of employees in the Public Printing Office by legislation last year. That explains it in part. There is some slight increase—not large, possibly—in materials; but the two principal items are the increase of salaries and increase of work. As long as we order additional printing, session by session, of course it will require additional money. This bill also carries all judgments of the Court of Claims—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Before the gentleman leaves the subject of the public printing, I wish to say that it strikes me, if the gentleman will pardon me, that this \$660,000 is an enormous deficit and that if the Committee on Appropriations can guess halfway right they ought to guess nearer the amount necessary for an annual appropriation than that. Here is a deficiency for the balance of this fiscal year of \$660,000. Now, the small amount of increase in salaries which the gentleman refers to does not account for one-tenth of this \$660,000, if I remember it correctly. It seems to me that the committee in making the appropriation for public printing could guess nearer to the accurate amount than \$660,000 out of the way, or two-thirds of a million dollars less than the amount called for, when the total amount appropriated, I presume, is something like \$4,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. The appropriations for 1901 were \$4,448,800; appropriations for 1902, deficiency and all—there was a deficiency appropriation last year of \$500,000—were \$4,658,000, or over \$100,000 more than the regular and deficiency appropriation for 1901. Now they come with the estimate of \$660,000. I ask the gentleman to listen:

OFFICE OF PUBLIC PRINTER.

SIR: I have the honor, in compliance with your request, to submit the following statement concerning the increase in the expenditures in this office, as follows:

	Per cent.
Increase in expenditure for wages, including leave of absence of employees, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, over the fiscal year 1900	7
Increase of amount ordered during the fiscal year over the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, about	15
Increase of employees to December 31, 1901, over same date, 1900	7

The increase in employees is 7 per cent, the increase in wages is 7 per cent, the increase in amount of material is 15 per cent. There you have it. In view of the legislation of Congress making these increases, and in view of the acts of Congress ordering additional public printing, it was just as necessary to have this increased appropriation as it is necessary for an apple to fall toward the center of the earth when it is loosed from the hand that has held it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If my colleague will permit me, I will suggest that one of these items of legislation is \$300,000 for leave of absence of the employees of that Public Printing Bureau.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. For what?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. For leave of absence.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Oh, no.

Mr. CANNON. I think the gentleman has the amount a little too large.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is in the neighborhood of that.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman will understand that I am not assailing the integrity of the amount appropriated; but what I object to is that now, at the close of this fiscal year, he comes and asks for a deficiency for printing of \$660,000, when the required amount should have been carried in the regular appropriation bill. And I even assert—I may be a little rash about it—that the Committee on Appropriations knew when they made the annual appropriation that a large deficiency would be necessary. I submit in the interest of legislation that this amount ought to be carried in a general appropriation bill. There is no other way for the Congress and the country to know what amount we are appropriating. Now, if you had put that additional sum in the appropriation bill for last year, it would have increased it nearly a million dollars, as you can see. Now they come here asking for a deficiency for a sum which should have been included in the general bill in the interest of good legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I again state to the gentleman that we appropriated in the sundry civil law, passed last March, for the service of the fiscal year, an amount equal to what the Printing Office cost the prior year and \$100,000 more, giving every dollar of the estimates and meeting this service as nearly as could be calculated. The gentleman has been for years upon the Joint Committee on Printing, and this appropriation was so full and satisfactory to his vigilant mind that he did not even submit a suggestion of increase last session of Congress, and where we fell short was in not properly being able to calculate the effect of the legislation of last Congress in increasing the wages and the effect of increasing the amount of printing ordered by Congress.

Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the gentleman's attention to page 47 of the bill, directly bearing on this point—and it may not be necessary to refer to it—that the law as it now exists gives to employees in the Executive Departments in Washington thirty days' vacation leave, and, in addition to that, they have thirty days' sick leave. Here is an appropriation of \$60,000 to pay for the vacation of employees, and the point I desire to ask is, Does this \$60,000 cover any portion of the sick leave that is now given to these employees?

Mr. CANNON. Now I will answer that question. The expense of paying leaves of absence to employees in the Government Printing Office, under the law giving them thirty days' leave of absence with full pay, is, in round numbers, \$300,000 a year. Now, my friend asks whether any allowance is made for sick leave in addition. I understand not.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. No; there is no allowance for sick leave in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. CANNON. And the gentleman wants to know why not put these employees on the same footing as the employees are in the other departments, if I understand him. I will answer that question by saying that I do not believe additional leave for Government employees should be allowed, and the only legislation that ought to be had is to give thirty days' leave of absence with full pay and amend the law taking away the sick leave from employees who now have it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I know the gentleman has no desire to do me injustice; but last Congress I introduced a bill in hoc verba with the language of the gentleman, and I have a bill which I introduced this Congress granting thirty days' leave to Government employees, but no sick leave to employees.

Mr. CANNON. Well, then, I congratulate myself that our minds are made up on that proposition, and I am quite sure the gentleman will be so forceful in this matter that when I hold up my hands and cry "Hurrah!" he will be enabled to cooperate, with other gentlemen, in breaking up this matter of extended leaves.

Mr. MUDD. Will the gentleman vote for a bill giving thirty days' leave of absence to all employees of the Government, laborers as well as clerks, including sick leave?

Mr. CANNON. I will not vote to pay it at the expense of labor in private employment, which is 90, yes, 98, yes, 99 per cent of the labor of this country, and which receives one-third less than the laborer and the clerical service in the employment of the Government. I will not vote to further burden that labor for further extension of sick leave or any other leave with pay. [Loud applause.] I will vote to cut off leave with pay to Government employees provided for by law and let them have one-third more on the average when they work for the Government than their brethren, ninety-nine out of one hundred, receive when they work for private employers and through the sweat of their faces contribute by taxation to pay all the bills.

Mr. MUDD. I only wanted to know the gentleman's position.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the

gentleman's attention to a provision of the bill, on page 43, establishing a bureau of insular affairs in the Attorney-General's Office.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understand, there is no legislation on the subject of the establishment of an insular bureau.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will just turn to the provision, the gentleman will see that it does not establish the bureau.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, it provides for the employment of clerks and other officers for the conducting of such work in the Department. "For defraying the necessary expenses incurred in the conduct of insular and other Territorial matters and affairs within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice." I want to know if that does not provide for the employment of additional men in the Department of Justice that are not now provided for by law?

Mr. CANNON. I will read the rest of it: "Including the payment of the necessary employees at the seat of government or elsewhere, to be selected and their compensation fixed by the Attorney-General, and to be expended under his direction, \$12,500."

It is an appropriation made to be expended under existing law by the Attorney-General, and believed on investigation to be absolutely necessary to enable the Department of Justice to perform its functions under the law, and in order, the same as it is in order to increase the clerks or other employees in the various departments.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Illinois will pardon me. I am not speaking as to the necessity of this appropriation. It probably is necessary, but the gentleman has not answered my question. I desire information of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Does not this provision require and authorize the Attorney-General of the United States to employ men and fix their compensation that are not now provided for by the law of the land.

Mr. CANNON. I think not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. These men appointed to these places will be under the civil-service provision of the law, as the general civil-service laws apply to the Department of Justice?

Mr. CANNON. I have not thought of it in that connection. I am unable to answer the gentleman's question, because, while I can guess rudely, sometimes accurately, and frequently inaccurately as to what the statutory law provides for, infinite wisdom, I sometimes think, could only tell what is proper under the administration of the civil-service law. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that I desire information on that proposition, and the gentleman has means of obtaining that information that I have not—

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (continuing). And when the provision is reached under the five-minute rule I desire to ask him the question again.

Mr. CANNON. If I can ascertain anything further about it, I will be glad to do so. We found the appropriation of \$12,500 asked for on account of the performance of these new duties, and, in the language we have used, we thought it was right and proper that the appropriation should be made, the same as it is made for other services in the Department of Justice.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that what I contend for is this: I do not doubt for a minute that this appropriation is very proper and very necessary, but as the question came up here on the floor of the House the other day, and as the gentleman from Illinois very ably took his position on the matter in the establishment of the new Census Bureau—that we should have perfected legislation in reference to the employment and establishment of these bureaus in order that Congress and the country might know in the future what employees we had on the statute books, and who we were employing, and not leave it to the general determination of an officer of the Government to change as the shifting sands of the sea from year to year, so that we nor the country could never know where to put our finger on the men who were in the service of the Government. Now, the gentleman from Illinois took a similar position in regard to the great power of the Government. I believe from the information we get that it is necessary, but I believe that when it is necessary to establish or provide for new employees in the Government we ought to know how many are required, in what position they are going to be placed, and what is going to be done with them. I think this House and the country are now entitled to that information.

Mr. CANNON. I will state in reply to the gentleman that this is an appropriation in the opinion of the committee necessary to make precisely as the appropriation is made for Indian depredation services—some of it temporary, some of it permanent, some going to one position and some to another in the Indian Service. The provision has always been general, giving to the Department

of Justice established by law the discretion. Again, it is like the appropriation made for defense of suits general in its terms, and the Department being established for this class of service necessarily requiring a little bit of discretion according to the demands of the insular service.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can readily see where from time to time it would be necessary to put on one clerk and take off another. As I understand it, the bureau of insular affairs is to be organized to look after legislation in the work of the Department of Justice in reference to the new insular possessions. I imagine from what I hear that they are as likely to remain a part of this Government as any other officers we have, and if that is the case that bureau of the Department of Justice is likely to become as permanent as any other department of the Government. And if that is so, I can see no more reason why that should not be definitely fixed by law than the employment of any other persons in the Department of Justice.

Mr. CANNON. I will state to my friend that it is quite within his province, when this item is reached, to move to strike it out, or to increase it, or to reduce it. Our committee, upon inquiry of the Department of Justice, found that that Department was already answering, so far as it had the power, all questions that were referred to it or should go to the Department of Justice, including questions touching our newly acquired territories. The Attorney-General said: "I am absolutely swamped for want of sufficient force to enable me to do my duty toward a growing country in connection with which these new questions are arising." And we thought it best to comply with his request and recommend to the House this small appropriation. If it does not meet the judgment of the House, I shall be quite content.

Mr. MANN. Is it not a fact that this appropriation contemplates the employment of attorneys—men learned in the law?

Mr. CANNON. I think so.

Mr. MANN. And such employees of the Department are not covered by the civil-service regulations.

Mr. CANNON. I can not answer that question; I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Assistant Attorneys-General—lawyers employed by the Department of Justice—are not employed under certification by the Civil Service Commission in any case, as I understand.

Mr. CANNON. I think the four Assistant Attorneys-General nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate are not so appointed. I am not sure as to the others.

Mr. MANN. I think that in no case, under the Department of Justice or elsewhere in the Government, is an attorney employed by the Government subjected to a civil-service examination.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman may be correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I find in lines 19 and 20, page 2, these words:

To enable the President to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the diplomatic and consular service, etc., \$40,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Will the gentleman from Illinois inform the House what is the specific object of that appropriation?

Mr. CANNON. I will state to the House all I know about it. As I understand the matter, this is what is known as the emergency appropriation, provided for, if I recollect, under section 291 of the Revised Statutes. The appropriation for this purpose for the present year was, I think, \$63,000. I believe such an appropriation as this has always been made, sometimes more, sometimes less. After the best inquiry I have been able to make, I believe that fund is at this time almost exhausted, leaving only \$12,000 or \$13,000. Upon inquiry your committee was of the opinion that this fund should be reenforced by an appropriation of \$40,000, to be placed in the hands of the President, under the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes. Does my friend want further answer?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. I will be entirely candid with him, as I seek to be in the committee and in the House. According to my understanding and information, the Emperor of Germany addressed to the President of the United States a telegram or letter direct informing him that his brother, Prince Henry, was going to visit the United States, and would be specially charged with a message of congratulation and expression of good will toward the President and people of the United States. The President, upon receiving this notice, as I understand, conceived it to be his duty, he being the official head of a great nation of 80,000,000 people, to properly receive and pay attention to the representative of a great nation from the other side of the water. For this, precedent has been made, if I recollect correctly, in the case of Princess Eulalie, who visited this country, I believe, in 1893, and whose expenses were paid from a fund like this, known as the emergency fund. And there are precedents in many other cases.

I believe this appropriation to be apt and proper. I think the gentleman from Mississippi, with this explanation, will acknowledge it to be apt and proper. Prince Henry as an individual, or

any other individual who may visit our country, would no doubt be courteously treated by our citizens, whether he had official position or not. But when such a one comes as the representative of that great people beyond the sea who have given us so many millions of their best bone and brain and brawn to help us work out the principle of self-government on this side of the Atlantic, then from every standpoint of courtesy that obtains between nations or peoples—in deference to a correct public sentiment, from a standpoint of wise policy on our part toward one of the great powers of the world—from every standpoint it seemed to the President and his Secretary of State proper to ask this appropriation to enable the United States to recognize properly the great German people when they appear through their chosen representatives upon our shores in an official capacity. [Applause.] That, I believe, covers the ground.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It does. I simply wanted to know whether there was any specific purpose behind this appropriation, and if so, what it was.

Mr. PRINCE. Allow me to ask the gentleman from Illinois why the word "experimental" is used in line 20, page 40, of this bill, where the language is—

For experimental rural free-delivery service.

Mr. CANNON. For the simple reason that this appropriation supplements the appropriation of the regular post-office bill providing for the service of the regular current year; and we have taken up and used the exact language of that bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have about concluded all I desired to say in connection with this subject.

Mr. GIBSON. Before the gentleman takes his seat I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to ask the gentleman if the paragraph on page 40 in reference to fees and expenses of examining surgeons is not identical with a similar appropriation in the pension appropriation bill which we have just passed?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; it is in the pension bill; but that, the gentleman will understand, is for the coming year, commencing on July the 1st. This is the necessary amount for the conclusion of this fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to ask the gentleman in connection with the subject he has just been discussing, who is to pay the expenses of the Hon. Whitelaw Reid, young Morgan, Captain Clark, Mr. Wetmore, and Mr. Bayless, who are, I believe, to attend the celebration of the coronation of England's new King?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, we have not arrived at that yet.

Mr. CLARK. I suppose the gentleman has given no thought to the subject at all?

Mr. CANNON. I have not studied it yet.

Mr. CLARK. You have not studied it, and are not able to give the information?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well; there are so many creeks to cross that we must cross that it is not worth while to speculate six months or a year ahead in connection with these matters. When the time comes it will be proper to consider them.

Mr. MUDD. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question, with his consent.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. MUDD. I wish to ask the gentleman in this connection a question with reference to the appropriation made here for the naval establishment. In many of the navy-yards of the country there has been recently a lack of funds for the purpose of carrying on necessary work, and the employees in some of them have been discharged from time to time because of this lack of funds. I would like to ask the gentleman if provision is made in this bill for the continuation of this work?

Mr. CANNON. I will state to the gentleman from Maryland that this bill fully meets the estimate of the Secretary of the Navy for the public service for the remainder of the fiscal year, for ordnance, for supplies, the yards and docks, and all the other requirements of the Navy, and I have no doubt that all necessary work will be done in expending this money, as I understand the drift of the gentleman's question, so there will be ample funds for these employees.

Mr. MUDD. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not think that I am asking for the employment of any new men or an additional force merely for the purpose of providing employment.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, not at all. I understand the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. MUDD. I only want to suggest that there seems to be not sufficient money to carry on the work in some of the navy-yards. The work is necessary and important and ought to go on, and so far as I am concerned I want to see the appropriation made for its continuance without interruption.

Mr. CANNON. We have made all the appropriations asked for by the Department or estimated, in my opinion, and I think that it will also cover the matter which the gentleman undoubtedly has in his mind, here in the navy-yard in Washington.

Mr. MUDD. The matter was called to my attention there, I am frank to say.

Mr. CANNON. Well, it has been called to my attention also, and I can only say to the gentleman that we have given all of the estimate asked by the Department. I think it is proper that we should. Men have been employed in the yard here and as the appropriations were exhausted they were dismissed. But as rapidly as possible, in an ordinary way, the necessities of the Government are being met in this regard, and I am much gratified to know that these people are being employed without regard to other circumstances when they are needed in the public service, and that worthy people are employed in all the necessary functions for the accomplishment of the Government service at the present time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to the item on page 14, providing for the payment of the superintendent of insurance a salary at the rate of \$2,500 a year, and to his clerk at the rate of \$1,000 a year, and a further provision of \$600 for office expenditures. It is not quite clear as to what that covers.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey that we included in the last Congress, and I think the last session of the last Congress, in what is known as the District Code, a provision which provides for these people. We have written the appropriation here literally in pursuance of the law.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations this additional question, if he does not think we are going just a little fast in these appropriations in the District? I believe this is the best government to-day in the United States, possibly the best in the world; but I am also inclined to think it is going a little unnecessarily fast and becoming unreasonably expensive, and I desire to ask the gentleman if there is not some way of curtailing these expenditures? Is there any necessity, in the opinion of the chairman, for any such office in this system; and if so, what are the duties of the official connected with it?

Mr. CANNON. In reply to the gentleman I will frankly state that I do not know. I suppose the necessity therefor was determined when Congress enacted the legislation in what is called the District Code, which passed at the last session of Congress. We find the law and the people appointed under it, and this provides their pay according to law. I have no doubt my friend, the chairman of the District Committee [Mr. BABCOCK], or some gentleman upon that committee on that side, could answer the question much better. I am not informed as to the necessity.

Mr. McDERMOTT. The title of the office is indicative of the duties that this officer and his clerk are to perform, namely, to superintend some class of insurance. It is almost beyond imagination that there should be any duties attached to such an office as that that would justify these expenditures.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman allow an inquiry?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. My attention has been called to the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury with reference to urgent deficiencies in connection with the Post-Office Department for rent of a suitable building for the storage of the files of the Post-Office for the period commencing January 1 and ending June 30, 1902, \$1,500.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have not had time to read the testimony before that committee, and I wish to ask why was that item omitted?

Mr. CANNON. Because the subcommittee, so far as I know—at least I speak for myself—were of opinion that further leasing for that purpose ought not to be authorized until the matter was looked into more fully than we had time to look into it in that investigation; and we supposed that the subcommittee having charge of the legislative or the sundry civil bill, whichever is the appropriate bill, would look fully into it. And for the further reason that a portion of the subcommittee, at least, were of opinion that there is, if properly utilized, ample room on the eighth floor of the Post-Office building for the storage of all records that ought to be kept. And further, I am of opinion that under existing law, if the proper authority whose duty it is to examine the records for destruction would perform its functions, a very large per cent, possibly 10, maybe 20, and I should not be surprised if 25 per cent of the alleged documents in this city that cumber the files and worse than cumber the files could be destroyed.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Second Assistant Postmaster-General seemed to be most insistent upon the request for this appropriation, and for that reason I have desired to get information on the subject.

Mr. CANNON. My friend is chairman of the committee on

the legislative and executive bill. I am not sure whether that or the sundry civil subcommittee will have the primary jurisdiction; but in either event in the usual way, no doubt, that matter will be exhausted. We did not feel that we desired to recommend that appropriation at this time.

Mr. BINGHAM. The statement of the gentleman is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I beg the pardon of the House for having detained it so long, and would not have done so had it not seemed necessary to occupy the floor in answering various queries that gentlemen have made.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman in charge of the bill has at length and in detail explained the provisions of this bill, and while in so doing there were some pretty sharp criticisms upon the Appropriations Committee because of the size of this bill, I wish to make a few remarks on that subject.

The bill does carry quite a large amount, larger than usual for an urgent deficiency bill, when it is remembered that we have a regular general deficiency bill to follow. The leader on the minority side of the House [Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee] and others have sharply criticised some of the items, stating that they ought to have gone on the regular bill, but I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee on Appropriations is not the only committee in this House that appropriates money.

Many of these deficiencies arise on appropriations made by other committees; and this is a kind of dumping ground into which all these deficiencies come, where they must be provided for. I want to say in all justice to good and decent legislation that a deficiency bill ought to have behind it one of several reasons for its appearance here. Either the departments do not estimate for money sufficient to meet proper demands or the committees having charge of appropriations do not meet those proper estimates. That is one reason why you have a deficiency on this floor. And I want to say here that some of these departments make their estimates in a very reckless way, and in such a manner that no committee, with the short time allotted to that committee to make an investigation, can tell absolutely what precise amount of money ought to be appropriated.

I trust that in the future some admonition or suggestion will reach these departments that will cause them to be more careful about the amount of money they ask for specific purposes. And then I am free to say, Mr. Chairman, that the committee into whose hands the matter is placed, when a fair and legitimate estimate is made for a proper purpose, ought to meet every dollar of that estimate, and not a cent less. That is good legislation and safe legislation. The public can understand it. There is no deception about it; there is no carrying over on account of a Presidential or other election of large amounts to be dumped into a deficiency bill to deceive the House and to deceive the people.

In the second place, the necessity for appropriations of this kind often comes from unseen causes in the management of the Government affairs, something that nobody could possibly foresee. Some of these items arise from accidents and providential causes, such as fire and storms, which bring about some of these appropriations. There are several of them in this bill. I remember one that I thought at first in the committee room I could not support. While our buildings were being erected in Paris a storm came along and blew them all down before they were completed.

We have put an item in this bill carrying a deficiency appropriation that was made necessary by that storm. And there is another reason why we have deficiencies in this House, and that is the absolute outright disregard of law and limitations on appropriation bills. Those cases are numerous. Often an appropriating act states on its face that this is the limit. Notwithstanding that limit the departments and the bureaus go right over it and contract for larger amounts that we must meet, and they are put into these deficiency bills.

There is another trouble about this matter of appropriations, and that is the great trouble which was brought to the attention of this House about four years ago; and I think the blame would be drawn from our shoulders, as a specific committee, if you will but remember it again. There are several committees in this House that appropriate money, and they do not know what each other is doing. They are not connected with the committee that raises the revenue. The Committee on Ways and Means provides for the revenue; and then without any concert of action—

Mr. BARTLETT. Will my colleague permit me to ask him a question with reference to the statement he has just made, that the departments of this Government expend money in violation of law and the acts which appropriate that money? Do I understand my colleague to make that statement?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I made this statement, and I will make it over again. Notwithstanding the limitation in the appropriation act, which is the law, contracts are often entered into that go over the specific amount in that law and in that limitation.

Mr. BARTLETT. And money is paid out on that?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And you have to appropriate in this way to meet it.

Mr. BARTLETT. My friend knows, as a matter of course, that it is an utter violation not only of the statute law, but of the fundamental principles of the Constitution, which declares that no moneys shall be paid out of the Treasury except on appropriations for a specific purpose?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. But the gentleman remembers many cases. We have discussed them on the floor of this House for the last ten years, since I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, where contracts have been made exceeding by large amounts the limitation. I was speaking, Mr. Chairman, of the trouble of getting the appropriations of this House together, so that there might be harmony and consistency all along the line. It is impossible to do so when the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on Military Affairs, and other committees are authorized to report appropriation bills. If we had one committee, and that committee consisted one-half for raising revenue and the other half for making appropriations, the whole committee sitting together, having the question of raising revenue and expending it within their jurisdiction, it would be very different.

There is another reason, Mr. Chairman, and that brings up the question that was so lengthily discussed between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] and the chairman of the committee. Our insular possessions being in an unsettled and very uncertain state, appropriations can not always be made in the regular bill. It is impossible. Consequently you find the \$500,000 appropriation to which reference was made; and in answer to a question—some gentleman on the floor asked why that should not be built by General Chaffee and the money taken from the treasury of the Philippine Islands—I would state that he could have done it under the law, for he is supreme there, over Congress and over everybody else, and can use that fund as he pleases; but there was no fund with which to do it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why did not he use that fund?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I had just stated that he had power to do so, but had not the funds. We are to-day and the civil commission there in power are trying to establish schools. It has taken an enormous amount of money to do it. More than that, they are trying to set up municipal governments in all the cities, towns, and villages, establishing a police force; that requires an enormous amount of money; and all those things, the establishing of courts, civil courts, with jury and witness expenses, and all those things bring an enormous expense upon the revenues of the Philippine Islands, and if this amount, \$500,000, in this bill should come from the revenues of the Philippine Islands, either the schooling of the children, or the courts, or the policing and the municipal expenses in the villages and cities would have to go unprovided for. That is the reason why it was put in this bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Will my friend allow me, in view of the fact that he has referred to me and what I said in answer to the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman is justifying, as I understand it, the appropriation of \$500,000 for the Army post at Manila.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am not justifying it, but giving the reason why it went in here.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Did the gentleman consent in the committee that it should go in?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman from Georgia certainly did consent that it should go in or it would not have been in without my protest.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The point I want to get at is this: The gentleman from Illinois failed to point out any law authorizing it. Now, will the gentleman from Georgia tell us where there is any law or authorization of this appropriation?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not think that there is any specific act.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Inasmuch as the law is explicit that no appropriation shall go into any general appropriation bill except in accordance with the law, how does the gentleman from Georgia justify himself in consenting to this provision? That is the question I wanted the gentleman from Illinois to answer, and now will the gentleman from Georgia do it?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman from Tennessee will remember the act gives certain powers to the War Department and to the President to carry on the expense of the war, or whatever you may call it, in the Philippine Islands, and authorizes them to do anything and everything for the preservation of life and property, not only for the Filipino, but for the soldiers and the property of the United States Government there involved. It was thought by the committee—or some members of it, at least—and by myself that perhaps that law authorized this appropriation.

Now, I am going to tell the gentleman why it was made. The

conduct of the soldiers and citizens in the city of Manila has demonstrated the fact that they must be separated. Some of the reasons can be made public and some can not on the floor of this House. The moral care and preservation of our troops absolutely demand that they should be separated.

Again, it is said, and we were so informed, that in nearly every instance where there was trouble between the citizen and the soldier, or where there was a rebellion against the flag, it was brought about by some imprudent conduct on the part of an officer or a soldier. Recently a large lot of cavalry has been shipped to the Philippine Islands. They must have shelter for their horses, and it was proven in the committee, and thoroughly set up as a matter of fact, that this \$500,000 expended for shelter would be no more costly and no more expensive than if the whole thing had been done with duck or canvas shipped from this country.

It is to shelter our soldiers from the wet season which will soon come, to shelter the horses, to separate the troops from these citizens, take them out of the huts and alleys and lanes of the cities and put them where discipline can be had. These are the reasons for it. Whether it ought to be in this bill or somewhere else is a legal question, and, not being a lawyer, I am going to leave that to the gentleman from Tennessee and the chairman of the committee to fight over under the five-minute rule when it comes before the House. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the point I tried to make has not been very clearly grasped by the gentlemen who have discussed this measure, or else I do not grasp it myself. On page 17 of the bill I find this language: "For the establishment in the vicinity of Manila, in the Philippine Islands, of a military post," etc.

The point I make is that the Appropriations Committee has no right to appropriate for anything not provided for by existing law, and by this act they are establishing a military post in the Philippine Islands. The Philippine Islands belong to the United States, and I concede that they have as much right to establish a post there as they would have in any part of the United States, but they certainly have no greater right to establish it there than they would have to establish it in any other Territory or State.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] in the discussion said we acquired it by treaty right. By treaty right we did not give the Committee on Appropriations any larger jurisdiction than it had before we made the treaty. We acquired certain posts from Spain. These posts were established by the law of Spain, and a deficiency for their support would be in order from the Committee on Appropriations; but the point I make is a deficiency can not exist where the object of the appropriation has not been provided for by any law whatever.

The gentleman speaks about the right acquired by treaty. We acquired Louisiana by treaty; we paid for it; it became our territory, and yet the Congress of the United States reserved the right at all times to say what improvements should be started, what posts laid out, what laws established in the ordinary way, by the regular committees of this House. I think the army in the Philippines needs this appropriation. I did not want to make the point of order, but I did want before this House, and before the Committee on Appropriations, to preserve the rights of the Military Committee to continue the legislation given it by the rules of the House.

I have no doubt that this appropriation is needed more urgently now from the fact that the civil government in Manila and other places in the Philippine Islands have been largely taking all the public buildings heretofore used by the army for civil offices. I have no doubt they need it from the fact that the health of the troops will be better in a new post established outside of the city of Manila than in the old posts used by the Spanish Government. I have no doubt of that fact; but I think that if the War Department or the Treasury Department and the Speaker of the House had referred this question to the Committee on Military Affairs, where it properly belongs, they could have had a bill reported and adopted by the Congress of the United States as expeditiously as could the Committee on Appropriations.

I agree with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that our army in Manila must be cared for, must be properly housed and clothed and fed. That is all true. But my friend will agree with me that the Committee on Appropriations has no right to undertake to establish new posts in the United States—has no right, under the rules of the House, to undertake to establish by law a Soldiers' Home; has no right to establish by law a national park; no right to establish by law any new improvement that the Congress of the United States has not already passed upon. And if the Committee on Appropriations can not do that with reference to any point in the old States and Territories, it can not do it with reference to Manila. But on account of the emergency of this public improvement I wanted to make this statement to the House now, without raising a point of order under the five-

minute rule and having the item ruled out of the bill, delaying further the building of this new post.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. HULL. I will if I can.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I have listened to the remarks of the gentleman with much interest, and I would like to know how it is that the rules of this House can apply to the House when legislating for the Philippine Islands while the Constitution does not apply to this House when so legislating.

Mr. HULL. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a question which is not pertinent to this discussion, and I have no reply to make to it.

Allow me to say as to one illustration of my friend from Illinois, that when it was decided to abandon the post at Omaha and start the post at Fort Douglas, some miles from Omaha, the Congress of the United States authorized the establishment of the new post. When the General of the Army wanted a post at Helena, Mont., application was made to the Military Committee, and the post was established. So with all these other posts that have been established.

I am not antagonizing this appropriation now, because, as I said a while ago, it is important that the post should be built—absolutely important. I have no doubt on earth that the Committee on Military Affairs would promptly have reported a bill if the question had been referred to that committee. But I do want to preserve the line which my good friends will acknowledge it is sometimes very difficult to preserve between the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations and that of the Committee on Military Affairs in regard to Army appropriations. For instance, the Appropriations Committee has under its control the fortification appropriation bill; and in connection with that bill it has gradually taken from the Committee on Military Affairs the right to provide for the equipment of the artillery, which the rules say shall belong to the Committee on Military Affairs, because the artillery arm is as much a part of the line of the Army as is the infantry or cavalry; and everything affecting the line of the Army should undoubtedly go to the Military Committee.

The establishment of military posts goes to the Committee on Military Affairs not on account of that division of jurisdiction, but because under the rules the Committee on Appropriations has no right to initiate new legislation. The Committee on Military Affairs can not, under the rules of this House, enact such legislation as this on the Army appropriation bill without unanimous consent of the members. The General of the Army or Secretary of War have no right to establish posts; they may and do provide temporary barracks and quarters. They have in the past established some posts this way which Congress has permitted, by appropriating for from year to year, to become practically permanent; but the power to do this legally is in Congress, and Congress alone. We should not abdicate our right in such matters.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WADSWORTH having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. PIERCE obtained the floor and said: I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, if it is true, as the gentleman from Georgia said, that General Chaffee is supreme in the Philippine Islands, that he is supreme over Congress and the rest of us, then the sooner General Chaffee is brought down a few pegs and ordered back to this country the better we shall be off; for it is one of the well-established tenets of the Democratic party, that the military authority must be subordinate to the civil authority. That principle lies at the very root of republican institutions.

My friend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON] makes sporadic fights in this House, as the doctors would say, for economy in expenditure, in which I have generally sympathized with and aided him; but he has been very tender footed and squeamish to-day about answering questions. I asked a perfectly fair question, Who is going to pay the expenses of this extraordinary aggregation of talent, made up of Hon. Whitelaw Reid, General Wilson, Captain Clark, young Mr. Pierpont Morgan, young Mr. Baileys, and young Mr. Wetmore, to attend the coronation of His Sacred Majesty King Edward the Seventh? The gentleman from Illinois answered that he did not know. He had not thought about that. He had better be turning his luminous intellect upon that subject.

Now, I have a suggestion to make to him. It is a poor rule that does not work both ways, and if it is right and proper for us to pay the expenses of Prince Henry of Hohenzollern in making us a visit, it is eminently proper for King Edward VII to pay the expenses of Reid, Morgan, Clark, and the rest of those people who

are going over there to see him crowned. I am teetotally opposed to paying a cent on that score. It is all right to pay the expenses of entertaining Prince Henry. I am glad he is coming, because his visit and the welcome the American people and Government will give him will have a tendency to give the lie to the slander that certain Anglomaniacs of this country are trying to work up, to the effect that the American people are friendly to England and an enemy to Germany, which is not true.

It is all right to pay the expenses of Prince Henry. He is our guest and we will make him have a good time.

But if the chairman of the Appropriations Committee does not know who will pay the expenses of Hon. Whitelaw Reid & Co., I do, and will give him the information. Some time, in some way, the American people will be compelled by a Republican Congress and a Republican Administration to pay the bills. So far as I am concerned, I will never vote one cent to pay any man's expenses to go to England, or elsewhere, to help crown a king. We went out of the coronation business July 4, 1776, and we are not yet ready to return to that unnatural and un-American habit.

Now, I want to say a word about this appropriation of \$500,000 for barracks at Manila. On the first day of this Congress, or the second, I forget which, the minority made what fight it could to keep the Reed rules from being adopted in this House. We wanted a chance to amend them and discuss them and make them better and more modern. But the Republican majority rammed those rules down our throats whether we wanted them or not. One of those rules provides that you can not adopt new legislation on an appropriation bill. If the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] has not the boldness to raise a point of order when that item comes up under the five-minute rule, I will do so myself, although I do not profess to be a parliamentary sharp.

As to the merits of that item: We captured Manila—and it was a partnership capture at best—in 1898. We needed barracks over there as much in 1898 as we do now; we needed barracks as much in 1899 as we do now; we needed barracks as much in 1900 as we do now. There has been ample opportunity to bring in a bill here for the construction of barracks at Manila and to give this House a chance to pass upon this question in the regular, sober, serious, careful way in which legislation ought to be adopted. There is no sense in violating a wholesome rule of the House by rushing this new legislation through under the whip and spur of an urgency deficiency bill. This \$500,000 item is only a starter. We had better kill the scheme now.

The most melancholy declaration I have ever heard made on the floor of this House was made by my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] when he said that we were to hold the Philippine Islands forever and a day—the most idiotic scheme that was ever hatched in the mind of man. Up to this present day the holding of the Philippine Islands has cost the American people about \$300,000,000, and it is costing them \$12,000,000 a month now. The Secretary of War asks for as much money this year as he did last. Does not he? The Secretary of the Navy asks this House for twenty millions more than he did last year, and yet my friend from Illinois says we intend to keep that process up. That is what he meant. He did not use those words, but what he did say indicates that we are to keep up this process of spending \$12,000,000 a month forever and a day.

Somebody on that side talked about civil government in the Philippines. On the 4th day of last July, with a great flourish of trumpets, they did establish civil government in those islands, and according to my information now every one of them has fallen to the ground except the one in the island of Luzon, and 5,000 insurgents are roaming around on that island almost in gunshot of Manila, where we started in 1898.

How much can we get out of it? Why, I remember a long time ago in this House that somebody asked my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] how long he intended to hold these islands. He replied that "we intended to hold them until we could squeeze all the money out of them we could get." That was just exactly the same plan that my illustrious fellow-citizen, Jesse James, used about holding up a railroad train [laughter], "until he could squeeze all the money out of it he could," and he kept up that business until a Democratic governor laid him away in his grave.

When did they begin taxing the people of the United States to build barracks out there? Why, until last April all these things were done out of the revenues of the Philippine Islands, and it is only since then that they have undertaken it. Why, my friend from Illinois says, it takes so much money to build the school-houses and educate the Filipinos that they thought it better to take this little item of \$500,000 to build barracks over there out of the United States Treasury.

Once more the doctrine, that charity begins at home applies. Within the broad confines of this Republic—north, south, east, and west—millions of American children, white and black, are without the school facilities that they ought to have, and here we

are boasting and vaunting ourselves upon going away from home, where the intelligence and education would do us some good, and squandering money in the Philippine Islands, 7,000 miles away, to educate somebody we never saw, never expect to see, and, so far as I am concerned, never want to see. [Laughter.] Let us educate American children first and after that go out as educational missionaries.

ECONOMY IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

For a long time I have been looking for "the man who would rather work than eat." I have never found that abnormal and interesting character for the all-sufficient reason that he does not exist. He is a mere figment of the imagination. He is a myth, as much as Jupiter or Minerva, Hercules or Venus, Vulcan or Aphrodite, Cyclops, or the sirens with their dulcet songs.

I have long since abandoned my chase after him, and lately have been diligently searching for the man who really enjoys paying taxes—enjoys it as he enjoys going to the circus and other such hilarious performances. I have not found him. He has neither a local habitation nor a name. He is as fleeting as the mirage of the desert, a will o' the wisp, or an ignis fatuus. He does not exist. If he did, he would be a monstrosity in the animal kingdom.

If we lived up to the Golden Rule we would have little need for Presidents and Congresses, governors and legislatures, courts and sheriffs, court-houses, penitentiaries, and jails, armies and navies, and all the other costly adjuncts of modern civilization, but because we do not observe the Golden Rule we have all these things galore. To support them, the taxgatherer, like the poor, we always have with us, and we most probably will have him until the dawn of the millennium.

All sensible people recognize taxes as a necessary evil—the less of which we have the better.

Therefore it should be the constant aim of legislators, national, State, or municipal, to secure the maximum of good government with the minimum of taxation.

To recklessly squander the people's money, as has been done here for years, is to invite and deserve the condemnation denounced upon those who grind the faces of the poor.

In his first inaugural—which has become a classic—Thomas Jefferson laid down certain basic principles which should guide those charged with the conduct of the Federal Government.

Inter alia he declared for "economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened."

Nothing could blind his clear vision to the fact that every dollar means a day of toil and sweat by somebody somewhere, and that in the last analysis labor pays all the taxes and foots all the bills of government.

How far we have departed in practice from his theory is shown by the riotous totals of the appropriations in the last ten years.

It is easy to be generous, even prodigal, with other people's money.

When the Fifty-first Congress was first dubbed "A billion-dollar Congress," it is reported that Hon. Thomas Brackett Reed answered the taunt with the bravado that "this is a billion-dollar country." If that brilliant man ever considered the acts of the Fifty-sixth Congress he must be compelled to remodel his famous mot so as to read, "this is a billion and a half dollar country," in order to make it harmonize with the appropriations of that Congress. Indeed, he would not have needed to wait till the Fifty-sixth Congress to revise his caustic remark, for the enlarged version of his mot would have applied to the Fifty-fifth Congress, the last over which he presided, whose appropriations were wicked and wanton waste.

The only circumstance which could be urged in mitigation of the colossal appropriations of the Fifty-fifth Congress when compared with those of the Fifty-sixth is that we were then engaged in a foreign war, while during the life of the Fifty-sixth Congress we were said to be at peace with all the world.

Still the totals are astounding year by year, and the voice of the reformer is silenced, while extravagance runs riot.

The growth of per capita Federal expenditures is amazing.

In 1803, the second year of Jefferson's Administration, the per capita Federal expenditures were only 50 cents.

In 1842, under John Tyler, they had risen to \$1.39.

In 1860, when James Buchanan was President, they had grown to \$2.01.

During the civil war the totals of appropriations, as well as the per capita expenditures, took an immense jump.

The lowest per capita appropriation since the war was in 1886, during Cleveland's first term, when it was \$4.22, the total being \$242,483,188.

In 1891 the per capita expense was \$5.71; in 1896, \$4.93; in 1897, \$5.01; last year was almost \$10 per capita, and unfortunately the tendency is toward still greater expenditures.

No living man can assign any valid or convincing reason for

this astounding and rapid growth in the per capita public expenditures. Certainly no member of this House has cheek enough to assert that the Government as now administered is an improvement upon Jefferson's method of administration.

Liberality in pensions to our soldiers and sailors and their widows, orphans, and dependent parents has become the settled policy of the Government; but few have avowed themselves openly in favor of a civil pension list, and yet that system, and of colossal proportions at that, is in sight. It is at present a cloud no larger than a man's hand, but unless Congress takes an immediate and resolute stand against it in a few years it will envelop the entire land.

The retired list is growing like Jonah's gourd vine. It is a great pity that it will not wither as soon. It is now proposed to pension ex-Presidents.

To place a person on the retired list with a salary is only another way of granting a pension.

The bill pending, to raise the salary of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service and then retire them on three-fourths pay, will cost the people about \$200,000 a year. There is no shadow of excuse for that raid on the Treasury. What is still worse, it is only the forerunner of a vast brood of similar bills to retire somebody and finally to retire everybody—that is everybody holding an appointive place under the Government—at a good, fat salary. The employees of the Weather Bureau and the railway mail clerks will come next; and, truth to tell, they are just as much entitled to a pension as are the revenue-cutter officers. Then the vast army—constantly growing vaster—of clerks, agents, and supernumeraries in all the departments and in the service of the Government anywhere and everywhere will be pensioned. If I voted to retire the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service I would vote to pension all the rest.

The inevitable result is that none of the taxpayers will be granted pensions and all of the taxeaters will enjoy that luxury.

There would be more wisdom and more justice in establishing a universal old-age pension for every citizen of the Republic than there are in the manner in which we are proceeding to create an old-age pension list from the civil departments of the Government.

The average citizen who is not in the employment of the Government is just as worthy of an old-age pension as is the Government employee, for the latter receives the higher compensation while the former does more and harder work.

Yet there is a constant, and apparently irresistible, pressure to increase the salaries of all governmental appointees, notwithstanding the fact that there are scores of applicants for every place at the present salaries—sometimes hundreds of applicants—and notwithstanding the further fact that if the Angel of Death should spread his wings on the blast to-night and kill every employee of the Government as dead as he killed the army of Sen-nacherib in a week's time every place could be filled by somebody as competent as the present incumbent.

At the last session of Congress Mr. HEMENWAY, of Indiana, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, made the startling declaration on the floor of the House that at least 10 per cent of all the department clerks are incapacitated for any duty by reason of old age or other infirmity, but they draw their salaries as regularly as the most robust one in the lot. Of course the per cent will grow year by year, for it is no fiction that life tenure in office fosters longevity. Any system which breeds such a state of affairs is an outrage on the toilers of the land, an insult to our boasted intelligence, a nuisance which should be abated for the public good.

In this connection I wish to state clearly and emphatically that I have nothing whatever against the persons who are the beneficiaries of the public bounty by reason of increased salaries, or of being retired on full or three-fourths pay, or of drawing pay for which they are unable to render any service. They are, almost without exception, amiable and intelligent citizens, and it is largely because they are amiable and intelligent that Congress yields to their unjust and unreasonable demands. Another reason that Congress yields, reluctantly and against its better judgment, as I believe, is that the applicants for this largess are here on the ground, in a city 60 per cent of whose residents claim citizenship elsewhere and a much larger per cent of whom live directly or indirectly on salaries paid by the Government. There is a community of interest among them; they seek two ends in common—increase of pay and life tenure in position—and they generally get what they go after.

I have never had any ambition to be proclaimed as "A watchdog of the Treasury." I have not arrogated to myself the character of an economist. I have not posed as an objector. It is an ungracious and ungraceful performance to object to the pet bills and provisions of other members and well calculated to render a

man unpopular with his fellow-Representatives; but there are waste and extravagance everywhere.

If John D. Rockefeller, who is generally taken and accepted as the richest man in America, were to conduct his business as recklessly as the Government's business is run he would go into bankruptcy in less than ten years.

There is not a man living who has brains, intelligence, and ingenuity enough to defend the methods pursued by Congress at present and for years past.

I have no doubt whatever that a good business man can run the Government business as well as it is now run for one-half of what we expend for that purpose.

It is our solemn duty to readopt "Economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened."

Here is a table showing aggregates of expenditures for every fiscal year since 1855:

1856	\$65,571,025.79
1857	67,735,707.66
1858	74,185,270.39
1859	69,070,976.74
1860	63,130,598.39
1861	66,546,644.89
1862	474,761,818.91
1863	714,740,725.17
1864	865,322,641.97
1865	1,297,555,224.41
1866	520,809,416.99
1867	357,542,675.16
1868	377,340,284.86
1869	322,865,277.80
1870	506,653,590.75
1871	292,177,188.25
1872	277,517,962.67
1873	290,245,245.33
1874	287,133,873.17
1875	274,623,392.84
1876	258,459,797.33
1877	238,600,008.93
1878	236,964,326.80
1879	206,947,883.53
1880	267,642,957.78
1881	200,712,887.59
1882	257,981,439.57
1883	265,408,137.54
1884	244,126,244.33
1885	290,226,935.11
1886	242,483,138.50
1887	267,622,179.97
1888	267,924,801.13
1889	299,288,978.25
1890	318,040,710.66
1891	365,773,905.35
1892	345,023,330.58
1893	383,477,954.49
1894	267,525,279.83
1895	376,195,298.29
1896	352,179,446.08
1897	365,774,159.57
1898	443,338,582.80
1899	605,072,179.85
1900	478,713,791.71
1901	500,967,333.15

I remember an old adage which says "Give the devil his due," and although I would not compare my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to his satanic majesty [laughter], still it is due to the gentleman to state that I will give the devil his due while endeavoring on this floor to procure economy in public expenditures. I have seen these expenses grow in amount from year to year, in the appropriation bills, and neither the one party nor the other is entirely to blame for it. It is a condition of affairs which has grown upon us gradually. That is the exact truth. I have seen the honorable gentleman from Illinois make the most gallant efforts to economize the expenditures in this House, and in nearly every case he was outweighed and borne down. I saw the gentleman in that position often during the last Congress.

There is another thing. I have observed here ever since I have been in the House, that there is no trouble whatever to establish a new office. There is no trouble whatever to raise the salary of an old official; but the very minute you undertake to abolish an old office or to cut down an old salary you run up against some insuperable obstacle. And let me tell you, my fellow-members, there is an old saying that charity should begin at home, and so should economy begin at home. There are twice as many employees hanging around this very House as there is any necessity for. There are so many of them that you almost have to run over them to get in and out. You have up in this gallery here two able-bodied citizens sitting at every one of these doors to pull the door open; and as a member suggested to me the other day, a gentleman of humorous turn of mind, when my brother from St. Louis [Mr. JOY] was trying to get two more on the pay roll, that the proper thing to do was to make an appropriation for some kind of machinery to lift these doorkeepers up gently so they would not overtax themselves in getting up to open the doors. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend allow me there?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; certainly.

Mr. CANNON. I think myself there are some unnecessary officials in the House and Senate, especially in the Senate; but if the public prints can be relied upon as anywhere nearly correct, it seems to me that the Missouri legislature double discounts the House of Representatives of the United States in its employees, and as that is at home, and charity and economy begin there, would my friend from Missouri be curious to run a comparison between the two? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is exceedingly amusing. It marks my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] as a humorist fit to rank with Grover Cleveland in his fishing articles. [Laughter.] But it is decidedly uncandid. I am not a member of the Missouri legislature. When I was, thirteen years ago, they did not have half as many clerks there as they have had since that time. Recently they have reduced the number very much. But I am here to legislate for the people of the United States, and I will give you my opinion in a nut shell, that unless these riotous totals of appropriations are cut down this great official system will get so top-heavy that it will topple to the ground of its own weight.

I am not stingy in the public service. I have no disposition to set up as a cheeseparer statesman. I am willing to pay public officials and to pay them well, but I am not in favor of having twice as many people on the pay roll as employees as there ought to be.

Now, the gentlemen over there on the other side had a confab among themselves about raising the wages of these rural free mail carriers. I have no doubt on earth they will be raised. They are getting more now than the average citizen can get. The people over in the departments are getting more pay and do less work than the average citizen. Yet they will all get their wages raised. And I undertake to say now that if every Federal official, including the House of Representatives and Senate, were to die to-night, within a month a new set could be secured who would discharge the official duties just as well as those who hold the offices now. What is more, they would take the offices gladly at the old salaries. I do not know of anybody in my district who is refusing to come to Congress because the pay is not big enough.

The truth is that we have become so thoroughly used to talking about millions and hundreds of millions here in this House that whenever we are discussing public measures every one of us has come to feel as though we were all multi-millionaires or billionaires ourselves. There will be a day of reckoning. Of course, as long as times are flush I understand perfectly well that it will be difficult to induce the American people to scrutinize appropriation bills closely. That is the reason extravagance is rampant. But whenever it becomes a little hard to pay the taxes they will begin to scrutinize them, and we ought to begin now to economize in all these unnecessary things against that day which must come.

I suggest to every man here, it is not a matter of politics, it is a matter of economy, it is a matter of plain common sense; and every dollar that we expend here in excess of what we ought to spend is practically a robbery of the people. I hear statesmen here talking about the money which belongs to the United States Government. It does not own a single dollar of money anywhere on the face of the earth. It is simply a trustee for the people, and a trustee of an express trust. Cato used to wind up every speech that he made in the Roman senate, no difference what the subject was, with, "Delenda Carthago est!" Carthage must be destroyed! It would be a good thing if every member in this House would get into the habit of winding up every speech that he makes, no matter what the theme, with this declaration, that "Federal expenditure must be kept within the limits of government of the people, by the people, and for the people, economically administered." [Loud applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

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

H. R. 3239. An act providing for the free transportation of all mail matter sent by Mrs. Ida S. McKinley.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 2044. An act to increase the amount of the official bond to be furnished by the United States marshal for the district of Alaska in certain cases; and

S. R. 15. Joint resolution to pay the expenses of the United States Government exhibit at the South Carolina Interstate and West Indian Exposition, in the city of Charleston, county of

Charleston, State of South Carolina, during the years 1901 and 1902.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes, or so much time as he may desire, to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. I only want a very brief time. I have listened with much interest to the gentleman from Missouri. It seems to me I have heard much of what he said, in substance, before, and yet if it be a good thing it can not be said too often. I am glad that the gentleman is so much of an economist. I should be very glad, indeed, of his careful assistance, as every other member of the House would be, in watching legislation, the enactment of new legislation, the entering upon new policies, for the cutting down of appropriations where they ought to be cut down, running all along through the details. I know if the gentleman gives his careful attention to the matter that he will be efficient. I know he will be on foot many times in the future where he has not been either on foot or horseback heretofore when the matter of appropriations was being considered.

I always listen to the gentleman with a great deal of interest. Thomas Jefferson; a hundred years ago; expenditures only 50 cents a head; 5,000,000 people then, I believe; according to the gentleman's statement, the expenditures only two millions and a half! If the gentleman would look it up again, I think he would find he is somewhat in error. He says now it is \$12 a head. Oh! no, no; nowhere near \$12 a head for the expenditures in this country, notwithstanding the great change. I was interested somewhat in this statement: According to the gentleman, there was \$2,500,000 in expenditures in 1802 under Jefferson. I do not recollect that the gentleman's voice was raised in opposition when, under the new conditions, this House solemnly pledged itself to give \$5,000,000 for the St. Louis Exposition to celebrate the acquisition of the territory acquired under Jefferson—twice as much as the whole Government cost, according to the gentleman, in 1802, under Jefferson. [Laughter.] Oh, where was the eloquent voice of the gentleman from Missouri then? [Laughter.]

The great city of St. Louis, one of the many great cities, splendid and magnificent in the year 1902, in the State of Missouri, and by its permission, I believe, gives \$15,000,000 toward one little show down there [laughter], making, with what the United States gives, \$20,000,000 in all. My countrymen, what extravagance! [Great laughter.]

Does the gentleman from Missouri refer to the expenditures made prior to 1860 as any guide for the expenditures that are to be made now? If he does not, what was the object of his speech? A new order of things has come in. The expenditures already made (and I crave the gentleman's attention) since the 4th day of March, 1861, that this nation might be preserved, in the payment of the pensions and sustaining the Army and Navy growing out of that great war, amounts to more than \$9,000,000,000. Why, for pensions alone to the soldiers of the late war \$140,000,000 a year are appropriated, and the gentleman strikes an attitude and talks about how much per capita it cost under Jefferson's Administration in 1802. [Laughter.]

Now, I do not pose as the watchdog of the Treasury. I am not a cheeseparer statesman. I have no desire to play in that rôle. I am for raising every dollar of money by taxation, and expending every dollar of that money that it is necessary to expend to enable the United States of America to perform its function with efficiency everywhere in our borders, including the newly acquired territory, upon all the oceans and seas of the earth and everywhere about the earth. [Applause on the Republican side.] I do not want to spend one dollar more. As the chairman of the great committee that prepares for the consideration of the House many of these great annual bills, my best efforts are given to that end. The gentleman says my desire to keep the Philippine Islands forever and a day is idiotic. Well, that is merely a matter of opinion. [Laughter.]

Why, Mr. Chairman, that is over and it is done. The Philippine Islands have been acquired by the United States by the highest law. I used to tell a story in the last campaign which saved me a half hour's talk inside of a minute, and I will tell it now. John and Mary, son and daughter of two farmers down in central Illinois, married. They were good people and lived upon a little farm of 80 acres of land. They agreed among themselves, among other things, that they did not want twins. They wanted a son. In the fulness of time a son was born. There was great rejoicing upon the part of the husband. Presently he was informed that there was another son; that was two. He tore his hair and rushed in and said, "Wife, we don't want twins." She said, "Husband, we have got them." [Great laughter.] And the love of that good woman twined about them, and in the fulness of time and vigorous manhood they will become citizens of a great Republic.

We have got the Philippines. Now, the gentleman from Missouri had quite as much to do with the beginning of the war under which the Philippines came as I had. I accept the logical sequence. He rejects it. Sometimes gentlemen, like my friend, I have thought, were always for war and its consequences in time of peace and for peace in time of war. That is to say, these things result, I will say to my friend, from the war with Spain. Nothing will undo them. I do not believe, if my friend was chargeable with the power to do it, if he was the President, or speaking for the majority in this House of Representatives, if he was in a position where he was required to act—because I have great respect for him, his courage, his capacity, and for his patriotism—I do not believe if he could stand up and by his single voice dispose of the Philippines or get away from the obligations of that treaty, the highest law of the Republic, that he would dispose of them or part with a single acre or island. I am kinder to my friend than he is to himself.

Another gentleman a few minutes ago asked the gentleman from Ohio this question: "How can we, under the rules of this House, effect legislation touching the Philippines when the Constitution, which is the permanent law and the highest law, does not go there?" I am glad to answer my friend. No man anywhere, here or elsewhere, for that matter, has greater regard for that fixed law of the land, the Constitution of the United States, than I have; and it goes everywhere that the flag goes. In the Philippines, with a people who are not competent for self-government; with a people in insurrection, with a people who are being educated and in the fullness of time will be fully educated and through the generations gradually work up to a capacity for self-government, the same usages and customs and revenue laws that exist in the United States, as we have built them up for over three hundred years, would not apply in every instance.

Therefore the Constitution of the United States, like the grace of God, is big enough and strong enough to throw its arms about the Philippines and adapt itself from year to year and generation to generation to their condition. That is what the Constitution of the United States can do; and it does go there. Gentlemen say it does not; I say it does go there; and that your Government and mine—a government of the people—can do as much anywhere that it may be possessed of territory as any monarchy or any other government on the earth has the power to do, the difference between the two being that we do things right, from the standpoint of self-government and building peoples up to self-government, while they frequently do things which, according to our standpoint, are not right.

I did not intend to submit additional remarks in this general debate, but I felt that I wanted to say what I have said. I am glad that I live in the year 1903. I am glad that this country has grown in population within our borders without regard to the newly acquired territory to almost 80,000,000 people. I am glad that we have 200,000 miles of railways. I am glad that we have the greatest internal trade in the United States amongst ourselves—if we did not have one dollar of trade abroad—of any government on earth. I am glad that we are first in agriculture among the nations of the earth. I am glad that we are first in manufactures among the nations of the earth. I am glad that our commerce for the surplus, which is insignificant in comparison with the home consumption, grows by leaps of a hundred millions or more every year. I am glad that we are broad enough to reach out and be upon terms of courtesy—international courtesy—with the world.

When Prince Henry reaches our shores and is entertained by our people, I am glad, that coming as he does, in an official capacity, he is to be entertained at the expense of all the people; [applause] and when our people go from the United States to Great Britain (if they do go—I have paid no attention to that—the matter has not come to me), when our people go to the mother country, having the same laws, the same language, the same literature, the same civilization as ourselves—if they go upon the invitation of Great Britain or if they go officially to represent our people, I expect, that when they strike Great Britain's borders, they will be entertained by Great Britain as we shall entertain Prince Henry. But from the United States to Great Britain's borders, if we send them, I will vote to pay their expenses, as Prince Henry's expenses will be paid en route, no doubt, to our borders. The two cases would be upon all fours.

I glory in speaking the English language. I glory in the Anglo-Saxon, the English, the American literature. I glory in our foreign trade. But I can not forget that one-half of our great foreign trade is done with our brethren under the flag of Great Britain, who speak the same language that we do.

I am for German policy. I am for French policy. I am for correct policy of all the governments of this earth as long as it is correct, and I am for Great Britain's policy as long as it is correct. When she is right, when she is our best customer, I am for treating her as such—for meeting her halfway and standing with

her as we stand with other nations and with other civilizations. And thank God, when she is wrong, we are strong enough and great enough to say, "Thus far and no farther shalt thou come." [Loud applause.]

I beg the pardon of the House for having in this general debate strayed away from this deficiency bill. It seemed to me that something like what I have said was apt in reply to the gentleman who has last spoken and others touching the question of general policy.

Mr. PIERCE. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND].

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I am prompted now to ask a little of the time of the House; prompted by the appearance of a new friend of the Constitution—an unexpected appearance—an unheralded appearance—a remarkable appearance. I refer, of course, to the appearance in this guise and garb of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. This is an event of some importance. There had not been any suspicion abroad in the land, and certainly none in the House, that the gentleman was going to declare any remarkable friendship for the Constitution, for up to this date, so far as we have been able to observe, he has not evinced any.

He is, however, a friend of the Constitution, because we have his own statement as evidence of the fact. He glories, as we all do, in the greatness of our country; but he assigns somewhat different reasons for his glorification from those which affect some of us. He tells us that the Constitution follows the flag, and he tells us almost in the same breath that while the Constitution is in the Philippines and everywhere that our flag is seen we, in the Philippines and elsewhere, have the power and right to do everything that any other nation has the power and right to do; and then he draws the remarkably fine and neat distinction that we differ from other nations in that we do, and seek to do, only that which is right, while they in their perversity do that which is wrong.

The Constitution of the United States, which we are assured by the gentleman from Illinois, has gone to the Philippines, as well as remains here in the United States, fixes a limit to what we can do, as that instrument is interpreted by some of its older friends. The powers of this Government are supposed to be limited, measured, and bounded by the provisions of that Constitution. In determining, then, what the Government can do we have been accustomed heretofore, and ought, Mr. Chairman, to be accustomed now, to recur to the Constitution to ascertain what the governmental powers are, and what the Government is. But the gentleman from Illinois goes out upon a broad voyage of discovery and exploration, and winds up with the announcement that we have rights and powers under our Constitution as boundless as any other nation on the earth can claim.

Now, what some other nation has the right to do depends, so far as its own internal structure is concerned, upon its constitution and upon its form of government. It has no relation whatever to our system. What it has the right to do, so far as the world is concerned, depends not so much upon its constitution or upon its government, as a matter of theory and philosophy, as, practically and ultimately, upon the power of its army and its navy to carry forward such policies as it may please to advance. That is just where the matter stands as between the Government of the United States and foreign governments, according to the best interpretation of our Constitution and the practice under their systems.

This is simply a deficiency bill which has been presented here by the Committee on Appropriations for our action. There is a provision in this bill for the erection of barracks—a military post—at Manila, in the Philippine Islands, established upon a permanent basis; and in establishing that military post, we are told by the gentleman from Illinois, we are doing right, because, he says, we differ from other nations in that we do right while they do wrong. We must assume, then, I suppose, that we are doing right in the establishment of the permanent military barracks at Manila.

The gentleman appealingly and eloquently illustrated the impregnability of his position, and he says that he has time and time again saved one-half hour's expenditure of time by the employment of the illustration. He did this when he cited the case of the young couple who had twins but would have been entirely satisfied with, and would have positively enjoyed the blessing of, one child in the family. Does the gentleman look upon the inhabitants of the Philippines as in the relation of twinning with the people of this Republic? Does he regard them as on a par with our American citizenship? I, for my part, repudiate any such twinning, any such relationship. The American people and the Filipinos were not born twins, and are not and in the future will not be "twins."

Their births did not take place at the same time, so far as their relationship to this Government are concerned. They are not of

the same stock. Politically they have not the same paternity or the same maternity. They have not the same achievements or the same objects. They have not the same prospects or the same hopes in life. The one constitutes the citizenship of the mightiest Republic upon the earth, a people who hertofore have devoted themselves to the glories of free government at home and to the glories of the just administration of affairs in our foreign relation.

The Filipinos, unhappily, have been dependents and the victims of tyranny for three hundred years, and when they hoped that by their own exertions and by our timely aid they had escaped from the taskmaster and achieved their own independence, lo and behold, by the administration of such gentlemen as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and those who subscribe to and entertain the same philosophy, they found themselves face to face with the unexpected condition that the rescuer was merely going to take the place—was determined to take the place—of the despoiler from whom they had escaped. And yet we are told the relation is that of twinship, and the anecdote of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] not only saves time, but makes clear his understanding of what he says. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman says that we are to hold these islands in perpetuity. He says it is a condition; that we have them and can not get rid of them. He says that upon this side we had as much to do with bringing on the war with Spain as those upon that side, and therefore the conclusion which he would draw, but which is totally unwarranted and totally unsupported in logic and in facts, is that we are as much responsible as gentlemen upon that side for our present relations to the Philippine Islanders. I deny it.

The war for the relief of Cuba; the war to aid the Cuban in his struggle against tyranny and for freedom; the war that was launched with a brave declaration of patriotic unselfishness, made here and echoed in the other Chamber; the war that the American people took up as a war of relief, a war of patriotism, a war of humanity, was not designed by us as a war of subjugation. It was not designed by us as a war of spoliation. In its objects and in its fruits it was not turned by us into criminal aggression, to a perversion of every principle of the Republic, to the assertion of every doctrine and the emulation of every practice of despotism. That does not lie with us. We do not carry that responsibility. The guilt is not upon us. You must bear that burden yourselves.

Is it true that there is any connection, logically and naturally, patriotically and constitutionally, between the war for the relief of Cuba and a perpetual occupation of the distant Philippine Islands by force of arms, the subjugation of their inhabitants, the forcing of our Government upon them, the maintenance, at tremendous cost in blood and in treasure to the American people, of an alien rule over an alien race? I deny that there is any connection. We were not bound to acquire the Philippine Islands. If we had adhered to the spirit in which we engaged in the war, if we had been true to the lofty purposes and the holy traditions of our own country and our own Government we never would have acquired them.

We would have scorned the suggestion that, starting in as deliverers, starting in as the champions of freedom, as the rescuers of the oppressed, we ourselves in turn should become the spoils-men and the oppressors and the tyrants. We would have scorned the suggestion; we would have had nothing to do with the islands except to give over their control gladly, not grudgingly, to the people who dwelt there and who had endured many things grievous to be borne and multitudes of whom had died in the effort to free themselves from Spanish tyranny.

And what we ought to have done then, we still can do. The door is not closed. What bars us? What fell agency stands between the great American Republic and the right? What is across our pathway leading as honor directs, to where glory may be won by the doing of a just and generous deed? Point it out. Where is the goblin? Where is the opposing force? Where is the impassable barrier? It is merely a figment of the imagination of gentlemen, merely a phantom of their waking dreams. Why, the gentleman's own philosophy—that we are as powerful as any other nation, that whatever any nation can do we have the power and the right to do—is a refutation of his claim.

Do we lack the power and the right to take the hand of the spoilsman from off the islands of the far-away seas? Do we lack the power and the right to give liberty to 10,000,000 people who are struggling and dying for it? Do we lack the power and the right to take the mailed hand from the throats of men who are crying out for liberty and for independent national existence? Ah, no; we do not lack either the power or the right. Who is to interfere?

Not a nation upon the earth to oppose, not an obstacle in our path, not a power but our own greed and vanity and selfishness to stand in the way of a grand achievement, by a grand Republic—

the crowning by grand and glorious deeds of a grand and glorious war, undertaken for liberty and humanity. There is no difficulty in the way except our own perversity, no difficulty in the way except the juggling with the Constitution which some of the gentleman's friends are doing. There is no trouble for us if we will do right.

Something has been said about our duty to other nations. What duty have we to other nations that compels us to emulate them in tyranny? What duty have we to other nations that calls upon us to abandon the teachings and the principles of our own Constitution, to spit upon our own records, to stultify ourselves at home and abroad? None. And yet the gentlemen comes in here with his bill, without a suggestion in his report that this is new legislation, without the caution mark that is ordinary in an appropriation bill when it carries new legislation.

He comes in with this \$500,000 Manila barracks item, which has been usurped from the Committee on Military Affairs. If there are armaments to be made or quarters to be built, if there is business of that kind to be done, there is a committee of this House whose duty it is to consider it; not the committee that has usurped the consideration of it, not the committee that has magnified itself into great notoriety, but the committee charged with the duty, under the rules of the House, to consider and report upon such matters.

Why does the gentleman rush into it? Why is this brief little report of a few lines brought here to the House, covering up and hiding rather than disclosing and revealing what this bill contains? Why? Because some other nation may do it? Because our Committee on Appropriations has the same power and right as any other committee appointed to a similar office in any other nation? Even if that be conceded, will the gentleman follow it up with the other part of the declaration, that this Committee on Appropriations here differs from other committees on appropriations in other lands in that they can do wrong, but this committee does what is right, and only what is right?

The gentleman from Illinois is further ready, as he tells us, to provide liberally for a committee or commission to go abroad to the coronation of the King of England. He tells us how he adores the Anglo-Saxon language; how sweet to his senses and how soothing to his ears are Anglo-Saxon words; how he loves those words; and how England is the mother country; and how its civilization is the same as ours. What is the civilization which Britain is furnishing to the world, in example, to-day? What is it?

Upon the fields of South Africa behold as gallant a people as ever had an existence in the history of the world, struggling and dying man after man, and not only men, but women and children, in the defense of home, in the defense of country, in the defense of liberty, in the defense of a republic—against what? Against that "civilization" that is striving with might and main, in overwhelming force, by all the arms and agencies that a mighty nation can bring against a weak nation, by all the force that aggressive wrong can hurl upon defenseless right, not only to crush out the life of the South African Republic, but to destroy utterly, root and branch, everything, great or small, old or young, armed or unarmed, that breathes in that South African country the breath of freedom, that scorns tyranny, that loves liberty and home well enough to fight and die for them.

That is the "civilization" which is said to be part and parcel of ours—the same kind as ours.

True we are furnishing something of an exemplification of civilization of that kind; but I believe that when the American people realize its enormity, realize what it is, when their pride is stirred, when their memories are quickened, and when they review and study our glorious history and glorious achievements and the grand institutions of our own favored land, then in their sober second thought, with the scales dropped from their eyes, with patriotism bounding and bubbling in their hearts, with sympathy actuating them in thought and in purpose—I can not but believe that when that time comes—God speed its coming!—the American people will not suffer themselves to be made the dupes of those who would have them furnish examples of the "civilization" whose purpose is spoliation, whose course is the track of the storm, whose peace is the calm of the desert, the quiet of death.

I do not believe in that brand of civilization. Let us turn from it to the prouder and grander civilization and citizenship of the American Republic. In spite of everything tending to discredit him, with his love of liberty as a talisman, the true American, I believe, will yet demand that right be done at home and abroad.

You can not get away from these islands! Oh, no; honor is involved. How tender some gentlemen are upon this subject of honor! Honor in turning against a weak ally! Honor in turning our own arms against the feeble men who fought by our side and aided in our success! Honor in crushing to earth those who aspire to liberty! Honor in dealing destruction, in the name of our Republic, upon the creators and devotees of another republic, even in the far-off islands of the sea! I do not understand it so.

I do not believe that the American people in their sober second thought will so understand it.

What spirit of grasping, what genius of greed, what perverted sentiment prompted us in setting the Constitution aside and forgetting all of our past? What blindness permitted us to enter into this treaty by which we acquired those islands from a vanquished foe lying prostrate at our feet, beaten here and beaten everywhere, not having anything in the islands and nothing of title to them except what had been obtained and lost by three hundred years of crime?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Would it not be well in asking the necessity of that treaty for that gentleman to include one William Jennings Bryan, and ask him why he procured by his own exertion the ratification of that treaty?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, of course I am not authorized to answer for William Jennings Bryan; nor am I nearly as able, if authorized, as a certain other gentleman was to speak for his successful competitor in the Presidential race. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I have no authorization whatever; and so I can say, gently, kindly, and confidentially, in this august presence, that I am not authorized even as was the gentleman who assumed to speak for the Presidential competitor of Mr. William Jennings Bryan; I have no more authority to speak for him than I have to speak for Mr. Bryan.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman from Missouri allow me a statement?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Yes; this is interesting.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman from Missouri knows what every other honest man knows, that I never in my life, here or anywhere else, in public or in private, assumed to speak for the successful competitor of William J. Bryan. It has been stated here over and over again, and has not escaped the knowledge of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I would not by even an inadvertence do the gentleman from Ohio any harm, and of course I would not magnify his office against his protest. [Laughter.] I did not say that the gentlemen ever asserted an authority on the part of the President of the United States to speak for the President. But there was something in the manner of the gentleman from Ohio; there was something in the all-persuasiveness of the statements which he would make; there was something in that air of authority and sanctity that somehow gathers about him [laughter]; there was something that echoed in the tones of his voice; something that appeared in the attitude and beamed from the countenance of the gentleman [laughter], which suggested that the gentleman did not care to combat the idea of inspiration, if it were abroad. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Now, I find that it was all like so many other things, a mere illusion, a mere appearance, a mere seeming. [Laughter.]

But to recur to William Jennings Bryan. I have said that I had no authority to speak for him; he is one of those gentlemen who speaks for himself, and does it exceedingly well. [Applause.] Yet I would like to advert for a moment to the suggestion which the gentleman from Ohio made concerning Mr. Bryan and the treaty. I have not much doubt that the gentleman himself and other gentlemen who talk from the same standpoint and for the same purpose, like the gentleman from Illinois, desiring to economize time, find it convenient in talking about the treaty and the Philippine problem to note Mr. Bryan's attitude and quote from Mr. Bryan's utterances on the subject, and then pass on.

Let us have a few words, if we can, of clear, common sense, and a historical account of that matter. In the first place, Mr. Bryan was for the ratification of the treaty. I say now, as I have said many times in public and in private, that I believe now, and have always believed since the question arose, that Mr. Bryan was wrong, and that it would have been far wiser, far better, if Mr. Bryan had said nothing on the subject, entertaining the views that he did entertain upon it. I will tell you how the question of whether the treaty ought to be ratified presented itself to Mr. Bryan. Mr. Bryan's error was due to overconfidence in the American people. I hope that future events will show that he was right, although the manifestation that he was right be a little tardy in appearing.

Mr. Bryan was of the opinion that as the war was actually over, as the fighting was done, the expense of maintaining a large army ought to be lifted from the shoulders of the American people; that the danger in camp of idleness, dissipation, and sickness to the soldiers, who had nothing more to do until formally discharged, ought to be avoided and ended. Mr. Bryan did not believe that the treaty was good, that the treaty was what it ought to be, and he never said that or anything like it; but he believed that inasmuch as the treaty had been made, inasmuch as it was the only treaty pending, inasmuch as its ratification would be to

formally end the war and discharge the soldiers who then were useless, it would be better to ratify it and trust to the sense and fairness and patriotism of the American people to deal later with the questions involved.

He favored the ratification of the treaty, but he did not favor the imposing of our Government upon the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands. Upon the contrary, he trusted to the great, broad, patriotic spirit of the American people to relieve them from such control as we acquired under the treaty, set them upon their feet, and bid them Godspeed as they would make their way into the family of nations, and watch over them a little time with disinterested care.

So, whatever gentlemen may think—and I have said what I think about the wisdom of the ratification of that treaty—whatever gentlemen may think about it, what you have done since the ratification, and what you did not intimate or declare you would do, is not at all chargeable to anyone on this side, or chargeable to Mr. Bryan.

Had you declared that your purpose was to hold the Philippine Islands perpetually; that it was your purpose to hold those people down at the point of the bayonet; that it was your purpose to establish and maintain a perpetual colonial government upon the other side of the world; that it was your purpose to expend seventy-five to one hundred million dollars of the American people's money annually in carrying on that performance abroad; that it was your purpose to fill the churchyards in city and town and country with the bravest and best of the young manhood of the land in sustaining that policy—had you proclaimed these things, your treaty never would have been ratified; your treaty never could have been ratified. [Applause on Democratic side.]

And how weak is your defense now; how short are you now of reasons for what you have done or excuse for it, when you appeal to the fact that Mr. Bryan was in favor of the ratification of the treaty as a reason for all that you have done and an excuse for all that you may do. It will not answer.

I go as far as you go in the expression of a difference in judgment from Mr. Bryan on that point. The ratification of the treaty was one thing. But the things that you dared not hint at, things which most of you did not dream of, things which if announced would have appalled you, things which you would have declared your opposition to, things which you have since done and things which you are now doing and things which you are about to do—they are quite different from anything that was thought of at the time as involved in the ratification of that treaty. Do not charge your swinging away from American principles and from your solemn professions to anybody but yourselves.

There was pending in the Senate at the time this treaty was ratified, if I recollect aright—when you had not disclosed your position on this question—a resolution declaring it to be the policy of the United States to give freedom to these islands. There was not one man in ten in the country who believed when that treaty was ratified that you were going to hold the islands as an American possession at the point of the bayonet; that you were going to force alien rule upon the inhabitants there; that you were going to endeavor to make in the far-away seas another Poland or Ireland; that you were going to follow the "civilization" of Great Britain as exemplified in South Africa.

There was not a hint of that. American sense and American patriotism were against it. By pretense, by subterfuge, by concealment, by inroads upon the Constitution, by disregard of the plainest mandates of the law, you are now doing that which then you did not even threaten, and which a large number of you then would have bitterly opposed.

You can not now escape the responsibility for this; it is upon you. Time and time again you have been appealed to, not in the spirit of partisanship, but in the spirit of broad Americanism, for our common country, above party and independent of party, to preserve our institutions, to tarnish not our good name, to sully not our banner, to foster liberty instead of implanting tyranny, to make people free instead of making them slaves—to give to the Filipinos what you claimed for yourselves instead of denying it to them.

In closing, I appeal to you, if I may, speaking for myself, to let the question drop out of politics, not force it into politics. I appeal to you as Americans; I appeal to you as descendants of our sires of 1776; I appeal to you upon the common, broad, elevated ground of American patriotism to recur to American principles, to stand by the Constitution, to cease this policy of terrorism and destruction in those far-away islands, and allow a republic which you blighted and destroyed to spring up again and flourish there, with no American hand to strike it down. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand what purport to be the notes of an extract from a speech made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] during my absence from the House. I ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

How much can we get out of it? Why, I remember a long time ago in this House that somebody asked my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] how long he intended to hold these islands. He replied that "we intended to hold them until we could squeeze all the money out of them we could get." That was just exactly the same language that my distinguished fellow citizen, Jesse James, used about holding up a railroad train [Laughter], "until he could get all the money out of it he could;" and he kept up that business until a Democratic governor laid him away in his grave.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would be glad if the gentleman from Missouri would state when those remarks were made by "the gentleman from Ohio."

Mr. CLARK. Why, Mr. Chairman, I can not give the date—the gentleman has made so many speeches in this House.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will give—

Mr. CLARK. Wait a minute. They were made during some of the innumerable set-tos which have taken place about this colonial business—somewhere from the beginning to the last.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will give the gentleman the date when they were not made. I never made such remarks—neither here nor elsewhere. I imagine the gentleman has probably tortured a few remarks that fell from my lips on one occasion upon the top of the Allegheny Mountains into an understanding something like this, and if he has carried that recollection with him up to this time it must have been a very unpleasant one to him. There are several gentlemen in the House who were present at that debate and can say if I used such language.

Mr. CLARK. This was said on the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I have never said such a thing in my life. I have never thought such a thing, and do not know of anybody who does think it, unless it be the gentleman from Missouri himself, and his imagination is so fertile and so genial that it is possible in some way he has succeeded in finding something somewhere or some suggestion of something of the kind. But, I repeat, I never used the expression. I have never said such a thing and never expect to.

And, Mr. Chairman, let me say that this is the second time that the gentleman from Missouri has made such a statement, and both times in my absence, and I will be greatly obliged to him if he will search the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD through for anything that he thinks will justify him in that suggestion. Search the records, for in them ye think ye have proof of your statement, and they are they which testify the truth.

But, Mr. Chairman, I shall not associate the gentleman from Missouri with Jesse James, but rather with one of Captain Marryat's characters—not exactly a human character, but that character may have suggested to the gentleman his imagery in regard to the Philippine Islands. Snarleyow was a scuttler, and I fear my friend will turn out to be one.

Now, I wish to speak upon another question. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], who has just taken his seat, has repeated the able speech that he made a few days ago in large part. I always like to hear it. It is a very eloquent argument, but would have been much more forcible if it were not for the fact that it was the current stock in trade of the campaign period of 1900, and made with the same degree of vigor and earnestness everywhere, and by a thousand men in the United States, made in a thousand newspapers in the United States, and overwhelmingly repudiated by the people of the United States in the election which immediately followed.

But I want to speak upon another question for a very few moments, and much more to ask the indulgence of the House at the close of my remarks than for the remarks themselves. The United States is a very great country. That will scarcely be questioned. To-day in all of the mighty industries of the world the United States stands No. 1—the greatest producer of all that falls from the labor of the hand of man. To-day we are sending our magnificent products into every civilized country of the earth, and finding a market under the very eaves and upon the very threshold of the manufactories of the Old World. Great strife for commercial supremacy is going on, and in very large part the United States stands the successful rival and undisputed competitor not alone of any one of the nations, but of all the nations of the world; and this is largely due to the fact that all the nations of the world are in large part joined together for the purpose of standing by each other and protecting their markets and disposing of their products, the result of their great industrial systems amongst each other.

Now, in the matter of production, the products of manufacturing establishments in the United States, we produce cheaper than anybody else, and in the matter of this production we stand at the very head of the list of the nations in that great sphere of national independence—the production of food supplies. In this no country can compete with our own. And yet, sir, there is one fact alone that mars the history and statement of our great success. There is one condition that stands in the way of the growth of our national independence, and our national supremacy in these matters

in all of the mighty productions of our country as compared with the other countries of the world—our products that are going abroad day by day and thronging the markets of the Old World, and not only to the civilized nations of the Old World, but to the semicivilized countries and to the oriental countries as well—and that is that we are carrying in our own ships and under our own flag less than 8 per cent of the 100 per cent of our products which we thus ship abroad.

We are levying tribute upon all the nations of the earth in the sale to them of our products of the field and the factory; we are levying tribute upon all the nations of the world and compelling them by force of our competition to purchase from us; we are forcing upon the world the great productions of this country in a fair share and degree, and yet we are paying to-day to the people of the Old World, in cash, out of the pockets of the American people, \$200,000,000, or about that sum, annually for the single item of the carriage and freight and transportation upon the products of the American people.

I know it has been stated, Mr. Chairman—and in this connection let me say that it is a most erroneous and misleading statement—that we are constantly showing an increase in our foreign transportation; that our merchant marine is certainly and steadily growing, and attention is called to the report of the Commissioner of Navigation of the Treasury Department to show the number of ships we are building in the United States, and it is a fact that during the year ending on the 1st of January we built more ships in the United States than in any other year of our history.

But it is also equally true and a fact worthy of consideration, Mr. Chairman, that only one of these ships was a first-class ocean-going ship for the foreign trade between the United States and the foreign countries of the world. Our legislation has built up our coastwise trade, and our shipyards have been busy in this class of building. But this condition does not apply to our foreign trade and our foreign shipping. So that instead of our foreign trade in our own ships and under our own flag growing in this country it is going the other way, and going the other way at a rate startling to the American people.

We have the raw material for the building of ships cheaper than any other great nation of the world. We have the finished product for the manufacture of great ships quite as cheaply furnished as in any other country of the world; but the trouble about our shipbuilding consists in the fact that we pay to the laborer of the United States engaged in that industry far higher wages than any other country of the world. But that is not the real question. That is not the thing that underlies our disadvantage and places us in the secondary position which we occupy. It is because we are paying such enormous wages to our seamen, 40 per cent more, I am told, at the lowest and most favorable computation to the American shipowner and ship manager, 40 per cent in addition to the average wages paid to the foreign sailor are paid by the American owner to-day.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose on this occasion to argue out the reasons for all this. Great Britain has been our greatest competitor, and she has ruled the waves in her domination of the marine service of the world; but the time has come when, by the testimony of British boards of trade and British mercantile associations and British shipping organizations, we discover conclusively that other nations are gaining upon Great Britain. During the last summer an investigation took place by a committee of the board of trade of London to ascertain as far as possible what was the real difficulty in the way of British trade; why it was that France and Germany, and even Norway and some of the other countries of Europe, were steadily gaining in the amount of their shipping and in the control of the mercantile business of the world.

With the consent of the House, which I propose to ask at the close of what I have to say, I shall put in the RECORD a condensed, but accurate, résumé of the testimony taken before this body, showing exactly this state of facts: That every civilized nation that operates upon the sea recognizes the fact that the nation that subsidizes its shipping is the nation that is growing in the control of the markets of the world. It is not alone the carrying of the product of American industry on the foreign ship into the foreign market. We must have lines of ships ready and willing to carry our products to the new markets where our interests have been developed. It is impossible to suppose that a German line of steamers will carry our merchandise upon most favorable terms to points in Europe where the markets may be most advantageous to us. On the contrary, if we would avail ourselves of those markets that are standing ready for our invasion we must invade them with the American ship, under an American registry, willing to go where American genius has blazed the way and discovered the market.

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. THAYER. Are you aware that there is now in process an amassing of capital, a uniting of four of the shipbuilding and ship navigating companies of this country, and the same number in Great Britain, in anticipation of uniting with four French and German lines in one grand combine?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am not aware of it, nor do I believe it.

Mr. THAYER. You saw it in yesterday's paper?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I saw in yesterday's paper a great many things besides that, some of which I knew to be true and some of which I doubted.

Mr. THAYER. This is a Republican paper which made the statement.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But you must remember that Republican papers talk with Democrats sometimes. [Laughter.] I do not know anything about the proposed community of interest which has been suggested among some of the great steamship lines of Europe. But no subsidy bill will benefit those people, because by the very terms of the bill not one of them can have an interest in any subsidy bill introduced in this Congress. Therefore, if what the gentleman has stated be true, the sooner the American people break down any combination of the character he mentions by a general subsidizing of everybody's freight ship that wants to carry American products to foreign countries, the sooner we will be rid of the effect of any oppressive combine like that.

Mr. THAYER. Is it not true that the bill must be very differently drawn from the one which was considered here at the last session?

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will do me the favor to read the bill I think he will discover that it has been framed very largely to meet the objections which the gentleman and others made in the last session; and I have no doubt that the gentleman will be just as ready with a new set of objections to the bill that has been framed to meet his objections. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, the point of these reports is this, and I do not wish to be diverted from it, for I do not intend now to make an exhaustive discussion of the shipping subsidy bill, nor of the river and harbor subsidy bill, nor of the irrigation subsidy bill, nor any of the other subsidy bills that we have before this House. But I want to point out that in the ratio that any one of the civilized countries of the world has subsidized its steamships, the trade of that country has all the time increased; and in the ratio that it has gone ahead of another, that country's trade in foreign markets has been increased, while the other countries have fallen off.

Now, Mr. Chairman, without taking any further time, I ask unanimous consent to publish in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the statements which I have referred to, with other statements illustrative of the same proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, Mr. Chairman, before I close I want to call attention to another argument which we shall no doubt hear. I want to refer to it simply for the purpose of putting in the RECORD a sufficient answer to it. I hold in my hands a newspaper publication, from the State of Connecticut, I believe. At all events, it contains a suggestion made about a remedy for all the ills we are laboring under, under the head of "Strong opposition to the subsidy proposition." It is this:

There is a simple and certain way to build up our merchant marine, the way it was done under the navigation laws prior to 1828. A method analogous to and on all fours with the principles of a protective tariff, the only way that the Republican party has been pledged to, and that is by a discriminating duty. This method admits of no appropriations, no inequality, no injustice, no intricacy, absolutely legal, open to the poor as well as the rich. It is just, it is proper. It is strictly in keeping with the principles of the Republican party, and, more, it is truly American.

Yours, very truly,

W. S. MANNING.

It will be very strange if our Democratic friend should be found in favor of a discriminating duty.

It was the doctrine of the Republican party, apparently inadvertently adopted and put into one or two national platforms, based upon the operation of the law of 1828, or the one referred to by the gentleman who writes that article, and I want to submit a sufficient answer to the whole idea of discriminating duties, and I will read from the report which I had the honor to make on the subsidy bill two years ago:

The first measure suggested in the last Congress was that of discriminating duties on imports. In support of that method of relief it has been said that while the United States imposed discriminating duties in the earlier history of the Republic our commerce under our flag very largely increased. That it did increase during a period when a law for discriminating duties was in force is undoubtedly true, but that it increased for that reason is, in very large degree, an erroneous conclusion. As to countries with which we had no treaties of equal commercial rights, and with the territories of Great Britain in North America and to a certain extent with the West Indies, we were free to make such discriminations in favor of our own flag, but the trade arising under those conditions was comparatively small, and in most

cases ships and cargoes under our flag were in such other countries and territories put at a disadvantage equivalent, and sometimes more than equivalent, to our discrimination.

In all such cases retaliation, in one form or another, is almost the necessary consequence, as we have ourselves proved in recent years, as well as earlier ones, in our own measures, usually confided to the discretion of the President, to meet what we conceived to be unequal and excessive exactions on our ships and cargoes in such foreign ports. Under present circumstances, it is sufficient to say that in a resort to discriminating duties, even if it were supposed we could impose them, their effect would not be to produce the result desired. Our existing treaties with every commercial nation on the globe forbid such discrimination, except, as we have stated, in respect of British North America and to a degree with the British West Indies.

Looking at the immediate and urgent necessity of measures for the public welfare arising from the conditions we have already stated, it is obvious that if Congress were willing to authorize the President to terminate all these commercial treaties, the time required—one or two years after notice given—would be so great as in a large degree to diminish the advantages of immediate action. And it may be added that it is open to the gravest question whether the resort to discriminating duties, if we were free to do so at this moment, would be of advantage to the United States. We may, therefore, leave out of the question this method of accomplishing the end desired.

That is an answer to the whole of this editorial suggestion on the result of discriminating duties. Why, Mr. Chairman, the proposition has grown up in various Administrations of the Government until we find ourselves not only in the position where discriminating duties would be met by retaliatory duties, but discriminating duties would be met by the announcement at once of nearly all the civilized countries of the world that our commercial treaties had been abrogated by our own violation of the treaties.

Mr. Chairman, with these remarks I conclude the speech so far as the present is concerned. I shall not attempt to reply to the speech of the gentleman from Missouri at this time. There is a campaign coming some time during the fall of the present year, when stump speeches will again be in order, but I think it will be well for the Republican side of the House to make no response to speeches that were repudiated in 1900, but be prepared with a fresh outfit when the issues in 1903 shall be before the people.

The following is the statement referred to in my remarks:

PELHAM, N. Y., January 8, 1903.

SIR: The subsidizing of shipping for the purposes of increasing our resources of national defense, for increasing our foreign trade, and for securing assured stability of transportation, is one of the subjects commanding widespread attention, in view of legislation now pending in Congress and before the committee of which you are chairman. In these circumstances, and being mindful of the importance of having placed before your committee and Congress, and thus the people at large, late information of value on the subject, I have ventured in the following pages to lay before you some of the facts and opinions contained in a report on steamship subsidies issued on August 1, 1901, by a select committee of the British Parliament, acting under the following resolution:

"THURSDAY, May 23, 1901.

"Ordered, That it be an instruction to the select committee appointed to inquire into the system of subsidies to steamship companies under foreign governments and the effect thereby produced on British trade that they do also report on similar bounties to sailing ships."

The report in question is inconclusive, except as to the testimony and subsidiary reports presented, which sets forth the views of the leading officials of the British Government concerned with the foreign trade of that Empire and of the shipowners and shipbuilders interested in its promotion. Considering the leading position occupied by British shipbuilding and shipowning in the world's commerce, it seems to me that too much weight and consideration can not be given by either Congress or the American people to the matter elicited. Right here it may be proper, in view of its brevity, to insert the report of the select British parliamentary committee on steamship subsidies:

"Your committee are of the opinion that at this late period of the session it will not be in their power to conclude their investigation. They have therefore agreed to report the evidence already taken to the house and to recommend that a committee upon the same subject be reappointed early in the next session of Parliament, August 1, 1901."

The hearings were 16 in number, beginning on June 11 and closing on August 1, 1901, the evidence alone occupying 256 pages, aggregating about 250,000 words, supplemented by some 60 pages of appendices and a voluminous and very valuable topical alphabetical index occupying 47 additional pages.

It is proper to say that the suggestion of the parliamentary investigation arose from the apparently heavy loss of British trade with eastern South Africa and the accompanying loss of carrying suffered by British ships through the competition of the subsidized lines of other nations, chiefly Germany. It was intended that the original scope of the inquiry should be confined largely to the causes for and the remedies applicable to this condition, and the original resolution instructed the committee to "consider and report upon the political and commercial advantages to be gained by encouraging British steamers to circumnavigate Africa, especially having reference to the east coast, and to report on the best means of giving them such encouragement."

This motion, the first recorded on the subject, was offered by Mr. Evelyn Cecil, who was elected chairman of the select committee subsequently appointed. But, as I have said, the scope of the inquiry was made extremely broad, as is shown by the resolution adopted, as quoted above. Your special attention is invited to the phrasing of Mr. Cecil's motion, and to the fact that he regarded "political" no less than "commercial" considerations involved, and that he, at least, thought that "political and commercial advantages" might be "gained by encouraging British steamers," and since the investigation as finally ordered was confined to the consideration of subsidies to steamships and bounties to sailing vessels, it would appear that the British Parliament, at least, was ready to disregard all other methods than those in arriving at "the best means of giving them such encouragement." The significance, no less than the suggestiveness of the limitations of the scope of the investigation, should not, therefore, be lost sight of by your committee or by Congress in the consideration of the evidence elicited.

For brevity's sake I shall confine the scope of this review of that testimony to a condensation of the salient points contained in the testimony of two important officials of the British Government, although I should be very much pleased, should you deem it of value or importance, to supplement this review with another devoted to still other important information brought to light through the investigation.

The first witness who appeared before the British Parliamentary committee was Sir Alfred Bateman, the comptroller-general of the commercial, labor, and statistical department of the board of trade, that board being, as you are no doubt aware, one of the great departments of the British Government. Sir Alfred Bateman has been connected with his department for thirty-seven years. He first brought to the attention of the committee the maritime policy of France, the subsidies paid to her steamships, and the bounties on construction and on navigation. He stated that, in France, "the total subventions for postal services have amounted in recent years to rather over a million sterling per annum."

A sum almost as large is annually paid by the French Government in bounties on construction and navigation. As to Germany, he said in part: "Assistance to shipbuilding is given only in the form of remission of customs duty and preferential railway rates for certain materials used in construction. As regards navigation bounties indirect assistance is given to two German steamship lines, the German East Africa Line and the German Levant Line, in the form of largely reduced rates of carriage for goods sent over the State railways for shipment by these lines." It is possible that the enormous increase in the export trade of Germany, as well as the growth of her aided steamship lines, have as their basis quite as much "the largely reduced rates of carriage for goods sent over the State railways for shipment by these lines," as in the direct pecuniary assistance received by them from the German treasury. As regards Austria, the Austrian Lloyd Steamship Company, he showed, receives subsidies not to exceed £242,500 annually. "Certain dues (that is, as to Suez Canal, etc.) are refunded" by the Austrian Government "to the company. The State advanced to the company one and a half million florins toward shipbuilding, to be paid in five yearly payments beginning January, 1902."

Besides, the line in question "has certain privileges as regards pratique and consular fees." The company also received "£5,000 per annum for parcel-post services." In Austria, at least, one might suppose from the evidence in hand, the Government felt a deep concern and showed extreme liberality in the development of a single steamship line. Probably, too, the very last matter to which the Government gave consideration in so doing was the advantages derived by or the benefits bestowed upon the Austrian owners of the line in question, that being a mere incident, reasons of state as well as of commerce doubtless being the controlling influences. Besides the sums paid to the Austrian Lloyd trading bounties and trip bounties are paid to other vessels, the trading bounties being 6 florins per ton for iron and steel steamers, 4.50 florins per ton for iron or steel sailing ships, and 3 florins for wooden or composite sailing ships during the first year after the ship's launch, these amounts decreasing by 5 per cent yearly and ceasing altogether after fifteen years.

This compensation is "increased by 10 per cent for ships built in national dock yards, and 25 per cent if constructed to the extent of at least one-half of home-produced materials." "The trip bounty is paid to vessels inscribed on the register at the rate of 5 kreutzers per ton burden (net) for every 100 nautical miles" * * * These trading and trip bounties amounted, in 1890, to 54,280 pounds sterling. In addition to these, other postal subsidies amounting to 17,208 pounds sterling were paid to companies other than the Austrian Lloyd in 1890. It is interesting to note that a law of 1895, providing for construction bounties to ships in the Hungarian mercantile marine, has hitherto been inoperative, the total tonnage "having been constructed in the United Kingdom." Italy pays bounties on construction and navigation.

"The bounty for navigation is paid on Italian-built vessels only, at the rate of 40 cents per gross ton per 1,000 miles run for steamers up to the fifteenth year after construction and 20 cents for sailing vessels up to the twenty-first year after construction. The yearly distance traveled on which bounties will be paid is limited to 32,000 miles for steamers with a speed of less than 12 miles per hour, 40,000 miles for steamers with a speed of from 12 to 15 miles an hour, 50,000 miles for steamers with a speed of over 15 miles per hour, and 10,000 miles for sailing vessels. The grand total to be paid in any one year is not to exceed 400,000 pounds sterling, and the amount of tonnage on which this and the bounty on construction are to be paid is also limited year by year for a series of years." Holland pays subventions only "for particular services for the regular transport of the mails," and at a rate per voyage.

The colonial government also supplements these subsidies "for certain services in the Dutch East Indies," the whole sum in 1898 amounting to 1,604,445 florins. "Then as to Sweden and Norway, Norway contributes sums for the maintenance of various services of which only a portion are admittedly for postal services," about £9,933 going for postal services and £18,333 "for state subvention." Both the proportion and the distinction are important, especially in view of the oft-made assertion that Norway and Sweden give no aid to their shipping. "In Sweden small sums only have been paid, principally to the steamship company Gothland, for maintaining traffic. The sums paid as subventions for postal services are considerably larger, but of no very great importance, amounting in all to £16,891." From this we learn that even Norway and Sweden find it to their advantage to pay subsidies, not alone for postal services, but for "maintaining traffic," that is to say, for assuring stability of interchange of commodities and the holding of foreign markets for the products of their people.

In this very connection it is quite interesting and pertinent to note that in the appendixes of the Report of the British Parliamentary Committee on Steamship Subsidies considerable space is given to a correspondence originating with the Messrs. Wilson (shipowners) and the British Government, in which the former draw the attention of the latter to the Norwegian subsidies, their first letter concluding with the following paragraph:

"We were the pioneers in these particular trades (between Norway and England), and have up to now maintained the trades in spite of this unfair competition; and it is not to the interest of English passenger traffic and the maintenance of English steamer lines that we should be driven out by the deliberate attack made by the Norwegian Government, with the avowed object of getting all the trade under the Norwegian flag; and we beg to ask that an inquiry be made by your department (the British foreign office) either with the result of inducing the Norwegian Government to withdraw their subsidy, or that we should have a subsidy sufficient to enable us to compete on fair terms."

This statement, from one of the largest firms of British shipowners, throws a flood of light upon the benefits of subsidies to foreign ships in competition with British ships, their disadvantages to British lines, and the means sought whereby their discontinuance, or a subsidy equivalent to the benefits received by the foreign rivals, be provided by the British Government. In a subsequent letter to the British foreign office the Messrs. Wilson assert that "it is of vital importance to the continuance of English steamers to the west coast of Norway that they should not be subjected to this ruinous competition." Obviously, the competition of the Norwegian lines, in order to be ruinous to their British competitors, must have been through a reduction in freight rates by the Norwegian ships that it was impossible for the British ships to profitably meet, reasons that perhaps would satisfy the Norwegian Government that the object sought through the subsidizing of the Norwegian lines was being attained, and with benefit to the Norwegian producers of the things sold in England and the Norwegian consumers of the things brought from England; because it is scarcely conceivable that the Norwegian lines could succeed by any other means than a reduction of charges, since neither Norwegians nor Britons would pay more to the Norwegian than they would to the British

lines. It is a fair assumption that in precisely the same manner benefits would be conferred upon our own people through the establishment of an effective policy by our Government upon these lines. That is to say, rates of freight would be reduced on American exports, and rates of freight would be reduced on American imports, to the obvious expansion of our trade and the benefiting of the subsidized American ships, the latter, in return, helping to fortify the nation with a resource of ships and men for auxiliary naval purposes in the ever possible need of them.

Pursuing their correspondence still further, in another letter the Messrs. Wilson state that "the portage bill (meaning monthly wages paid to officers and crews, and for victualing) of a British and a Norwegian steamer of equal register" which they submitted showed "a difference of upward of £48 monthly in favor of the Norwegian flag." Their conclusion, that "such advantages, together with the subsidies given by foreign nations to encourage their shipping is (sic) gradually, but surely, undermining British shipping," is certainly reasonable, and unquestionably impressive, as well as suggestive to ourselves. Here we have a situation of a nation, whose people are able to buy their ships as cheaply as their rivals, and to operate them more cheaply, paying subsidies in order to secure them under their own flag.

We may be sure that the Norwegians are not disposed to throw their money away or to spend it uselessly; but, if it was necessary, as doubtless it was, for Norway to supplement the advantages already possessed by her people over their British rivals with additional advantages in the way of subsidies in order to secure the establishment of Norwegian lines of ships to be run in competition with unsubsidized British ships, how much more necessary it must be for the United States Government to give subsidies to American ships in order that they may successfully overcome the advantages of cheaper ships and their cheaper operation enjoyed by foreigners in competition with American ships? And how much stronger the argument for American subsidies and bounties becomes when we reflect that not only do foreign ships possess the advantages of greater cheapness of construction and operation, but in many cases—in the large majority—these advantages are supplemented, in the case of the foreign ships, with very liberal subsidies and bounties from their several governments.

Subsequent to the letter last quoted from the Messrs. Wilson that firm brought to the attention of the British foreign office the fact that still another Norwegian subsidized steamship line was to be established between Norway and British ports—"this in addition to the already subsidized service to Newcastle." "The question," conclude the Messrs. Wilson, "is a very serious one, and if the above intention is carried out by the Norwegian Government it practically means the cessation of all British regular lines trading to the west coast of Norway." So, then, subsidies do have the effect, after all, of giving the carrying to the ships of the nation that pay them. If that is the object sought by the United States, the testimony of the Messrs. Wilson and the success of the Norwegians suggest the methods by which this nation may achieve similar results.

Again, the query naturally will arise in many minds, if the payment of subsidies by foreign governments to their own lines of ships will have the disastrous effect upon British lines complained of by the Messrs. Wilson, what effect has the more than half century payments of subsidies by the British Government to British ships had upon the previously unsubsidized shipping of foreign countries? The United States knows, from its own experiences preceding the civil war, that such payments by the British Government to steamship lines in competition with American lines had the effect, upon the withdrawal of subsidies by our Government from our lines, to drive the latter out of the trade and to leave the subsidized British lines in sole possession of it. It is a fair assumption, in the light of this experience, and in view of the apprehensions shown by a great firm of British shipowners, and evidently shared in at least to some extent by the British Parliament, in view of the investigation into the matter it has undertaken, that the revival of the subsidy policy by our Government will, as in the case of Norway and others that may be cited, cause a revival of steamship lines under our flag, with military and naval advantages to our Government and increased trade advantages to our people.

Russia, as Sir Alfred Bateman points out, now confines her coast trade to native ships, and pays subsidies, amounting in all to 2,633,000 rubles, to ships under the Russian flag. "In addition, the Government defrayed the Suez Canal dues of the first two lines to the extent of 600,000 rubles to the volunteer fleet and 200,000 rubles to the Black Sea Navigation Company. The total amount is thus 3,433,000 rubles, or about \$364,750. Just lately an agreement has been entered into with the Russian Steam Navigation Company for at least seven sailings between September and March for Bushire and Bender Abbas. The bounty is fixed at 4 rubles per sea mile. The first sailing was on February 16, 1901." In Denmark, Sir Alfred Bateman shows that £24,000 per annum are paid in subsidies to particular Danish lines. "If the freight charges," he says, "do not come up to a certain sum, the State makes good the deficiency." * * * In another case, "wharfage dues at Esbjerg are also remitted to the company."

In Belgium, in the case of a certain line, where no subsidies are paid, "certain facilities" are extended. In the case of Bulgaria, where the subsidies paid are "very small," the "Bulgarian Government purchased a quarter of the shares issued by the Bulgarian Steam Navigation Company and undertook to grant a subsidy of 9 per cent on the paid-up capital for the free carriage of mails and transport of soldiers, munitions, and State employees at half rates." * * * By a law promulgated toward the end of 1897 or the beginning of 1898 a loan of 120,000 francs was granted to the company without interest for the purpose of construction or purchase of two new vessels."

These several last-quoted cases establish the fact most clearly that the governments concerned were quite willing to fully indemnify the owners of the ships running under their flags against loss, not by any means in order to enrich the owners of the ships, but for the broader purposes, well expressed by Chairman Cecil, of securing "political as well as commercial advantages." While the methods employed necessitated safeguarding the shipowners not only against loss but of assured profits, that was a mere incident, and not the object sought—considerations that can not too clearly be impressed upon our own people and fully recognized by their Representatives in Congress when dealing with the subject themselves.

Even Portugal pays subsidies, although small in the aggregate. Sir Alfred Bateman summarizes the Japanese law "for the encouragement of shipbuilding and for the encouragement of navigation" through the payment of subsidies. "In addition, subsidies are paid to particular lines for particular services," the nature of the services, presumably not wholly postal, not being stated.

In the course of Sir Alfred Bateman's testimony it was shown that one of the effects of the quite general and extensive subsidizing of foreign steamship lines by their governments had been to not only very greatly increase the commerce of the countries granting the subsidies, but it had the further effect of diverting to near-by continental ports for transshipment British goods intended for consumption in remote and distant portions of the globe, these goods going the longer distance in the subsidized foreign instead of, as formerly, in the British ships.

Although some Americans affect to deny that Great Britain gives subsidies to British ships, yet no less an authority than Sir Alfred Bateman states that "subsidies are given by the post-office, by the Admiralty, and by the colonial office, as regards the Elder-Dempster Line." In the case of the latter

line it is instructive to learn that the subsidy paid, according to Sir Alfred Bateman, "has not so much to do with the carrying of mails; it has more to do with the carrying of bananas." For an annual subsidy of £40,000 the line in question agreed, among other things stipulated by the British Government, "to purchase at the current market rates of the day not less than 20,000 bunches of bananas for each voyage from Jamaica to an English port, and convey all bananas so purchased to the English port."

So the British have been able to coin a new designation of subsidies, namely, "the banana subsidy," with which to build up British shipping. We may well imagine with what derision and scorn a similar suggestion would be received in the United States, far less its actual incorporation in our national statutes. Not so, however, with the "mistress of the seas," who is at all times wide awake to British commercial and maritime interests, and hesitates at no method that will promote and conserve them. Sir Alfred Bateman also testifies that Great Britain pays one-half of a subsidy, the total of which is £27,000, for the subsidizing of a line of steamers running from Canadian to West Indian ports, but apparently not touching anywhere in the United Kingdom.

Extracts from British consular reports were read to the committee by Sir Alfred Bateman bearing upon the subject under investigation, one of which, written in 1890, read as follows:

"A home line of English steamers, assisted by H. M. Government—for no company without a subsidy would hope to compete with the heavily subsidized foreign lines that for many years have had agencies at Zanzibar—which could carry the mails, passengers, and cargo at a fair rate of speed and which might at the same time be economically utilized to bring out the plant required for the Uganda Railway, would not only be a great boon to British commercial houses at Zanzibar but would undoubtedly prove a powerful incentive to the development of British trade throughout East Africa."

It certainly is refreshing to note the frank admissions of British officials as to the benefits that follow the payment of subsidies for the establishment of steamship lines, in view of the quite disingenuous denial of their benefits by certain newspapers and individuals in the United States. The British consul at Zanzibar makes clear the impossibility of unaided British ships successfully competing with or supplanting a heavily subsidized foreign line that has long enjoyed through its agencies the control of the trade, and it requires no stretch of imagination for us to realize how it is that unaided American steamship lines have not been established with which to compete with the heavily subsidized lines of other nations that now enjoy, as a result of such subsidies, a practical monopoly of our foreign carrying trade.

As showing the effect of the establishment of a line of steamers in developing increased and regular trade, another British consular officer says: "A direct line of British steamers between London and Mombasa would go far to stimulate trade in British goods, as importers are strongly averse to the delays and damages transshipments entail." Precisely the same could be said of importers abroad regarding the restrictions upon American trade because of "the delays and damages transshipments entail," in such notable cases, for example, as the shipment to either England or Germany of American goods destined for the ports of South America—delays and damages that would be overcome if our Government would, by a liberal subsidy policy, cause the establishment of "direct" steamship lines to those South American countries.

Still another British consular report, discussing the trade on the coast of China, says: "It will be seen from the above how absolutely predominant the British flag is in the carrying trade. On the coast, indeed, except for the share which falls to the China Merchants' Company, we have almost a monopoly of the business. On foreign voyages the German and French mail steamers, both of which are subsidized, take a considerable share of the export trade, especially silk, most of which is invoiced to Mediterranean ports."

The next witness was Sir Henry Bergne, who is the head of the commercial department and examiner of treaties in the British foreign office. He was asked by the chairman whether "any great distinction can be drawn between a port like Zanzibar, which is not served directly by any British steamers, and ports which are? Would it effect their trade, do you think?" To which the answer was returned: "I should think it would affect the British trade, decidedly."

In precisely the same way American trade is restricted, through the lack of direct lines of American steamers between important foreign and American ports.

The following question and answer show the value of subsidies to steamship lines and how they increase a nation's trade:

"I should like to ask you a question with regard to the statements which Sir William Ward, the British consul at Hamburg, makes with reference to the advantage of German subsidies to German lines. Have you anything to say with regard to the sea-borne trade of Hamburg with the Levant and West Africa?—I think the one which shows the greatest increase is the German Asiatic line. * * * The tables together show that in 1888 the volume and value of goods carried out and homeward was £951,000 and £1,400,000. In 1898 the amounts were £2,658,000 of the first class and £3,292,000 of the second. That is a very considerable increase."

With reference to the growth of the Austrian sugar export trade the witness was questioned as to whether or not the increase was in Austrian or foreign ships, the witness finally showing that almost without exception Austrian ships did the carrying.

It was shown that while there had not been any great increase in the exports to India from foreign countries in competition with Great Britain, in the exports from India there had been large gains made by the Germans and gains by other nations, with an actual decrease in the value of the exports to Great Britain, which led to the following question and answer, inferentially explanatory of the loss to the British and the gain to the foreign competitors:

"You are aware, are you not, that all the steamers running to India are very heavily subsidized?—Yes."

"And the German, Austrian, French, and Italian steamers are very heavily subsidized, are they not?—Certainly."

In seeking information as to increases and decreases of trade, the committee asked searching questions as to whether the losses also fell upon British ships as well—whether the gains in trade and in carrying were enjoyed by foreigners—one of the members of the committee, in the course of asking a question along this line, saying:

"It is far more important to have the nationality of the carrying ships than it is to have the volume of trade." That is to say, the loss of trade might be borne, but the loss of shipping could not be.

As bearing upon the influence of subsidies upon trade, the following questions and answers, in the examination of Sir Henry Bergne, are instructive:

"Now, please, will you give the figures for Natal?—The figures for Natal are as follows (expressed in pounds sterling): In 1895 the total import was 1,518,000, of which British was 1,231,000 and German 19,500. The exports for that year totaled 877,000, of which British were 696,000 and the German was naught. I have not the figures for the other one hundred and eighty thousand odd. In 1896 the total import was 2,466,000, of which British was 1,734,000 and German 51,815. The exports for the same year totaled 1,140,000, of which British represents 673,000 and German 84,000."

"That is, from nothing?—Yes; that is from nothing in ten years. Then in 1899 the imports were 6,718,000 (of course that is during the war), of which 4,649,000 were British and German 206,000. The total exports for the same

year were 1,885,000, of which British was 778,030 and German 413,000, as compared with 84,000 in the year 1895.

"Does that include coal, do you suppose?—No, I should not think so; I do not know what it may be—it may be that the full returns give the details of the trade, but I have not them with me."

"Of course the German East African steamers have been more directly in communication during these eight or ten years with Natal than they have with the Cape, have they not?—I think so."

"They did not run to the Cape at all, did they?—No; they only established the round service last year, I think."

"So that in the Cape figures the question of German subsidized ships does not come into consideration, does it?—Hardly."

"But so far as Natal is concerned, they have existed since the time the first subsidy was given?—Quite so."

There is food for serious reflection in the foregoing. If we substitute South America for Africa and German for British ships, as compared with our own, or rather the lack of them, we see that Germany has built up and is more rapidly building up a great trade through the instrumentality of German subsidized steamship lines, with ports where but ten or fifteen years ago no trade whatever with Germany existed. To-day our trade with South America is nothing near to what it could be made with direct lines of American steamships running from American to South American ports. We lack the trade and we lack the ships. Indeed, it may be truthfully said that we lack the trade because of our lack of direct American steamship lines.

The trade with New South Wales, when examined in detail, in effect showed the same changes as did that of Natal, leading the chairman of the committee to ask:

"It is a gigantic increase compared with the British, is it not?—Yes."

"That is owing to the Germans starting a line between those two dates, I suppose?—No doubt."

The figures for the trade with Victoria were given, with practically the same showing of enormous gains for German and French trade, which led to the following questions and answers:

"Can you account for either this French or German increase; they seem to be a little irregular, but in general they are very decisive increases as compared with Great Britain?—I can not express any opinion about that."

"Of course subsidized steamers of both those countries run to Victoria, do they not?—French subsidized steamers run everywhere, because the subsidy is on miles run."

"May we take it that the increase is mainly due to the subsidized steamers being put on these various routes?—I should think it is probable; I could not say positively."

Then the statistics regarding the trade of the other two Australian colonies were read, covering the same period and dates, which was followed by the following questions and answers:

"Generally these figures show, do they not, the same tendency, though not quite so markedly, as in some of the other Australian colonies?—That is so."

"Subsidized steamers run to those places, do they not?—I think so. The Germans do, at all events."

"With regard to the cause of the increase, I suppose your opinion would be the same as you have stated with regard to the other Australian colonies, would it not?—The increase in proportion to the total trade is much smaller in these cases, so that it is not so significant as in other cases. I am not sure whether lines run there. I can give the exact routes of the German subsidized steamers to the East, if the committee would like to know them."

The list is as follows: "German subsidized steamers run from Hamburg and Bremerhaven to Antwerp, Southampton, Lisbon, Genoa, Naples, Port Said, Suez, Aden, Colombo, Singapore, Hongkong, Shanghai, Yokohama, Hiogo, Nagasaki, Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, and New Guinea; also to Tanga, Amsterdam, Las Palmas, Cape Town, Port Elizabeth, East London, Durban, Zanzibar, Dar-es-Salaam, Mozambique, Beira, Delagoa Bay, and back again, touching at the same ports."

This question was asked: "Then, again, in order to get an explanation of the fact that German trade has increased twenty-six times between 1885 and 1899, I should have to address myself to the colonial office, should I?—I think so."

Very interestingly indeed Sir Henry Bergne sketches the growth of subsidies, covering, more in detail, the points covered by Sir Alfred Bateman, as to "When shipping bounties were first given in Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Russia, and Sweden and Norway," as he explained, he thought "those countries would be sufficient for the purpose." As proving that subsidies are not paid wholly for postal purposes, the Austrian-Hungarian law specifically states that it is granted (1) as "a premium on purchase; (2) a special subvention based on voyages made in the interests of national commerce mileage." Again, in the matter of German subsidies, Sir Henry Bergne states:

"This subsidy appears to have been more in the nature of a postal subsidy, but it was also looked upon as value paid for that service combined with the many important interests of German trade, of the requirements of the navy, of a colonial policy, and of the wish to increase German prestige in certain places."

He says further: "Then, as to Russia, in 1889, Mr. Law, who was our commercial attaché in Russia, reported that he had been unable to discover that any direct assistance was given in aid of construction, but he stated that considerable indirect assistance in the form of loans and contracts was given by the Government, and he sent information regarding the grant of Government subsidies in aid of the running of ships."

While the answer given to the following question elicited nothing in reply of value, yet it is suggestive of the thought in the mind of the chairman of the committee who asked it, and is therefore worth repeating:

"Before leaving the topic with which we have been dealing, I want to ask you one question about Zanzibar. Do you think the absence of British shipping in that quarter not merely affects British trade, but to some extent affects British prestige among the native merchants and the native population there?"

If we ever expect to secure and to hold the great bulk of the Eastern Asiatic trade, which our resources and skill and our position, as well as their necessities, justify our believing we can secure and hold, we must realize the importance of the impression we shall create in conducting that trade in alien or native ships. The natives of the Orient are as impressed with visible signs of a nation's entity, the ships of her construction and the flag that flies, no less than the cargoes therefrom, as are the denizens of Africa, and we may not expect to win their respect, their confidence, or their trade if we confess our inability to become our own shipbuilders and shipowners by sending alien vessels, under alien flags, commanded by aliens, to do our carrying and to become the go-betweens in our trade relations. Nowhere is dependence so synonymous with inferiority as with the natives of the Far East, and we shall lack their respect if we employ alien ships to do our carrying with them, and the lack of respect carries with it loss of prestige, with which dominance in trade is impossible.

Had the chairman of the British Parliamentary select committee on steamship subsidies been an American official, engaged in conducting a

similar inquiry with reference to the United States, how much greater would be his apprehensions regarding his country's trade and prestige through its almost total lack of ships? The inference in the last question quoted is unmistakable. It is infinitely more suggestive to us, lacking a merchant marine in the foreign trade, than it is to Great Britain, possessing, as she does, by far the larger part of all the shipping engaged in international trade. If, in their circumstances, the British have need to be concerned regarding their country's material welfare, in which a merchant shipping is so potential a factor, how much more solicitous should the American people be, considering their circumstances.

The quotations from British consular reports made by Sir Henry Bergne, following those already quoted by Sir Alfred Bateman, and bearing upon specific examples of the value of subsidies and bounties to the ships of competing nations, are of sufficient value to deserve repetition here, since the obstacles confronting British shipping in the effort under way to maintain unimpaired British mercantile sea power are far more serious to ourselves. The British own the larger part of the world's ocean-going shipping and have enjoyed for generations the command of the greater part of the world's sea carrying. If the subsidy and bounty policies of other nations arouse the fears of the British as to the future of Great Britain's maritime supremacy, as well as seriously menace their commercial predominance in the world's great markets, what does the situation teach us? Surely, as to our own trade, at least, we may hope to secure a just proportion of its carrying in our own ships by the adoption of the same policy.

The maritime policies of other nations are not directed, per se, against Great Britain's shipping, but for the establishment of commercial marines of their own; but so great has been the British ascendancy in the carrying trade of other nations that any measures adopted by the latter to secure a shipping of their own necessarily means the displacing of British shipping. Subsidies and bounties, as applied by other nations to the creation of sea-going merchant shipping fleets of their own, seem to be succeeding. Why, then, should they not succeed with us? Why should not the successes achieved by other nations be also achieved by the United States by the adoption of the same methods? In our case, however, we have little or no experience, and no prestige whatever as a maritime power; but with the British they are entrenched in experience and fortified with prestige, the result of centuries of supreme control of the world's carrying trade. Sir Henry Bergne says:

"On the effect of subsidies I wish, with your permission, to read to the committee a few extracts which I have taken from reports received from consuls this year, which bear upon the effect of subsidies, and I think it would be of a certain amount of general interest to the committee. 'The British vice-consul at Mariupol (Kertch) reports this year: The percentage of British tonnage to the total stood in 1898 at 80 per cent; 1899, 60 per cent; 1900, 45 per cent. He ascribes this to the fact that the trade from Antwerp, formerly exclusively under the British flag, is now taken up by German and Belgian companies, who run regular lines from Antwerp and Hamburg.' That is an excerpt from a consular report which has come in this year. The second extract is from the British consul in French Indo-China, Mr. Tremlett: 'Compared with 1899, British tonnage in 1900 shows a diminution of 34 vessels and 32,507 tons register; German tonnage for the same year an increase of 18 vessels of 25,375 tons.'

"Does he give any reason for that? No; I think not. 'His Majesty's consul-general at Hamburg gives figures of British and German tonnage for 1900, and says the German is gradually replacing the British at Hamburg. Notwithstanding this, the value of British imports into Hamburg for 1900 exceeds that for 1899 by more than 2,000,000 pounds sterling, principally ascribed, however, to coal.' In connection with that, this same report has several very valuable observations, and I should like to put a copy in for the information of the committee. It will be issued in the course of a day or two now. That is the report from Hamburg for this year; I only have a proof of it in shape at present. I will read two extracts from it. He says: 'At present Hamburg has almost the monopoly of the German trade with eastern South Africa. It is indeed to be seriously feared that the new German steamer line, which will offer special advantages to the export trade of this country, will have a prejudicial effect upon British trade in South Africa, unless, indeed, British steamships are placed in a position to be able to compete with the German line on an equal footing.'

The Germans are succeeding now through a policy adopted by Great Britain over sixty years ago—that of paying subsidies to steam lines wherever trade expansion seems attainable. The Germans have ships practically as cheap as do the British, in addition to which they are manned and victualled more cheaply than British ships are. The amount of the subsidy enjoyed by the German ships, therefore, no doubt gives the latter still another advantage over the British which the latter will find it even more difficult to meet or overcome. Seeking ourselves to share in the world's trade, of which that quoted is a part, and finding the Germans with their equally cheap ships, their more cheaply manned and operated and subsidized ships, intrenching themselves in the possession of the trade, and of its carrying, to the exclusion more and more of the British, the seriousness of the undertaking in which we are to engage will be the better understood and the difficulties in our pathway the more clearly realized. We should not enter upon the contest insufficiently equipped to meet and overcome the difficulties that will beset us. For the Government to effectively protect and promote its shipping there is justification upon many grounds, the most important of which is the serious need of modern merchant ships and trained men, useful if occasion should arise for auxiliary war purposes.

But in such a contest we may be sure that the struggle will be waged with the most potent of all weapons—lower freight charges. Only by offering these may we hope to secure a share of the carrying. Upon that battle ground our rivals will surely be prepared to meet and to the utmost of their power resist us. In doing this, in the reduction of freight rates inevitable in such a struggle, our own people will unquestionably get back all they may pay out in subsidies, and the doors of the world's markets will swing open wider than ever for our present and growing surplus products. First, then, it will be the nation that will be the most benefited through the possession of additional ships and men, and, secondly, through reduced freight charges, the producers of our great staples, the surpluses of which go abroad in such vast quantities. The loss in the beginning because of the fierce and prolonged competition will fall heavily upon our shipowners, and it is unlikely that when they emerge from the struggle that freight rates will ever again be maintained at their present normal level, because the very contest itself will have compelled economies in the construction and in the operation of ships that will make for permanent lower freight charges. But to resume our consideration of the British consular quotations:

"The German trade with Singapore was prejudicially affected last year by the troubles in China. On the other hand, German shipping interests in the Straits Settlements appear to have experienced a marked development in that part of the world by the acquisition of a large number of formerly British steamers, which are employed particularly in the trade with the Far East. His Majesty's consul in New Caledonia reports this year: 'British shipping in 1900 was of less importance than in 1899, and this will continue, not only in consequence of the war in South Africa and the troubles in China, but on account of the very high subsidies paid by the French Government to

French shipping. For instance, a four-masted bark, 2,400 tons register, left Havre in ballast for Saigon, where she took in a cargo of 1,000 tons of rice for Noumea. From here she loads ore for Rotterdam, and her subsidy for the entire voyage will amount to from £6,000 to £6,400, according to the distance run.'"

These French ships have already invaded the carrying trade of the United States, notably in the carrying of grain from our Pacific ports to Europe. It behooves us, therefore, to look quite as keenly to the growing competition with which we will be confronted through the operation of these heavily subsidized and bountied ships of continental Europe as to the difficulties of matching and in part overcoming the British possession of so vast a proportion of our carrying. The Germans and French are already in the field, not so numerical as the British, but nevertheless better fortified, while we, as yet, are scarcely upon the threshold of active competition. By the time we are in the field these new factors in the world's carrying trade will be even better entrenched than now to meet and oppose our efforts. But, as has been said, the inevitable reduction in freight rates, consequent upon the contest to be waged, will more than repay the people of the United States for whatever outlay they make in order to enable American ships to successfully compete. Sir Henry Bergne continues:

"Then I have an abstract from this year's report from Malaga. The vice-consul at Almeria says: 'In this connection I must point out that British shipping is considerably hampered by bounties paid to Italian vessels, which enable them to compete with our national vessels to the latter's detriment. An owner of a large fleet of British vessels, who is also one of the principal exporters of iron ore from this place, has told me that he has frequently to employ Italian vessels to carry iron ore, to his prejudice as a shipowner; that is, he would otherwise have employed his own vessels had they been on anything like equal terms, but the subsidy of the Italian Government quite handicapped them.'"

Here, surely, is proof of the reduction in freight charges that follows the subsidizing and bountying of a nation's shipping, and, it is to be noted, upon no other plan than reduced freight charges would the competition have succeeded.

In the face of this kind of testimony, how can we blind ourselves to the necessity of Government aid for the encouragement of an American mercantile marine in our foreign trade? Or how can we deny the effectiveness of subsidies and bounties in enabling the ships receiving them to successfully compete with their foreign rivals? How futile to assert, in the light of such statements, that subsidies and bounties are unnecessary and impotent. It should not be forgotten that the statements quoted were not made in order to warn the United States, which is merely considering the advisability of undertaking the creation of an American ocean-going mercantile marine, but, rather, to warn the nation that to-day proudly boasts of unchallenged dominion of the seas. If such warnings are necessary to Great Britain, how doubly so they must be to us, lest we underrate the seriousness of the undertaking, and so, possibly, inadequately prepare to carry it to success. To resume, Sir Henry Bergne was further questioned, and testified as follows:

"Are you aware that Italian subsidies have become of such huge magnitude that they think of reducing them?—No.

"Have you not seen it stated in one of your reports?—I do not recollect it. They are getting rather large, and I believe there has been considerable debate in the Italian Chamber about it.

"You do not remember seeing it in one of your recent reports?—No, I do not remember it; it may be there for all that. I have another paper I should like to read in the same connection; it is a little long perhaps, but it is worth reading, I think. It is a dispatch we have just received from the British consul at Bordeaux, dated 3d of June, No. 8 commercial. It is addressed to the Marquis of Lansdown: 'My Lord, the question of subsidies and bounties to shipping being one often brought before His Majesty's Government, I have the honor to transmit herewith copies of a prospectus of a company it is proposed to form here to work three sailing vessels, "the capital invested being guaranteed by the insurance and the profits by the navigation bounties.'"

The sentence is one that may well stagger the British, while disclosing the serious determination of the French Government in its maritime policy. "The capital being guaranteed by the insurance and the profits by the navigation bounties." What will prevent French maritime success so fortified? The quotation continues:

"The French mercantile marine act of January 30, 1893, gives to sailing vessels, built in France, for ten years after their launch, a navigation bounty which amounts to about £4,000 per annum for a vessel of 3,200 tons. A very large number of these vessels have been built of late years in French ports in order to obtain the bounty, although nearly all the materials for their construction have been imported from the United Kingdom, under the law which admits such work free of duty for what is called 'temporary admission,' the material of the vessel when put together and sent to sea being considered to be reexported. Thus the French taxpayer provides the bounty to enable the vessels to be worked for the benefit of the shareholders, while the making of the plates and building materials in France is discouraged by the admission of foreign materials free of duty.

"In the prospectus voyages of seven different vessels are given to prove what an excellent investment French sailing vessels are. The system on which these vessels are bought, or, as the prospectus has it, 'hired,' is that half the capital is raised by shares, the remainder being lent by banks, or through them by the builders, on mortgage of the vessel at 5 per cent interest. As a matter of fact the vessels in which the Société Navale du Sud Ouest is interested have been built by a company in which some of the present promoters are interested and who now desire to raise the capital to pay for them and work them. According to the figures given it is quite true that the interest is guaranteed by the bounty, for without it there would be little or no profit at all. In the case of the vessel *Charles Gounod* the navigation bounty for thirteen months amounts to 17 per cent per annum on the value of the vessel to 34 per cent on the value of the shares, the profit on the working being one-half per cent. In the case of the *Général Neumayer* the navigation bounty amounted to 18 per cent per annum on the value of the vessel, or 37 per cent on the share capital, and allowed a dividend of 21 per cent being paid, although the expenses were nearly £1,000 greater than the receipts.

"In the case of the *Reine Blanche* the receipts were considerably below expenses, but the bounty amounted to 22 per cent on the ship's value and to 44 per cent on the share capital, allowing a dividend to be paid of 33.19 per cent per annum. The *Général de Charette*, which went from Nantes to Portland, Oreg., in ballast, brought back a cargo of wheat, after a voyage lasting ten and one-half months, and received a bounty of 20 per cent per annum on her value and 40 per cent on her share capital, so that although the freight earned was nearly 18,000 francs below the expenses the shareholders received a dividend of 25.9 per cent per annum. The *Jules Verne*, with a larger capital than the others, appears to have been worked much more economically, so that while the bounty amounted to 15 per cent per annum the dividend paid was 22.4 per cent per annum. The gem of the collection is the voyage of the *Louis Pasteur* of two hundred and seventy-four days, in ballast, to Newcastle, New South Wales, and San Francisco, and home with a cargo in one hundred and fifty-eight days to Westport, Ireland. The navigation bounty amounted to 50 per cent of the earnings and to 20 per cent per annum on the capital, the

dividend earned being reduced, by the expenditure being 22,000 francs over working earnings, to 15.83 per cent per annum.

"The last case is that of the *Admiral Troude*, which, in less than eleven months, when freights were low, paid a dividend of 24 per cent per annum, of which the bounty formed 15 per cent. The effect of one of these large French vessels seeking cargo in a port where British vessels are also seeking must be disastrous to the latter, as the French vessel could accept a freight which a British vessel could not possibly afford to accept. The result of this encouragement to build sailing vessels in France is that on October 1, 1899, there were sailing vessels under construction in: France, 54,760 tons; United Kingdom, 5,164 tons; Germany, 656 tons; Italy, 3,450 tons; and that in 1893 the navigation bounties paid to French steam vessels amounted to 85 per cent and to sailing vessels 15 per cent; in 1898 steam vessels received 63 per cent and sailing vessels 37 per cent of the navigation bounties.

"It is proposed to make in two years time a new navigation law, which will encourage the building of steam vessels in France to the same extent as the law of 1893 has encouraged the building of sailing vessels, and, although the results hitherto attained do not appear to have been satisfactory for France or injurious to British interests, chiefly, I take it, because the French have encouraged a form of propulsion already almost abandoned by other nations, there is no knowing what will be the result if France gives equal encouragement to the steamship in the future that she has given to the sailing ship in the past. The examples of the working of the bounty system which I have been enabled to give here may prove of use in helping to solve the questions which may arise when the day arrives.

With these statements before you and your committee, which could be very greatly amplified, it must be apparent that the subsidies and bounties paid to the merchant shipping of other countries are potential factors in their maritime development. In view of the extent to which the denial of either the existence or efficacy of shipping subsidies and bounties has been published in the United States, the effect of which is to create hostile sentiment to an American policy of shipping subsidies and bounties among the American people and their Representatives in Congress, I trust that it will be your disposition to secure, through the channels open to the Government and accessible to the people and to Congress, the publication of the facts herein recited, to the end that a more accurate and intelligent knowledge of the scope and effect of subsidies and bounties upon the world's shipping may more widely obtain.

I have the honor to remain, very respectfully,

ALEX. R. SMITH.

HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,
Chairman Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The bill as introduced in this session is as follows:

[S. 1348. Fifty-seventh Congress, first session.]

In the Senate of the United States. December 9, 1901. Mr. Frye introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and the common defense; to promote commerce, and to encourage the deep-sea fisheries.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I.

OCEAN MAIL STEAMSHIPS.

SECTION 1. That section 1 of an act approved March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce," be, and hereby is, amended to read:

"The Postmaster-General is hereby authorized and directed to enter into contracts, for a term not less than five nor more than fifteen years in duration, with American citizens for the carrying of mails on American steamships between ports of the United States and such ports in foreign countries, the Dominion of Canada excepted, as in his judgment, having regard to the national defense, will best subserve and promote the postal, commercial, and maritime interests of the United States; the mail service on such lines to be equitably distributed among the Atlantic, Mexican Gulf, and Pacific ports. Said contracts shall be made with the lowest responsible bidder for the performance of said service on each route, and the Postmaster-General shall have the right to reject all bids not in his opinion reasonable for the attaining of the purposes named."

SEC. 2. That section 3 of the act aforesaid be, and the same is hereby, amended to read:

"SEC. 3. That the vessels employed in the mail service under the provisions of this act shall be American-built steamships, owned and officered by American citizens, in conformity with the existing laws, or so owned and officered and registered according to law; and upon each departure from the United States the following proportion of the crew shall be citizens of the United States, to wit: During the first two years of such contract for carrying the mails, one-fourth thereof; during the next three succeeding years, one-third thereof, and during the remaining time of the continuance of such contract, at least one-half thereof; and shall be constructed after the latest and most approved types, with all the modern improvements and appliances for ocean steamers. They shall be steel screw steamships, and divided into the following classes according to gross registered tonnage and capacity to maintain at sea in ordinary weather the following speeds:

- "Over 10,000 tons:
- "First class, 20 knots or over.
- "Second class, 19 knots and less than 20 knots.
- "Over 5,000 tons:
- "Third class, 18 knots or over.
- "Fourth class, 17 knots and less than 18 knots.
- "Fifth class, 16 knots and less than 17 knots.
- "Sixth class, 15 knots and less than 16 knots.
- "Over 2,000 tons:
- "Seventh class, 14 knots or over.

"It shall be stipulated in the contract or contracts to be entered into for the said mail service that said vessels may carry passengers with their baggage, in addition to said mails, and may do all ordinary business done by steamships."

SEC. 3. That section 4 of the act aforesaid be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That all steamships of the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth classes, employed as above and hereafter built, shall be constructed with particular reference to prompt and economical conversion into auxiliary naval cruisers, and according to plans and specifications to be agreed upon by and between the owners and the Secretary of the Navy; and they shall be of sufficient strength and stability to carry and sustain the working and operation of at least four effective rifled cannon of a caliber of not less than 6 inches, and shall be of the highest rating known to maritime commerce. And all vessels of said five classes heretofore built and so employed shall, before they are accepted for the mail service herein provided for, be thoroughly

inspected by a competent naval officer or constructor detailed for that service by the Secretary of the Navy; and such officer shall report, in writing, to the Secretary of the Navy, who shall transmit said report to the Postmaster-General; and no such vessel not approved by the Secretary of the Navy as suitable for the service required shall be employed by the Postmaster-General as provided for in this act."

SEC. 4. That section 5 of the aforesaid act be, and is hereby, amended to read:

"SEC. 5. The rate of compensation for such ocean-mail service, to be paid per gross registered ton for each 100 nautical miles sailed from the port of clearance in the United States to the port of entry in the United States, according to the route required by the Post-Office Department, shall not exceed the following:

- "Steamships of the first class, 2.7 cents.
- "Steamships of the second class, 2.5 cents.
- "Steamships of the third class, 2.3 cents.
- "Steamships of the fourth class, 2.1 cents.
- "Steamships of the fifth class, 1.9 cents.
- "Steamships of the sixth class, 1.7 cents.
- "Steamships of the seventh class, 1.5 cents.

"The rates of compensation to a steamship to be employed in carrying the mails to a foreign port in North America under any contract hereafter to be made under the provisions of this act shall not exceed 70 per cent of the maximum rates established by this section: *Provided*, That in the case of failure from any cause to perform the regular voyages stipulated for in said contracts, or any of them, a pro rata deduction shall be made from the compensation on account of such omitted voyage or voyages, and that suitable fines and penalties may be imposed for delays or irregularities in the due performance of service according to the contract, to be determined by the Postmaster-General: *Provided further*, That no steamships so employed and so paid for carrying the United States mail shall receive any other bounty or subsidy from the Treasury of the United States."

SEC. 5. That section 8 of the act aforesaid be, and the same is hereby, amended to read:

"SEC. 8. Such vessels shall take, as cadets or apprentices, one American-born boy, under 21 years of age, for each 1,000 tons gross register, and one for each majority fraction thereof, who shall be educated in the duties of seamanship or engineering, rank as petty officers, and receive such pay for their services as may be reasonable."

TITLE II.

GENERAL SUBSIDY.

SEC. 6. That from and after the 1st day of July, 1902, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, subject to the provisions of this title, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the owner or owners of any vessel of the United States duly registered by a citizen or citizens of the United States (including as such citizens any corporation created under the laws of the United States or any of the States thereof), and being at the time of entry engaged in the foreign trade of the United States, which shall be entered in the United States from a foreign port or from any port in the Philippine Islands, compensation as hereinafter provided, that is to say:

(a) On each entry, not exceeding 16 entries in any one fiscal year, of a sail or steam vessel, 1 cent per gross registered ton for each 100 nautical miles sailed.

(b) On each entry, not exceeding 16 entries in any one fiscal year, and for a period of five years from the date of registration of a vessel of over 1,500 gross registered tons, which shall be completed and registered after the passage of this act, one-fourth of 1 cent per gross registered ton for each 100 nautical miles sailed, in addition to the compensation provided in paragraph (a).

SEC. 7. That compensation under this title shall not be allowed in respect of any of the following-named vessels:

(a) A vessel on a voyage extending only to a foreign port less than 150 nautical miles from her last port of departure in the United States or from a foreign port less than 150 nautical miles from her first port of arrival in the United States.

(b) A vessel on a voyage less than one-half of the whole length of which, on her outward and homeward voyages, respectively, shall have been on the sea between a port of the United States and a foreign port.

(c) A vessel which shall not be at least of the class A 1, as classified either by the Record of American and Foreign Shipping or the United States Standard Owners, Builders, and Underwriters' Association, or equivalent classification in any other register of shipping of at least equal merit.

(d) A vessel of which less than one-fourth of the crew shall be citizens of the United States or such persons as shall be within the provisions of section 2174 of Revised Statutes.

(e) A barge, canal boat, or vessel without motive-power of its own, or a tugboat, or a vessel engaged in wrecking.

(f) A foreign-built vessel, hereafter admitted to American registry pursuant to the provisions of section 4136 of the Revised Statutes.

(g) A vessel while employed in the coasting trade.

SEC. 8. That the mileage upon which compensation shall be paid under this title shall be determined by the direct customary route from the last port of departure in the United States to a foreign port or a port in the Philippine Islands, and from such last-mentioned port by the direct customary route to the first port of arrival in the United States. If during the voyage the vessel shall enter at two or more foreign ports or ports in the Philippine Islands, the distance by the direct customary route between such ports shall also be included in the mileage upon which compensation shall be paid under this title.

SEC. 9. That any vessel, before receiving compensation under this title, shall have carried, free of charge, the mails of the United States, if the Postmaster-General shall have so required, for the whole or any part of a voyage for which compensation shall be claimed.

SEC. 10. That any vessel, before receiving compensation under this title, shall, when required so to do by the Secretary of the Treasury, carry on each foreign voyage, as a member of the ship's company, one American boy, under 21 years of age and suitable for such employment, and one such boy in addition for each 1,000 gross registered tons, who shall be taught in the duties of seamanship or engineering, or other maritime knowledge, as the case may be, respectively, and receive such pay as shall be reasonable.

SEC. 11. That the owner of any vessel, before receiving compensation pursuant to this title, shall agree, in writing, that said vessel may be taken or employed and used by the United States for the national defense or for any public purpose at any time; and in every such case the owner of any such vessel so taken or employed shall be paid the fair value thereof, if taken, at the time of the taking; and if employed, shall be paid the fair value of such use. And if there shall be a disagreement as to such fair value the question of the valuation shall be submitted to and determined by three impartial appraisers, one to be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, one by the owner or owners of the vessel, and the two appraisers so appointed shall, before they proceed to act, select a third appraiser. The decision of a majority of such board shall be final and effective. In case of any taking or employment, as provided in this section, the shipping obligations of the officers and crews existing at the time shall be deemed to have terminated.

TITLE III.

DEEP-SEA FISHERIES.

SEC. 12. That from and after the 1st day of July, 1902, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, bounties as follows:

(a) To the owner or owners of a documented vessel of the United States engaged in the deep-sea fisheries for at least three months in any one fiscal year, \$2 per gross ton per annum: *Provided*, That at least one-third of the crew shall be citizens of the United States, or such persons as shall be within the provisions of section 2174 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) To a citizen of the United States serving as a member of a necessary and proper crew of a vessel of the United States documented and engaged in deep-sea fisheries for at least three months during any one fiscal year, \$1 per month during the time necessarily employed in the voyages of such vessel.

TITLE IV.

GENERAL PROVISIONS.

SEC. 13. That a vessel shall not be entitled to compensation under two or more titles of this act at the same time.

SEC. 14. That a vessel which has at any time received compensation pursuant to any of the provisions of this act shall not be sold, except by the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, to a citizen or subject of a foreign power, under penalty of forfeiture.

SEC. 15. That the President of the United States shall from time to time cause to be made, by the proper heads of departments, regulations for the due execution of the provisions of this act.

I append an editorial from the Marine Journal of recent date:

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN SHIPBUILDING.

The German campaign against the American shipping bill goes merrily on. It was inaugurated a few months ago by Herr Ballin, director-general of the Hamburg-American Line, who published an article over his own signature in many of the London newspapers, in which he attempted to show that shipping subsidies were not necessary to the development of a merchant marine. The article was evidently intended for American consumption, and it was extensively quoted here by the free-trade papers and others opposed to the shipping bill. His argument was ingenious, but fallacious. He simply pointed to the Hamburg-American Line as an example of what may be done in shipping without subsidies. Of course, he carefully omitted all mention of the fact that his company, and all other German shipping companies, receive indirect aid from the German Government and municipalities to an extent which is just as advantageous to them as a direct subsidy would be.

The latest phase of this foreign campaign against the shipping bill is a report made to his government by a German naval constructor on the condition of shipbuilding in the United States. The conclusions which he reached after his alleged investigation are that our shipyards are developing with amazing rapidity, and everything relating thereto is in a condition of prosperity and advancement well calculated to alarm the great shipbuilding concerns of both Germany and Great Britain.

This German expert finds that although wages here are 40 per cent higher than in Europe, yet the cheapness of materials employed in the construction of steel ships and the superior tools used by our shipbuilders enable them to build vessels as cheaply as they can be built abroad. This is true only as to tramp steamers; and while our shipbuilders can construct these as cheaply as they can be turned out in foreign yards, they do not do it for the very good reason that our underwriters are more exacting than are the British Lloyds. The result is that an American-built tramp is more expensive and has not that tendency to go to the bottom which is more or less a characteristic of the cheaper British tramps.

This report of the German naval constructor is not accurate in its conclusions as to the immense prosperity of American yards. These conclusions were no doubt drawn from certain antishipping-bill newspapers, which some time since made a concerted effort to spread this misinformation. The Marine Journal showed at the time that the activity then noted in our shipyards was due to Government work and that, as a matter of fact, the percentage of merchant vessels under construction was small. Even with their Government contracts some of our important yards have been laying off men because of lack of work. These are the facts, and there is nothing in the situation to frighten the German and British shipbuilders. Of course this German expert knows this as well as anybody, but to have brought out this point would have defeated the object of his report, which was to throw ashes on the ways of the shipping bill. At the same time we expect to see this important measure successfully launched this winter.

And the following from the Washington Post of last Sunday:

SHIP-SUBSIDY BILL—A FOREIGN VIEW OF THE PROPOSED MEASURE AND ITS ULTIMATE EFFECT.

EDITOR POST: There is one phase of the controversy in reference to the ship-subsidy bill which seems, curiously enough, to have escaped the notice of the opponents of the measure, both in the press and among the public, and that is the violent denunciation of the bill in the mercantile circles of Europe, and especially in Great Britain. Now, I happened to be in the quadrangle of the Liverpool Exchange talking to some English marine merchants when the news came that the shipping bill of the last session of Congress was virtually abandoned. There was considerable jubilation, and one gentleman, turning to me, exclaimed: "There, you Yankees are not going to have everything. Why, you want the earth, and then you won't be satisfied." Then others chimed in, and I had to listen to a tirade of abuse of our fiscal policy in general, especially of the attempt, as they called it, to rob England of her shipping supremacy by means of the ship-subsidy bill.

Taking advantage of a lull in the storm, I remarked quietly, "What beats me, gentlemen, is the opposition to the measure on our side of the water; why seven-tenths of our most reputable papers are against it, and if, as you say, it would be so bad for Great Britain, why it must be good for us. I must confess I don't understand it." One gentleman who had not taken much part in the conversation, but who I afterwards understood to be a ship-owner, observed, "Well, I can explain that easily enough. Do you remember when Beaconsfield bought the Suez Canal shares? Well, it roused a howl of indignation throughout the country, and did more to defeat the Conservatives at the election of 1880 than the so-called Bulgarian atrocities. I have always been a Tory and am one now, but I voted, not against my party on that occasion, but against Beaconsfield and his Suez Canal schemes, as did thousands of others, although the comments of the Continental press ought to have opened our eyes. We were wrong; Beaconsfield was right. It was an audacious but magnificent policy, and has given us control not only of the canal, but Egypt with all its coming riches. In a similar way you Americans are frightened at the word subsidy, forgetting that the whole of your so-called protective policy is nothing but subsidies.

"Why," he continued, "if that shipping bill is passed it would be the last straw on the back of British commerce. Your protective duties have injured our trade immensely. All we have left is our ships. Take them from us, and good-bye to England's commercial supremacy."

I listened attentively and made no comment further than to say, "Well, it's an old adage 'that outsiders see most of the game.' I suppose it is so in this case."

TYRREL E. BIDDLE.

No American can do his own country a greater good than by aiding to build up our merchant marine. No American can aid the British producer to our injury more distinctly than by opposing such aid. [Loud applause.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, General GROSVENOR, says that he defies me to find in the RECORD any remark like the one I said he made. Of course, I was only quoting from memory. But the simple fact that you can not find what that gentleman said on the floor of this House in the RECORD is absolutely no proof whatever that he did not say it. A great many people in this House, and there are none more given to it than my friend from Ohio, have a habit of saying smart things in the heat of debate, and then going to work and editing those remarks out of their speeches. My friend has edited as much as anybody I ever saw, and he can improvise more history in a given length of time than any other man here. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will say to the gentleman that I never edited that remark out of a speech. I have edited out some colloquies, but always with the consent of the other side.

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And I have really wished, as I have a very kindly feeling for the gentleman from Missouri, that he had done a little more editing himself than he has.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps it would have been better if I had, but I am always willing to be judged by what I say in this House. Sometimes I have edited a speech to the extent of modifying some bitter thing that I had said about somebody, to make it more gentle. I do not know that I can find what he said in the RECORD; I do not know that I can find it in a newspaper; I do not know that I quoted it precisely right, as it was said a long time ago; but, as sure as I am standing here, the gentleman said something substantially like that, and it was commented on by the papers in the country. If I can find it, I will call his attention to it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will facilitate the gentleman. I do not know exactly who it was, but somebody had bawled out, "How long are we going to hold the Philippines?" and I replied that "we would hold them until we got ready to let them go," and then shot away at the other side and said that we would not ask the consent of the Democrats of this House, or something like that; but as for holding them and squeezing money out of them, which would be like squeezing blood out of a turnip, I did not say anything of that kind.

Mr. CLARK. As an ordinary proposition I would take the gentleman's word on anything except a speech he had made himself. He felicitates and vaunts himself about a debate which he and I had, for revenue only [laughter], down at chautauqua at Mountain Lake, Md., and says my recollection about that must be unpleasant. I never hear him make a remark like that that I do not think of a transaction which happened out in the State of Kansas.

In an early day out there the cashier of a bank stole all the money there was in the bank and blew it in on No. 2 wheat. The depositors caught him and were proceeding to hang him. He said he wanted to make some remarks, and they let him down. He declared that he desired to make a proposition; that he had no money to give them because that was all gone, but he did not want to die the ignominious death by hanging. So he proposed to them that they might cut him into pieces, and each one take the piece that suited him best. One old chap on the outside of the crowd yelled out: "The rest of you fellers take what you please, but, as for me, give me that feller's gall!" [Laughter.] Now, that is what I want. If it ever comes to pass that my friend from Ohio is dissected, the rest of you take what you please, but give me his gall. [Great laughter.]

My friend from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON], and my friend from Ohio, both had the same idea in their speeches. Which one of them originated it or which is entitled to that "bad eminence," I do not know, but my friend from Illinois said that I was instrumental in getting up the Spanish war, and that having gotten it up I "renigged" when it came to taking the consequences. My friend from Ohio says I am like a fictitious character named Snarlyow that he read about somewhere, who scuttled the ship. I want to say to both the venerable and illustrious gentlemen that I did help get up the Spanish war; that I did what I could to facilitate it. I rejoice in that fact to-day. That was purely an American transaction, to make somebody free and to extend representative government on the face of the earth. [Applause.]

But I was not in favor then, and I am not in favor now, of enslaving any human being, black, white, or brown, anywhere, either in the Eastern or Western Hemisphere. [Applause.] My friend from Illinois tells his old and delicate campaign twin story

about the young couple who were disagreeably surprised by the arrival of twins; but "they had to keep them," says the gentleman, and therefore we have to keep the Philippines. Well, it so happens that twins are blessings of this life that do not come to many. I take it that a rational man would not object very much to twins born in the family of which he is the father, but he would object seriously to a lot of nondescript, saddle-colored brats being deposited surreptitiously on his doorstep. [Laughter.] That is what I am objecting to in this Philippine business. [Laughter.]

Let us see whether we shrank from the responsibility that came from the Spanish war. That is a great philosophical and historical question. How did we go into it? Why, we went into it with the solemn resolution, passed by the lower House of Congress and the Senate of the United States and signed by William McKinley, that we were not going into it for land-grabbing purposes or for territorial aggrandizement, and we put Cuba into that resolution. The truth about it is, gentlemen, that if the American Congress had known where the Philippine Islands were, they would have put the Philippine Islands into that resolution, too [laughter]; but we were all a little short on geographical knowledge then, and if we had been compelled to start for the Philippines instantly we would not have known whether to travel north, south, east, or west.

I deny that the taking and keeping of the Philippine Islands are any natural result of the Spanish war. The only possible connection between the two performances is that one happened subsequent to the other in point of time. William R. Day ought to know something about it. He was Secretary of State when that treaty was negotiated and ratified, and also head Commissioner at the Paris conference. He declared some time during the debate in which Mr. LITTLEFIELD, of Maine, led here on the Porto Rico question—during that debate or just before or just after it—I say that William R. Day declared in public print that we did not hold the Philippine Islands by conquest, but we held them by right of purchase. I am going to hunt that document up and print it in the RECORD, too, because Republicans here are now very fond of denying it.

I want it written on my tombstone when I am dead that I was one of 35 men in this House, out of 357, that had the nerve, the courage, the patriotism, and the good sense to vote against paying Spain \$20,000,000 for the Philippines, even after the Senate of the United States had ratified the treaty, for that transaction is the source of all our woes.

My friend from Illinois jogs my memory about the vote for the \$5,000,000 appropriation for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition. Well, it was inevitable that it had to come sooner or later, and he might as well have shot it into me as to have somebody else shoot it into somebody else. I intend to answer it once for all, so that no other man in this House will ever have to answer it again. Here is the answer. It is twofold. In the first place, if we could have gone back to the beginning of things I am not certain, if I had been a member of this House, that I ever would have voted an appropriation for any of these world's fairs in the United States. That is the first proposition. But all the rest have had them, and why should we not have it? Why make flesh of one and fowl of another?

The second answer is, and it appeals to the common sense and patriotism of every man in this House irrespective of political affiliations, that there have been a few events, very few indeed, in the history of the United States, and in the history of America, which are worthy of national commemoration, on which we can all agree as to the wisdom—things that have been epoch makers, the things that have caused us to be what we are, the most powerful nation on the face of the earth. The first one was the discovery of America by Columbus; the second was Patrick Henry's great speech before the Virginia house of burgesses precipitating the Revolution, which still stirs the blood like strains of martial music; next the firing on the British regulars at Lexington and Concord by the New England militia and Minute Men; next the Declaration of Independence; next Washington's capture of Lord Cornwallis on the blood-stained heights of Yorktown; next the adoption of the Constitution, and last, the Louisiana purchase—the greatest transaction in real estate bruted on this earth since the devil took the Saviour to the top of a high mountain and offered Him the dominion of the world if He would fall down and worship him.

If it had not been for that purchase by Jefferson, it is extremely doubtful whether the United States could have maintained its independence. But for that we would have been hemmed in on the north by the British and on the west by the British, because it would not have been twelve months from the time we rejected the purchase that England would have gobbled up that territory from Napoleon; and if anybody except us ever took a foot of land away from England I would like to know when and where it was done. We would have had the Spanish on the south of us, and I

doubt exceedingly whether this Republic, hemmed in on three sides, could have maintained its independence.

And among the blessings, numberless and rich, which flowed from the election of Thomas Jefferson in 1800, there is none that equals in importance the Louisiana purchase. If old John Adams had been elected, there never would have been an American citizen resident west of the great river; and if the landing of Columbus, if the Declaration of Independence, and if all of these other things are worth commemorating, Thomas Jefferson's greatest act is worth it; and we are going to commemorate it in the grandest exposition seen on earth since the morning stars first sang together for joy. My friend is cordially invited to attend.

And, while I am at it, I want to suggest to the jingoes in this House and out of it, who have for three years been wandering up and down the land making asses of themselves by declaring that the Spanish war made us "a world power," that they are exactly ninety-five years behind the times. Thomas Jefferson made us "a world power" on the 30th day of April, 1803, when he bought for a song from the armed soldier of democracy a country greater than that over which the mad Macedonian waved his all-conquering banner, or over which the Roman eagles flew. And this country owes it to Jefferson's memory, if to nothing else, to have a commemoration of that event.

Even Thomas Jefferson himself, who divides with King Solomon and Lord Bacon the honor of being the wisest man that ever lived, had no adequate conception of the vast importance and far-reaching influence on human affairs of the wondrous bargain in real estate which he secured from the martial Corsican. One of the strangest omissions in all literature was made by him, when, having sounded all the shoals and depths of honor, he failed to refer in any way to the great purchase in the famous epitaph which he prepared for his own monument, and which runs in this wise:

Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the American Declaration of Independence, of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia.

These were magnificent deeds—immortal achievements—each ample to give him imperishable renown, and for which we are all his debtors forever and forever; but, if he could have comprehended the full and marvelous effects of his unequalled trade with the First Consul, he would have added to that epitaph a fourth claim to the eternal admiration and gratitude of his countrymen and to undying fame—"the author of the Louisiana purchase"—which, alone of itself, entitles him to first place among American statesmen. In my judgment it was the most stupendous of all his acts. If he had never lived, somebody, sometime, would have written a Declaration of Independence. It most probably would not have possessed the majestic sweep and epic quality of Jefferson's Declaration, but it would have sufficed. If he had never been born, somebody would have written a statute for religious freedom in Virginia and would have established a great university in the Old Dominion; but if he had not been President in 1803 we would have never owned one square foot of land west of the Mississippi, and to-day all over that matchless country, where Old Glory floats, there would flutter in the breeze the banner of the Spanish bournons, the tricolor of France, or the cross of St. George.

Jefferson belongs to the country, and the whole country, but he belongs especially to us living west of the Mississippi River.

His name is written on the mountain,
His memory sparkles o'er the fountain;
The meanest rill, the mightiest river,
Rolls mingled with his fame forever.

[Applause.]

And I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois right now that I have no apologies to offer for voting for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition appropriation; on the contrary, I glory in it. And, further, I declare that the fact of my having voted to give \$5,000,000 to celebrate one of the greatest events in American history is no reason why I should be estopped from opposing, whenever I feel like it, extravagant appropriations upon the floor of this House. Every tub must stand on its own bottom, and that is a very poor excuse to give for such extravagance. I now and here serve notice on all concerned that the remarks which I make here to-day on economy are simply a general preface to a line of conduct upon which I have determined to enter upon, and if any more extravagant measures get through this House while I am here they will do it after I have exhausted all parliamentary means to defeat them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, I desire to correct one statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

An impression quite generally exists—it has been repeated on this floor a number of times—that the \$20,000,000 which this Government paid in concluding a treaty of peace with Spain was paid for the purchase of the Philippine Islands. The gentleman from Missouri quoted Mr. Day as authority for that statement. Without stopping to inquire what was said by Mr. Day, I wish to

say to the House—and I shall take only a few minutes—that the \$20,000,000 was paid no more for the purchase of the Philippine Islands than for the purchase of Porto Rico, Guam, the Isle of Pines, and for the cession of the sovereignty by Spain over Cuba.

The first controversy on the meeting of the peace commissioners was as to how much of the debt of Spain that she had pledged the revenues of Cuba for would the United States assume or provide that it should be assumed by Cuba. On that question almost a month was spent. Then the proposition was made whether, waiving that question temporarily, they could agree on other provisions of a treaty, the Spanish commissioners insisting that, if they waived that question temporarily, all other questions should stand in abeyance until the other questions of a treaty had been agreed upon by both commissions.

When the proposition to pay \$20,000,000 was made by the American commission in the form of an ultimatum, not a single article of the treaty had been finally agreed upon, though the commissioners of both countries had gone over all the questions of a treaty, beginning with the cession of Spanish sovereignty over Cuba, the cession to the United States of all her islands in the West Indies, of Guam and the Philippines in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. CLARK. Let me ask the gentleman what did we give the \$20,000,000 to Spain for?

Mr. GROW. To secure the concluding of a treaty of peace between the two Governments.

Mr. CLARK. Why did you have to pay for a treaty?

Mr. GROW. Because the Spanish commissioners would not have signed a treaty without any payment of money on what they called the Cuban debt.

Mr. CLARK. Do not you know that they would have had to sign any treaty that we offered?

Mr. GROW. Well, I was not there, and I do not think the gentleman from Missouri can speak for the commissioners. The controversy was that unless this Government would assume a part at least of the Cuban debt the Spanish commissioners would not sign a treaty. They would have gone home, and Spain would have said the American nation, with its great power, had seized the colonies of Spain, and in her weakness she could not prevent it.

Mr. CLARK. Do not you know that the American commissioners absolutely refused to consider the question of damages in Cuba?

Mr. GROW. Yes, sir; I know that they refused to pay anything to Spain for the indebtedness of Cuba, or to permit Cuba to pay anything. That is why that question was passed over temporarily and the other questions were taken up to see if there could be any agreement about them. The Spanish commissioners had taken their position on what they insisted was international law. The American commissioners conceded that if a country takes a territory from a foreign government, upon which there is an obligation to pay an indebtedness, and it is absorbed by the conquering nation, then that nation is liable for such indebtedness.

That is international law. But the American commissioners said there was no obligation on this country to pay a debt of Cuba, for she was not absorbed into our territory. We were only a trustee; therefore international law did not apply.

But, Mr. Chairman, I did not rise for the purpose of making a speech or to discuss any question, but to correct the misapprehension which has gone to the country through the newspapers, in the first place, and has been repeated on the floor of the House upon this subject. That misapprehension grows out of the statement that the \$20,000,000 we paid Spain was for the purchase of the Philippine Islands; and I repeat that in all probability the negotiations for a treaty of peace with Spain would have failed had it not been for this payment on the part of the United States.

Senator Gray, one of the American commissioners, on his return to this country, in a speech in the city of New York, at a banquet of the Ohio Society, February 25, 1899, said:

There came a time in the course of those negotiations—and this, perhaps, is one of the secrets to which your president alluded—when, after four or five weeks of doubt and anxiety, it became apparent that these negotiations must either be broken off and your commissioners return without a treaty at all, and that would be relegated to the necessity of taking not only the Philippines, but Cuba and Porto Rico, by the ruthless hand of military conquest, or, by some concessions that comported with the magnanimity and greatness and character of this country, gain them by the voluntary cession of a treaty of peace.

It was at such a time the offer was made as a final settlement of all the questions in dispute.

The payment of \$20,000,000 to Spain provided for in the treaty was not, therefore, purchase money for the Philippine Islands. A careful examination of the negotiation on the several articles of the treaty shows conclusively that the \$20,000,000 was finally agreed on to cover all the points of difference between the American and Spanish commissioners on all the articles of the treaty, none of which was finally concluded until the adoption of the last article.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a question?

Mr. GROW. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. Does not the gentleman recollect the fact that in the public instructions given by the President to the Paris commissioners that went out to the country, when they left for France, that there was no mention of the acquisition by the Government of the United States of the Philippine Islands; and does not he recollect further that while there was a general discussion as to the assumption of indebtedness on the part of the United States for the Spanish claims in Cuba, that the mention of \$20,000,000 was never made by the commissioners in this conference until after they had delivered their ultimatum that they intended to take the Philippine Islands?

Mr. GROW. That was the last thing considered. The question of our taking the Philippine Islands was the last question discussed, and not a single article of the treaty had been finally agreed upon until the offer of the \$20,000,000 in the form of an ultimatum. The Spanish commissioners said rather than leave the question open for a renewal of the war they were willing to receive this sum of \$20,000,000 and would sign the treaty.

Mr. WHEELER. But does the gentleman dispute the question that the acquisition of the Philippines was not considered as a part of the instructions given to our peace commissioners at Paris?

Mr. GROW. I am giving the history of the treaty and the way it came to be signed, and the reasons for it.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak upon this question at any length. You will see, if you will read the documents connected with the matter, exactly what was done at each of the meetings of the Commission. You will see that these matters were all considered in detail, and finally, after all the other questions were considered, the question of the disposition of the Philippine Islands came up, the last thing in the negotiations except the status of the native inhabitants. The American commissioners said to the Spanish commissioners that if they took any of the islands they must take all of them.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman not admit that until the Philippine Islands were mentioned the question of the twenty millions was never suggested by the commissioners on either side?

Mr. GROW. Yes; because that was the last thing they discussed.

Mr. WHEELER. What was the last thing?

Mr. GROW. The amount to be paid to conclude a treaty.

Mr. WHEELER. The \$20,000,000 was?

Mr. GROW. The taking of the Philippines was the last question discussed, and the \$20,000,000 was an ultimatum to secure the signing of the treaty.

Mr. WHEELER. Was the \$20,000,000 ever discussed until after that?

Mr. GROW. No, of course not, because that was an ultimatum. They took up each question by itself, and they went through with the question of the Philippines, which was the last one, and on that last one came this proposition as an ultimatum from our commissioners to the Spanish commissioners to conclude all the articles temporarily agreed to. If the \$20,000,000 had not been offered there would have been no treaty signed, and it was for signing and concluding the whole treaty that the \$20,000,000 was offered and paid, as an ultimatum.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman pardon one other question? Is it not true that before the \$20,000,000 question had been mentioned the American commissioners had peremptorily declined to assume any of the Spanish debt?

Mr. GROW. Certainly, and that was what the Spanish commissioners stood on. If this ultimatum had not been offered to conclude a treaty, they would have gone home without signing a treaty.

Mr. WHEELER. Well, that is a mere play upon words.

Mr. GROW. The Spanish commissioners said they could not go home to the Spanish people after signing a treaty that took away all their colonies and made no provision for the payment of any part of their indebtedness to Spain. It was as a substitute for the indebtedness that they were claiming on Cuba and these other colonies that the \$20,000,000 came in, and the United States paid it rather than to leave the question of peace or war open.

Mr. WHEELER. Is not that my friend's construction of it?

Mr. GROW. I am in bad voice for talking by reason of a cold, and I would not have spoken at this time if it had not been for the statement of the gentleman from Missouri. He relies upon one of the commissioners for his statement, and I simply rose, as Benton used to say, to vindicate the truth of history.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Will the gentleman answer one question before he takes his seat, because I do not want him to be misunderstood by the House?

Mr. GROW. I am not in condition to speak further, but I will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Do I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania to state to the House that the Philippine Islands were not the consideration, or a part of the consideration, for which the \$20,000,000 was paid?

Mr. GROW. No more a consideration for the Philippines than for Porto Rico or the cession of the sovereignty of Spain over Cuba; all alike in one. It had nothing to do especially with the Philippine Islands. That I assert on the history of this transaction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I wish to state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I have read and reread carefully the proceedings of that Commission and I can not come to the conclusion which he has stated here, and I do not believe the House or the country will either.

Mr. GROW. The gentleman, of course, can draw what conclusion he should arrive at after reading the proceedings; I come to mine from reading it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GROW. We did not make the history, but we each of us can judge what it was, and as I stated in the beginning, so I close. I trust gentlemen will excuse me now. At some other time when I am in better voice I shall be happy to discuss this question further.

I conclude then with the statement, sustained by Mr. Gray when he came home, for he went there not intending to take any territory from Spain. He opposed it in the Senate before he went. In a conversation with him in the Senate Chamber after his return, he said, in the discharge of his duty as a commissioner, he came to the conclusion to join with his associates in taking the Philippine Islands. They could not give them back to Spain and leave them under a despotism from which we had released them in the fortunes of war.

This country could not take them and sell them to some other country. The offer of the \$20,000,000 was, as I said before, made in order to secure the treaty; and if the gentleman would carefully read the last few pages of the report of these commissioners, he would find that the \$20,000,000 was no more the consideration for the Philippines than for Porto Rico or the Isle of Pines, or the release of the sovereignty of Spain over Cuba.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. We might have treated them just as we did Cuba, and saved all the complications and embarrassments which have followed.

Mr. GROW. The entire proceedings of the Commission are published in Senate Executive Document No. 62 of the third session of the Fifty-fifth Congress. I will append to my remarks extracts from these proceedings which I think will sustain my position.

October 1, 1898, the Peace Commission met at Paris.

From October 7 to October 26 the Commission was engaged in discussions on the debt of Cuba, amounting to about \$500,000,000, and the cession by Spain of her sovereignty over the island, and the cession of Porto Rico and the Spanish islands in the West Indies, which ended temporarily with the following language:

The American commissioners deem it unnecessary, after what has been stated, to enter into an examination of the general references, made in the Spanish memorandum, to cases in which debts contracted by a state have, upon its absorption, been assumed by the absorbing state, or to cases in which, upon the partition of territory, debts contracted by the whole have been by special arrangement apportioned. They are conceived to be inapplicable, legally and morally, to the so-called "Cuban debt," the burden of which, imposed upon the people of Cuba without their consent and by force of arms, was one of the principal wrongs for the termination of which the struggles for Cuban independence were undertaken. (Executive Document No. 62, part 1, page 50.)

At the conference October 14, 1898, the following suggestion was made by the Spanish commissioners and agreed to by the American commission:

The Spanish commissioners stated that before proceeding with the discussion of the questions under consideration they desired it to be understood that if certain articles should be agreed to, but in the end no treaty should be signed, the articles so agreed to should not in such case be taken as expressing either Government's estimation of its just rights in respect of the subjects to which the articles related. (Senate Executive Document No. 62, part 1, page 45.)

October 14, 1898 (Senate Executive Document No. 62, part 1, page 59):

After much discussion, the president of the Spanish commission stated that the Spanish commissioners did not care for the phraseology in which the relinquishments of sovereignty was expressed, so long as it embraced an obligation as to debts, such as was stated in the second of the articles presented by them.

The president of the American commission, replying to this statement, inquired whether the president of the Spanish commission intended thereby to say that the Spanish commissioners would refuse to consider any articles as to Cuba and Porto Rico which contained no provision for the assumption of indebtedness by the United States or Cuba, or both.

October 26, 1898 (Senate Executive Document No. 62, part 1, pages 61 and 62):

The Spanish commissioners, although understanding that strict law decides the question of the Cuban debt in their favor, are in duty bound and are willing to moderate the said strictness in view of the advantages which

Spain may derive from other stipulations of the treaty which, without being prejudicial to the United States, may be favorable to Spain.

Considering, therefore, that the article or articles to which the president of the American commission refers can not at this time be the subject of final approval, since they must remain subject to the others to be included in the same treaty, meeting the approval of both high parties:

"The Spanish commissioners answer the said question by stating that, reiterating their conviction that pursuant to law the colonial obligations of Cuba and Porto Rico must follow these islands and their sovereignty, they do not refuse 'to consider any articles as to Cuba and Porto Rico which contain no provision for the assumption of indebtedness by the United States, or Cuba, or both,' subordinating the final approval of such articles to that of the others which are to form the complete treaty, and they therefore invite the American commissioners to enter upon the discussion of the other points to be embodied in the treaty and, at the outset, to take up the discussion of the Philippine Archipelago, and to propose to the Spanish commissioners what they understand should be agreed upon in said treaty with respect to this subject."

The American commissioners, after the reading of this paper, inquired whether they were to understand that the Spanish commissioners accepted the articles previously presented by them as to Cuba, Porto Rico, and Guam.

The Spanish commissioners replied that they accepted them in the sense stated in the paper—provisionally, subject to the conclusion of a treaty of peace.

October 31, 1898 (Senate Executive Document No. 62, part 1, pages 108, 109):

The American commissioners, having been invited by the Spanish commissioners at the last conference to present a proposition in regard to the Philippine Islands, beg to submit the following article on that subject:

"Spain hereby cedes to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands and lying within the following lines: A line running along the parallel of latitude 21° 30' north from the one hundred and eighteenth to the one hundred and twenty-seventh degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich, thence along the one hundred and twenty-seventh degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich to the parallel of 4° 45' north latitude, thence along the parallel of 4° 45' north latitude to its intersection with the meridian of longitude 119° 35' east of Greenwich, thence along the meridian of longitude 119° 35' east of Greenwich to the parallel of latitude 7° 40' north, thence along the parallel of latitude 7° 40' north to its intersection with the one hundred and sixteenth degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich, thence by a direct line to the intersection of the tenth degree parallel of north latitude with the one hundred and eighteenth degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich, and thence along the one hundred and eighteenth degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich to the parallel of latitude 21° 30' north."

A proper reference to the cession thus proposed may be inserted in the article of the treaty relating to public property, archives, and records in territory which Spain cedes or over which she relinquishes her sovereignty.

The American commissioners beg further to state that they are prepared to insert in the treaty a stipulation for the assumption by the United States of any existing indebtedness of Spain incurred for public works and improvements of a pacific character in the Philippines.

November 4, 1898. Proposition of the American Commission to assume the indebtedness of the Philippine Islands was rejected by the Spanish commission.

November 23, 1898 (Senate Executive Document No. 62, part 1, pages 210, 211). The following is the reply of the American commissioners on the rejection of their proposition:

The situation that has arisen in the Philippines was neither foreseen nor desired by the United States, but, since it exists, that Government does not shirk the responsibilities growing out of it; and the American commissioners now make to the Spanish commissioners, in the light of those responsibilities, a final proposition.

The proposal presented by the American commissioners in behalf of their Government for the cession of the Philippines to the United States having been rejected by the Spanish commissioners, and the counter proposal of the latter for the withdrawal of the American forces from the islands and the payment of an indemnity by the United States to Spain having been rejected by the American commissioners, the American commissioners, deeming it essential that the present negotiations, which have already been greatly protracted, should be brought to an early and definite conclusion, beg now to present a new proposition embodying the concessions which, for the sake of immediate peace, their Government is, under the circumstances, willing to tender.

The Government of the United States is unable to modify the proposal heretofore made for the cession of the entire archipelago of the Philippines, but the American commissioners are authorized to offer to Spain, in case the cession should be agreed to, the sum of \$20,000,000, to be paid in accordance with the terms to be fixed in the treaty of peace.

And it being the policy of the United States to maintain in the Philippines an open door to the world's commerce, the American commissioners are prepared to insert in the treaty now in contemplation a stipulation to the effect that, for a term of years, Spanish ships and merchandise shall be admitted into the ports of the Philippine Islands on the same terms as American ships and merchandise.

The American commissioners are also authorized and prepared to insert in the treaty, in connection with the cessions of territory by Spain to the United States, a provision for the mutual relinquishment of all claims for indemnity, national and individual, of every kind, of the United States against Spain and of Spain against the United States that may have arisen since the beginning of the late insurrection in Cuba and prior to the conclusion of a treaty of peace.

The American commissioners may be permitted to express the hope that they may receive from the Spanish commissioners, on or before Monday the 28th of the present month, a definite and final acceptance of the proposals herein made as to the Philippine Islands, and also of the demands as to Cuba, Porto Rico, and other Spanish islands in the West Indies, and Guam, in the form in which those demands have been provisionally agreed to.

November 28, 1898, the Spanish commissioners reply to the ultimatum of the American commissioners in the following language (Senate Executive Document No. 62, part 1, page 213):

Spain having on her part exhausted all diplomatic recourses in the defense of what she considers her rights and even for an equitable compromise, the Spanish commissioners are now asked to accept the American proposition in its entirety and without further discussion, or to reject it, in which latter case, as the American commission understands, the peace negotiations will end, and the protocol of Washington will consequently be broken.

The Government of Her Majesty, moved by lofty reasons of patriotism and humanity, will not assume the responsibility of again bringing upon Spain all the horrors of war. In order to avoid them it resigns itself to the

painful strait of submitting to the law of the victor, however harsh it may be, and as Spain lacks the material means to defend the rights she believes are hers, having recorded them, she accepts the only terms the United States offers her for the concluding of the treaty of peace.

It will be seen by these extracts from the official records of the discussions on propositions to be incorporated as articles in the treaty of peace that all of them were left in abeyance until the treaty should be finally agreed on; and the final conclusion of the treaty was the proposition on the part of the American commissioners to pay Spain \$20,000,000, which should cover all the controversy from beginning to end about the cession of territory or the debts of Cuba, Porto Rico, or the Philippine Islands.

Then the different articles that had been passed over were agreed to, and the last one was that "The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to correct the gentleman from Missouri nor to detract from the part taken by President Jefferson in the Louisiana purchase; but I think the time has come when it should be stated upon the floor of this House that there was a man behind the President who will yet be recognized by all Americans as the one of all others responsible for the Louisiana purchase.

I welcome the coming of the St. Louis Exposition, if for no other reason than that it will be the means of again bringing to the attention of the country the truth of history. It ought not to minimize the efforts of Thomas Jefferson, in so far as such efforts were rightly spent, but it will certainly bring into view the magnificent work of a distinguished New Yorker, Robert R. Livingston, minister to France, by whom and through whom the Louisiana purchase was made. [Applause.]

Napoleon announced his determination to sell whatever American territory he had obtained from Spain, and without hesitation Mr. Livingston took him up, agreed upon a price, and reported the transaction to Mr. Jefferson, who at once assumed that he had no constitutional authority to make the purchase. He went so far as to write intimate friends, members of the United States Senate, urging that they look with disfavor upon the proposition, since it could not be approved unless a constitutional amendment was adopted opening the way for its purchase by the Executive and its ratification by the Senate; but while Mr. Jefferson was arguing its unconstitutionality, Mr. Livingston completed the bargain, secured the cooperation of the Barings, who negotiated a loan of \$15,000,000, the purchase price, and then sent a confidential letter to the President saying that unless the purchase be ratified at once, Napoleon would change his mind.

Upon the receipt of this letter President Jefferson dropped his constitutional objections, wrote his Senatorial friends to say nothing about it, and urged them to get together and confirm the purchase without delay. That, in brief, is the history of the Louisiana purchase, and that history, wrought out in all its details by the orators who will be heard at the St. Louis Exposition, should be written in letters of gold and published from Maine to the Golden Gate, that the country may know that the man with the nerve, with the breadth of mind, with the foresight to make that purchase and force its ratification was not Thomas Jefferson, the narrow constructionist of the Constitution, but Robert R. Livingston, one of New York's greatest and foremost statesmen. [Applause.]

I do not wish to depreciate the part taken in that great historic transaction by the President of the United States, whose name is justly honored; but I do believe the time has come when all American citizens should recognize the fact that the man to whom we owe the honor and the debt of gratitude for the Louisiana purchase is Robert R. Livingston, of New York, and not Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia. [Applause.]

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a part of the report of the commissioners.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no other remarks to be made upon the bill the Clerk will read it by sections.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good many questions discussed to-day while this bill was under discussion, but there is one question that I think should be called to the attention of this House and the country before we pass the first bill that gentlemen on this side of the House will say is a raid on the Federal Treasury. I have been a member of Congress for some time. If I recollect rightly, some years ago an urgent deficiency bill carried very few millions of dollars. To-day we find reported to the House a bill carrying the largest appropriation, so far as my knowledge goes, that has ever been brought here as an urgent deficiency bill.

We not only find that the scope of the bill is changed. We have been accustomed to unusual legislation in appropriation bills. We have been accustomed to new legislation in sundry civil bills. We have been accustomed to changes by legislation on a general

deficiency bill that comes at the end of a session; but we find now, in an urgent deficiency bill, that usually comes into this House merely for the purpose of paying off debts of the Government that Congress failed to provide for in the general bills of the last session, that new and unusual appropriations are made. We find that the Appropriation Committee has not been content with holding the purse strings of the nation, but that they propose to and have usurped the power of other committees of this House.

Now, I have heard gentlemen upon that side of the House, gentlemen who are members of the Appropriation Committee, time after time striking at other bills coming from other committees because they proposed new legislation, which was contrary to the rules of this House. They had given these reasons. Why? Because it was necessary to have them properly considered. I have heard them state time out of mind that when these great committees were constituted the Speaker selected members with a view to their knowledge of the particular questions considered; that men with that judgment and that knowledge were able to properly prepare the bills and present them to the House.

Now we find that these great questions are presented here by a committee that is not charged with any such duty. Why should this House in an urgent deficiency bill provide for the building of forts in the Philippine Islands? Why should it provide for the establishment of barracks in the Philippine Islands? Is it shown that the Secretary of War has been in communication with the Appropriations Committee? Are the gentlemen constituting the membership of the Appropriations Committee more able to judge whether or not we ought to have a force of soldiers in the Philippine Islands than the committee that is charged with that duty, and who should orderly report a bill of that kind, and give us full knowledge and information as to the requirements?

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman permit me, just there?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. This is a formal estimate that comes to Congress by way of provision for an expenditure of this Government for this current year. It is a matter of deficiency, because it is for the current year. The Secretary of War not only forwarded that estimate, but was before the subcommittee and had a hearing, and what he stated is printed in the hearings here, to which the gentleman can have access. The Committee on Military Affairs does not have jurisdiction of it at this time, because they make their appropriation for the coming fiscal year and not for the present year.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand the gentleman very clearly. If the Committee on Military Affairs had reported a bill at the last session of Congress, or this session, providing for an army barracks in the city of Manila, or had put a provision for the expenditures of the Army of the United States in that bill, and the appropriations were not sufficient to carry out the law that had been made by Congress, then it would have been very proper and correct for the Secretary of War to call upon the gentlemen constituting the Appropriations Committee to make up the deficiency. But I take it, from what I can learn on this matter, that the question of erecting these barracks was never heard of either in the committee or in this House until it came before the Appropriations Committee, and they were asked to put in a provision carrying the money to build these barracks and furnish the money for that purpose.

Now, I do not criticize the Secretary of War. I say candidly that I know of no man in the halls of the Congress of the United States that is more capable and able to put through legislation that he believes in than the gentleman from Illinois, or is more capable of defeating legislation that he is opposed to than the gentleman from Illinois. And when the Secretary of War wanted this provision put in here for his own purpose, he very properly went to the gentleman from Illinois to carry it through. But that does not warrant the Appropriation Committee in bringing it in, nor does it warrant us in continuing to appropriate money for new legislation without a fair consideration of it by the proper committees and the members of this House, simply because the heads of the great departments know that the most speedy route and the quickest road to accomplish what they want is to go to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, if he believes in their proposition and is willing to advocate it. As far as the House is concerned, it does not come here in the usual channels and in the usual way.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Illinois state whether General Chaffee recommends this appropriation?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; the whole record is here. All the recommendations are printed as a public document.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, we come to another matter. I know it is absolutely useless to object to the insertion of these items in a general appropriation bill. I am not falling out with my friend from Illinois. I know the power that he exercises in this House and the power that he exerts in the Congress of the United States. I know that I or any other member of this House,

when that provision comes before the House, can make a point of order striking it from the bill and send the bill out of the House of Representatives, as the rules of the House require that it should come into the House without new legislation. But I also know that when it goes to the Senate of the United States, by those methods that we all know and understand, that these provisions will be placed in this bill again, and they will come back here and either be unanimously consented to in conference or they will go back to the Appropriation Committee; and when it is reported again to the Committee of the Whole House it will be impossible for any member to strike those provisions of new legislation from the bill, because it will come back here as a Senate amendment.

It is not this particular item that I am objecting to. I do not know the merits or the demerits of the proposition. The other day a bill was brought in here from the Pension Committee. The subcommittee having it in charge reported it without amendment. An individual member of the House rose in his seat and offered amendments to that bill for the benefit of the Federal soldier that he believed he was justified in offering, and that he could not get reported otherwise, and I, among others, insisted that this amendment should not be considered, but should be reported in order and properly.

Now, I say to the membership of this House that if that was correct then, it is correct to enforce the rules of this House and provide that every member of the House shall stand on the same basis so far as the legislation of this country is concerned. You can not do it if you are going to legislate through the general appropriation bills.

I recognize the fact that the man who stands here alone and merely makes the point of order will lose his proposition when it comes back here from the Senate. If the membership on this side of the House, or the membership on that side of the House, who have stood here and explained to the country what they would do if they could have the opportunity, if they have the courage to stand up to their convictions and belief that they should have the same rights under the rules of this House to enact legislation that they believe in, they could enforce it. The men on that side of the House who go back to their constituents every fall and claim that they could not get legislation for the Federal soldiers of this country because they could not put it on the appropriation bills, that the rules knocked them out and they could not get it from under the rules of the House, are placed in that position because they have not got the courage or sand to stand up here and enforce the rules when the Democratic party wants to help them do it.

If you have got individual members on that side of the House who want legislation, who have promised their constituents to give them legislation, who believe in these things—if you have got the courage of your convictions, to stand up here and prevent legislation in general appropriation bills, to let every committee stand on its own bottom, and if a gentleman wants legislation make him carry that legislation to the committee to which it belongs, then you can get what you want, and what your constituents want, and you won't do it until that time.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9315) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for prior years and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

PURCHASE OF PANAMA CANAL.

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report of the Isthmian Canal Commission upon the proposition of the new Panama Canal Company to sell and dispose of all its rights, property, and unfinished work to the United States for \$40,000,000.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, January 20, 1902.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave for the withdrawal of papers was granted in the following cases:

To Mr. CURTIS, papers in the case of John Prescott, Fifty-sixth Congress, no adverse report having been made.

To Mr. KNOX, papers in the case of Lydia G. Cate, Fifty-fourth Congress, no adverse report having been made.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. EDDY, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for two days, on account of important business.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was discharged from the further consideration of bills of the following titles and the same were referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

A bill (H. R. 9313) for improving Rhode Island avenue between Fourth street NE. and Twelfth street NE.

A bill (H. R. 9314) for improving Lansing street (Lowell street) between Seventh street and Twelfth street NE.

And then, on motion of Mr. CANNON (at 4 o'clock and 55 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 assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John B. Klepper against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Joel C. Johnson, administrator of estate of Richard W. Johnson, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of David Rudy against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Mary R. Jones, administratrix of estate of Asa F. Allen, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of the Mississippi Manufacturing Company against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Joseph W. Mays, administrator of estate of Pinckney Halton, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Ernest Neill, administrator of estate of Joseph H. Egner, 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 were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8206) to provide for the construction of a revenue cutter for use at Philadelphia, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 103); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7645) to maintain the legal-tender silver dollar at parity with gold, and to increase the subsidiary silver coinage, submitted the views of the minority, to accompany report (No. 32, part 2); which said views were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4208) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Pardee, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 74); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5149) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Bachelder, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 75); 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. 7623) granting a pension to Aaron M. Applegate, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 76); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5169) granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Kingsley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 77); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3230) for the relief of Catherine Pflueger, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 78); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2416) granting an increase of pension to John B. Wilcox, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 79); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3261) granting a pension to George R. Grubaugh, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 80); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5108) granting an increase of pension to Elisha T. Taylor, alias Elisha T. Bisbee, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 81); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2528) granting a pension to Helen M. Evans, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 82); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2429) granting an increase of pension to John C. Morrison, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 83); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5248) granting a pension to Frances A. Tillotson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 84); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3300) granting a pension to George B. Boyd, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 85); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5147) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Lane, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 86); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1374) granting an increase of pension to James Willard, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 87); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2412) granting a pension to Helen L. Pepper, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 88); 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. 2193) granting an increase of pension to David A. Ireland, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 89); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RUMPLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2321) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Martin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 90); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LATIMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1035) granting a pension to Esther F. Moody, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 91); 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. 1144) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth O. Gould, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 92); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2265) granting a pension to M. V. Hathaway, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 93); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 202) granting a pension to Mary E. Davis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 94); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RUMPLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1728) granting an increase of pension to George W. Thompson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 95); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1647) granting an increase of pension to Helen F. M. Edwards, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 96); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RUMPLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2983) to amend an act entitled: "An act granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Thompson," approved March 3, 1901, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 97); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2978) for the relief of Joseph H. Penny, John W. Penny, Thomas Penny, and Harvey Penny, surviving partners of Penny & Sons, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 98); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5106) for the relief Rasmussen & Strehlow, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 99); 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. 5094) for the relief of the persons who sustained damages by the explosion of an ammunition chest of Battery F, Second United States Artillery, July 16, 1894, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 100); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. OTEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4988) for the relief of Mary E. McDonald, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 101); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4471) for the relief of James M. Chisham, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 102); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (S. 332) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Crosby—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2161) granting an increase of pension to A. Curtis Steever Carpenter—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

House bills Nos. 1758, 6810, 7894, 8027, 8028, and bill for the relief of Margaret Lee—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9500) to amend the law creating the district of the Teche, Louisiana—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOODY of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 9501) to provide for the sale of the unsold portion of the Umatilla Indian Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9502) confirming the title of mixed-blood Indians to certain lands, and providing the manner for selling, conveying, and encumbering the same—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 9503) to authorize the Oklahoma and Western Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Fort Sill Military Reservation, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK: A bill (H. R. 9504) appropriating money for the protection of property in Lincoln County, Mo.—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 9505) providing for leaves of absence to certain employees of the Government—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 9506) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Indians located upon the Grande Ronde Reservation, in the State of Oregon, and to make an appropriation to carry the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9507) to limit the value of lands selected in lieu of lands covered by unperfected bona fide claims or patents within forest reservations—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9508) to authorize the heirs of deceased allottees on the former Siletz Reservation, in Oregon, to sell and convey allotted lands—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 9509) providing for the purchase by and on behalf of the United States of the right to use the Daniel process of producing engraved plates—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SCOTT (by request): A bill (H. R. 9510) providing for pensions for officers in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAKENEY: A bill (H. R. 9511) to regulate the importation of opium and fixing penalties for violations thereof—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 9512) repealing the national bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 9513) granting 5 per cent of the land sales on military land warrants to the public-land States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9514) to extend the public-land laws to the district of Alaska—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 9515) to amend section 4 of an act passed December 27, 1894, entitled "An act to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Shiloh"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 9516) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the Peoria and Miami surplus lands in the Quapaw Agency—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 9517) to provide for the further improvement of the inland water route from Norfolk, Va., to Albemarle Sound, North Carolina, through Currituck Sound—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9518) to provide for the further improvement of Pamlico and Tar rivers, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9519) to provide for the further maintenance and improvement of the harbor at Beaufort, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9520) to provide for the improvement of Scuppernon River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9521) to provide for the improvement of the harbor at Edenton Bay, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 9522) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served during the Spanish-American war and beyond the period of their enlistment—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9523) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served during the Spanish-American war and beyond the period of their enlistment—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 9524) to authorize the Missouri and Meramec Water Company to take water from the Missouri River, and to construct a dam or other devices for that purpose—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9525) to extend the provisions of the pension act of June 27, 1890, to the Missouri Enrolled State Militia and other organizations—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) for the relief of the Enrolled Militia of Memphis and western district of Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMALL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 129) for the survey of Perquimans River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 130) for the survey and improvement of Indian Island Slough, in Pamlico River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. OTJEN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 131) authorizing the transfer to the Library of Congress of the library of State reports, and so forth—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A resolution (H. Res. 97) requesting information relative to receiving ships—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH (by request): A resolution (H. Res. 98)

directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make certain inquiries in regard to the Georgetown and Tennallytown Railroad—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DE GRAFFENREID: A resolution (H. Res. 99) providing for an additional page—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ADAMS: A bill (H. R. 9526) granting a pension to Martha R. Osbourn—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9527) for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. Lermond, of Calhoun, McLean County, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. APLIN: A bill (H. R. 9528) granting a pension to Edward S. Dickinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9529) granting a pension to Eliza Bayard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9530) granting an increase of pension to Nettie Bullas—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9531) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus F. Coon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9532) granting an increase of pension to John Dick Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 9533) granting a pension to G. N. Warfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 9534) for the relief of the heirs of William Elliott—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 9535) granting an increase of pension to Louise Ward—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 9536) granting a pension to Travis Glasscoe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 9537) granting a pension to Marquis Lafayette Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 9538) for the relief of William McCarty Little, a lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9539) to authorize the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion as to Jasper L. Dodge, late of Company F, First Rhode Island Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON (by request): A bill (H. R. 9540) granting additional pension to Thomas J. Slusser—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9541) to increase the pension of Shelton Flannigan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9542) granting an increase of pension to John A. Hardy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9543) for the relief of Sylvester W. Quackenbush—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 9544) granting an increase of pension to George W. Barry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK: A bill (H. R. 9545) granting a pension to James T. Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9546) granting a pension to Lewis K. Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9547) granting a pension to George W. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9548) granting a pension to Annie A. Gallagher—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9549) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Church at Warrenton, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9550) for the relief of Frank Lincoln—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9551) granting a pension to Emma E. Upton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9552) granting a pension to Johanna Callahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9553) granting a pension to Isaac Willingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9554) granting an increase of pension to James T. Gilkison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9555) granting an increase of pension to Robert Bartlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9556) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Shup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9557) granting an increase of pension to James G. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9558) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Engle—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9559) granting an increase of pension to Clara M. Wakefield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9560) granting an increase of pension to James E. Kelsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9561) granting an increase of pension to James C. Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9562) granting an increase of pension to W. J. Chittenden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9563) granting an increase of pension to William Rozelle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9564) granting an increase of pension to Frank J. Melton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9565) to grant a pension to Howard Franklin, son of Benjamin Franklin, Company E, Fifty-second Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 9566) granting a pension to Margaret Powers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9567) granting an increase of pension to Tunis J. Roosa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9568) for the relief of Elijah T. Hurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 9569) granting an increase of pension to Albert Deits—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9570) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Gabrion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9571) to correct the military record of Nathan Skidmore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 9572) for the relief of Capt. Isaac Alt's company (B), Forty-sixth West Virginia Volunteer Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9573) for the relief of Capt. John Bond's company, West Virginia Volunteer Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9574) for the relief of Capt. E. C. Harper's company (A), Forty-sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9575) for the relief of Capt. John Bogg's company, West Virginia Volunteer Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9576) for the relief of Capt. Sampson Snyder's company, West Virginia Volunteer Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 9577) removing charge of desertion from military record of Sylvester Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 9578) for the relief of the heirs of Denis O'Callaghan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 9579) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Caldwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9580) granting an increase of pension to Robert Shoemaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9581) to correct the military record of Michael H. Mangin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 9582) granting a pension to Eliza J. Mahurin, of Medora, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9583) granting a pension to Elymas F. Wilkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9584) granting a pension to Henry H. Sarver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9585) granting a pension to Joshua Tracy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9586) granting an increase of pension to John Greble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9587) granting an increase of pension to James M. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9588) to correct the military record of William T. Rominger, of Hartsville, Ind.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9589) referring to the Court of Claims the claims of O. P. Cobb and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 9590) for the relief of Thomas J. Lear—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9591) for the relief of George R. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HANBURY: A bill (H. R. 9592) granting a pension to Emily Briggs—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 9593) granting a pension to Elizabeth Rickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 9594) for the relief of Kelles Chewing—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 9595) granting a pension to John Q. Pugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9596) granting an increase of pension to Valentine Lloyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9597) for the relief of Thierman & Frost—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 9598) granting a pension to John Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9599) granting a pension to Joseph Disney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 9600) for the relief of Hyland C. Kirk and others, assignees of Addison C. Fletcher—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 9601) for the relief of Erwin Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9602) for the relief of Henry Taylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KYLE: A bill (H. R. 9603) granting a pension to Elizabeth Vanzant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9604) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Orthineal Burkett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 9605) granting a pension to Ettie E. House—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9606) granting a pension to Charles Blitz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9607) granting a pension to George M. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9608) granting a pension to Joseph K. Welt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9609) for the relief of the estate of H. Niswander—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9610) to increase the pension of Catherine Bowsher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 9611) for the relief of Maria M. C. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9612) to correct the military record of David Hurlburt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9613) to correct the naval record of William Perkins—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9614) to correct the military record of Rufus W. Herrick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9615) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles F. Allen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 9616) to pay Samuel M. Blair the sum of \$12,470—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 9617) to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of Bernard Quinn for compensation for the loss of dwelling houses, fencing, stable, and other property in Dalton, Ga., by order of General Sherman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 9618) for the relief of John Ronald—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MOODY of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 9619) to remove the charge of desertion against John Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 9620) for relief of William J. Hines—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 9621) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Y. Transue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 9622) granting an increase of pension to John Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9623) granting an increase of pension to John Fesler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9624) granting a pension to Henry C. Burgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 9625) granting a pension to Elizabeth T. Becket, widow of John Becket, late a private in Company K, Eighty-sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 9626) granting an increase of pension to James J. Eighney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9627) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda M. Dean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9628) granting an increase of pension to Jesse F. Snow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID (by request): A bill (H. R. 9629) granting a pension to Clarence E. Haney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHEA of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9630) for the relief of Leander J. Keller—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 9631) for relief of Susan J. Stegler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9632) for the allowance of claims of certain citizens of Virginia for damages to their property incident to the encampment at Manassas and march from Camp Alger to Thoroughfare Gap, Virginia, as recommended by a board of officers appointed for the consideration of claims for damages to property by volunteer soldiers during the war with Spain—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 9633) for

the relief of the estate of Amy L. Mahoudeau, deceased, late of Pointe Coupee Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9634) for the relief of the estate of Archibald D. Palmer, deceased, late of East Feliciana Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9635) for the relief of the estate of Archibald D. Palmer, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9636) for the relief of the estate of Francois Bouligny, deceased, late of Pointe Coupee Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9637) for the relief of the estate of Eliza E. Barron, deceased, late of West Feliciana Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9638) for the relief of Bertrand and Gaudin Cazes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9639) for the relief of the estate of Mary E. Taylor, deceased, late of St. Landry Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SELBY: A bill (H. R. 9640) granting an increase of pension to Lieut. Col. William J. Wyatt, of Franklin, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 9641) granting an increase of pension to Capt. John B. Calhoun—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 9642) granting a pension to Richard J. Van Valkenburg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHATTUC: A bill (H. R. 9643) granting a certificate of merit to John A. Cassell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9644) granting a pension to William Bode—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 9645) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Boyle, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SKILES: A bill (H. R. 9646) granting a pension to Maggie Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9647) granting a pension to Lucia Webster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9648) for the relief of Peter Parsch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 9649) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hanley, Tecumseh, Mich.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9650) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Fellows, as guardian of Augustus W. Fellows, Ann Arbor, Mich.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9651) for the relief of Robert M. Jack, Daniel F. Jack, Henry Hayden, John Kennedy, Wright H. Calkins, and James E. Barrett—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9652) granting an increase of pension to Martin H. Ozment, George W. Williams, and Isaac N. Willhite—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STARK: A bill (H. R. 9653) granting an increase of pension to James L. McGee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 9654) granting a pension to John S. James—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 9655) for the relief of the legal representatives of James M. Alexander, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 9656) granting a pension to Lunsford Y. Bailey, of Monmouth, Ore.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 9657) granting a pension to Martha Loveland—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENDERSON: A bill (H. R. 9658) granting an increase of pension to Robert Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 9659) granting a pension to Laura A. Van Nye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9660) granting a pension to John E. Kirkham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9661) granting a pension to Charles C. Clise, of Carmel, Hamilton County, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9662) granting a pension to Emma M. Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9663) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Wall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9664) for the relief of Joseph H. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9665) to correct the military record of Archibald Chittick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 9666) for the relief of Clara H. Fulford—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 9667) for the relief of Robert F. Thompson, for services rendered by him for compilation of the

laws relating to Indian affairs—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROBB: A bill (H. R. 9668) granting a pension to Solomon Butler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9669) to correct the military record of Eugene Sovine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 9670) granting an increase of pension to Aaron C. Badger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VANDIVER: A bill (H. R. 9671) granting a pension to John Bartmann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9672) to correct the naval record of John J. James—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolution of Philadelphia Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade, in opposition to reduction of duties on tobacco and cigars imported from Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. W. Gaskill and other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of a law against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Philadelphia Lager Beer Brewers' Association, favoring repeal of war tax on beer—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Herman Otter, for protection for the beet-sugar industry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of W. O. Siebold and others, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the Constitution relating to polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL: Protest of farmers of northern Colorado, against reduction of tariff on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. O. W. Sheldon and others, of Pueblo, Colo., favoring antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Musicians' Protective Association, Leadville, Colo., urging the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Resolutions of the Philadelphia Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade, protesting against any change of the rates of duty on tobacco and cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Resolutions adopted by the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, of Sacramento, Cal., protesting against the passage of a measure to admit free of duty into the United States sugar grown in Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, Atlanta, Ga., requesting the appointment of a commission to study and report upon the commercial and industrial condition of China and Japan—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN: Resolutions of Janesville Leaf Tobacco Merchants' Association, of Janesville, Wis., in opposition to the reduction of duties on Cuban tobacco imports into the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BULL: Resolutions of Unions No. 212, Pawtucket; 195, Providence; 219, Newport; Granite Cutters' Union of Westerly, and Trades and Labor Union of Providence, all of the American Federation of Labor, and of Union No. 99, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, all of Rhode Island, favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 8136, granting a pension to Penelope A. Dexter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of William H. Davis and others, for the passage of the bill to reclassify the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Business Men's Association of Pawtucket, R. I., in favor of amendments to the bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania: Petition of Alex McIntosh and 5 others, against reduction of tariff on raw sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS: Resolutions of National Live Stock Association, favoring the admission of Arizona into the Union as a State—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolution of National Live Stock Association of Denver, Colo., in favor of the Wadsworth bill relating to oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the National Live Stock Association, in relation to lieu-land laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Sidney Clarke and others, favoring the admission of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of J. E. Thompson, of Kenney, Tex., and others, favoring the adoption of a resolution of sympathy for the Boers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Resolution of the Board of Trade of Chicago, Ill., asking for a review of the record of the court as to the conduct of Admiral Schley in the battle of Santiago—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of William H. Davis and others, for the passage of the bill for the reclassification of Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, for the improvement of Point Judith Harbor of Refuge—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of Electrical Workers' Union No. 99, of Providence, R. I., favoring construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Business Men's Association of Pawtucket, R. I., in favor of amendments to the bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Isaac Dewitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK: Petition of T. E. Blacksmith and other citizens of Lingo, Mo., favoring reenactment of Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORLISS: Resolutions of National Association of Railway Commissioners, in favor of the Cullom bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the National Live Stock Association, in favor of House bill No. 8337, to amend the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of W. E. Lamson and other citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of a law against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of John H. Neidigh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of John H. Boyles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Sampson Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Johanna Callahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of James E. Kelsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Dr. W. J. Chittenden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of farmers and citizens of Michigan, protesting against tariff legislation reducing the duty on raw sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Printing Pressmen's Union No. 24, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petition of Shawnee Indians of the Indian Territory, asking Congress to give them their rights in the Cherokee Nation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CURRIER: Resolutions of Sampson Post, No. 22, Department of New Hampshire, Grand Army of the Republic, urging that naval vessels to be authorized in the naval bill be constructed at the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mrs. Eunice I. Godfrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARRAGH: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5829, to provide for the erection of a public building at Traverse City, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 6688, granting an increase of pension to Charles Hubbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Capt. E. C. Harper's Company A, Forty-sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Capt. Isaac Alt's Company B, Forty-sixth West Virginia Volunteer Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Capt. Bogg's company, West Virginia Volunteer Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Capt. John Bond's company of West Virginia Home Guards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to John May—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolution of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the appointment of a commission to study and report upon the commercial and industrial conditions of China and Japan—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Chicago Clearing House Association, in relation to the ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on the direct taxation of banking capital—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Sacramento (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, in opposition to the admission of Cuban sugar free of duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Resolution of Trades and Labor Council of Lewistown, Mont., for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Resolution of Beaufort (S. C.) Board of Trade, favoring an appropriation for connecting the waters of South Edisto and Ashepoo rivers by a cut through Fenwick's Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, for the improvement of Charleston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, in relation to the tariff on Cuban sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Janesville Leaf Tobacco Merchants' Association, of Janesville, Wis., against the reduction of the tariff on Cuban tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of New York Produce Exchange, urging tariff concessions to Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, opposing concessions in the way of tariff reduction to the people of Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of certain farmers of Michigan, against any tariff reduction for Cuban sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Chicago Clearing House Association, urging the repeal of provisions of the war-revenue act imposing a tax upon banks and bankers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSS: Resolutions of unions No. 330, 9, 39, 9417, 127, and 2, American Federation of Labor, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of German-American citizens of Chicago, expressive of sympathy for the Boers, the women, and the children of South Africa—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Chicago Clearing House Association, favoring repeal of the special tax on banks and bankers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution of the Tri-State Medical Association of Western Maryland, Western Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, favoring the establishment of a psycho-physical laboratory in the Department of the Interior—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolution of Allegheny Council, No. 23, Daughters of Liberty, of Allegheny, Pa., urging the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law, etc.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of W. M. Dick and other citizens of Bellevue, Pa., favoring the enactment of a law against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of William H. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Joshua Tracy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of C. A. Buchanan, of Seymour, Ind., for a reclassification of clerks in the Railway Postal Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Norman Carr and 85 citizens of Franklin, Ind., for the enactment of a law against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of J. W. Fowler Post, No. 366, Grand Army of the Republic, of New Lexington, Ohio, in favor of per diem pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Jas. N. Parker and other carriers on rural-delivery routes outside of Chillicothe, Ohio, asking for increase of salary—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Resolution of Iowa Park and Forestry Association, for the preservation of forest lands, etc.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of Volga, Iowa, for an amendment to the national Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Women's Missionary Society of Volga, Iowa, and others, for the protection of native races in the islands of the Pacific and elsewhere against the sale of firearms, opium, and intoxicants—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of John R. Booth and others, for a public building in Danbury, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of 105 citizens and legally qualified voters of Freeport, Ill., for amendment of Constitution to prohibit

and punish polygamy and defining legal marriage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 38 residents of Winnebago, Ill., favoring the Gillett bill excluding liquor selling in the South Sea Islands—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of Friendship Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and councils of Daughters of Liberty, at Freehold and Jamesburg, N. J., favoring the passage of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Joseph Disney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to James C. G. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of United Mine Workers of district No. 25, of Missouri, concerning the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of W. H. Makeaney and 2 others, favoring building war vessels in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of J. C. Williams and George H. Fritts, relating to compensation of postal clerks in the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Resolution of Mount Hope Grange, No. 902, of New Hackensack, N. Y., against the irrigation of any portion of the public domain at Government expense—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Dutchess County, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the Constitution relating to polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYLE: Petition of R. T. Kelley and others, for the suppression of anarchy, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolution of Iowa Park and Forestry Association, December 11, 1901, L. H. Pammel, secretary, in favor of a southern Appalachian national park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Stephen Dyer, to accompany House bill for increase of his pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Holyoke, Mass., in favor of a law to prohibit the sale of liquors at any Army or Naval post or any Government station—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of Retail Dealers' Association of Trenton, N. J., for the removal of the 10 per cent tax on beer—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of O. E. Throckmorton, for the erection of a monument on the battle ground of Tippecanoe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Jersey City, N. J., for a new post-office building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Washington Council, No. 1, Order United American Mechanics, and Junior Order United American Mechanics of Cedarville, N. J., in relation to the suppression of anarchy, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of New Jersey State Grange, for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of J. C. Fuller and other citizens of Millbank, S. Dak., asking for an amendment to the Constitution defining legal marriage to be monogamic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Haverhill (Mass.) Board of Trade, in favor of a 9-foot low-water channel in the Merrimac River from Haverhill, Mass., to the vicinity of the Artichoke River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the Haverhill (Mass.) Board of Trade, in regard to the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOON: Paper to accompany House bill No. 1267, for relief of Mary Ann Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Papers to accompany House bill No. 1323, authorizing an increase of pension in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany claim of Susan J. Stigler—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Eliza Antry and 21 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., and vicinity, for the suppression of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Petition of the United States Brewers' Association, requesting the entire removal of the war tax on malt liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the Empire State Sugar Company, against the removal of the duty on Cuban sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the Cane Sugar Producers of America, against

the proposed concessions to producers of cane sugar in the island of Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the New York Produce Exchange, urging the reduction of duties on Cuban products brought into the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN: Letter from Lake Seamens' Union of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring erection of a marine hospital at that point—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Master Plumbers' Association of Buffalo, N. Y., in relation to the plumbing board of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of Charles Hunter and other citizens of Pittsburg, Kans., concerning the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Protest of citizens of Sugar City, Colo., and farmers of northern Colorado, on the proposed tariff on Cuban and foreign sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Papers to accompany House bill No. 4170, granting an increase of pension to H. P. Macloon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Papers to accompany House bill 9296, granting a pension to Mary E. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Cincinnati Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade and the Cigar Manufacturers' Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, asking that duties on Cuban cigars and tobacco remain as they are at present—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKILES: Petitions of the Presbyterian Christian Endeavor Society of Norwalk, Ohio, and the Christian Endeavor Society of Hunts Corners, Ohio, favoring the passage of the Gillett-Lodge bill to protect native races in the Pacific islands—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: Resolution of George W. Furbeck and other citizens of Albany, N. Y., for a constitutional amendment defining a legal marriage to be monogamic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNOOK: Paper to accompany House bill 8952, granting an increase of pension to Patterson Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 5509, granting an increase of pension to Joseph Berger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 8541, granting an increase of pension to Mahlon C. Moores—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 8951, granting a pension to Minnie Gusler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of Alert Lodge, No. 380, I. A. of M., of Ansonia, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STARK: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5514, granting a pension to Eliza Ann Howe, of Geneva, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Internal Revenue Storekeepers and Gaugers' Association of the district of Nebraska, favoring the passage of House bill No. 3095, relating to internal-revenue officers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Major Potter Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Reynolds, Nebr., favoring the construction of war vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Resolutions of the Central Labor Union of Portsmouth, N. H., favoring the building of war ships in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Central Labor Union of Portsmouth, N. H., favoring the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VANDIVER: Petition of farmers and citizens of Taney County, Mo., for relief on account of the recent drought—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petitions of Women's Literary Club, Women's Industrial and Educational Union, Ladies' Guild of Episcopal Church, Musical Society Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and branches of C. M. B. A., all of Dunkirk, N. Y., urging an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of farmers and beet growers of Livingston and adjacent counties, in the State of New York, against the reduction of tariff on Cuban sugar and tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of business men and farmers of Canton, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., favoring the passage of oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Retail Clerks' Union No. 146, of Lockport, N. Y., American Federation of Labor, favoring the construction of naval vessels at Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WARNOCK: Petition of J. M. Baldwin and 137 others, for amendment of the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

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

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Jesse S. Bower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of J. T. Curley and other citizens of Michigan, for the retention of duty on raw sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chicago Clearing House Association, urging the repeal of the special tax on capital and surplus of banks, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Associated Fraternities of America, praying for relief from the ruling of the Post-Office Department excluding fraternity publications from the mails as second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of St. Clair County Farmers' Institute, Michigan, for the retention of the present tariff on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Paper relating to the case of William Martin v. Cynthia A. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS: Resolution of the California State Board of Trade and the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, in opposition to the proposed reduction of the present tariff rates on Cuban sugar and tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, for the maintenance of a hatchery for the propagation of cod and the cod-fisheries industry in Alaskan waters—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., urging the creation of a department of commerce and industries—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Board of Trade of San Francisco, Cal., favoring change in the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., against reciprocal trade relations with Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG: Resolution of Philadelphia Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade, protesting against any change in the existing rates of duty on tobacco or cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Chicago Clearing House Association, urging the repeal of the special tax on capital and surplus of banks, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. J. Whitthorne and others, of Columbia, Tenn., in behalf of the claim for the destruction of Jackson College by Federal troops—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of W. W. Lawrence, of Pittsburg, Pa., in relation to the extension of patents Nos. 273773 and 266198—to the Committee on Patents.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 21, 1902.

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.

LEASING OF INDIAN LANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 7th instant, a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, containing information relative to the leasing of large quantities of Indian reservations for mining, grazing, and other purposes, as shown by the records of his office, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

TOPOGRAPHIC WORK OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 13th instant, a letter from the Director of the Geological Survey, together with an abstract of reports, letters, clippings, indorsements, resolutions, and petitions indicating the demand for topographic work of the Geological Survey; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Geological Survey, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented a petition of the Young Men's Business Association of Greensboro, N. C., praying that an ap-

propriation be made for the improvement of Cape Fear River in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Produce Exchange of Wilmington, N. C., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of J. M. Fox and 229 other citizens of North Carolina, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Amalgamated Wood Workers' Union No. 93, American Federation of Labor, of Winston-Salem, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of sundry citizens of West Virginia, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WELLINGTON presented a petition of 50 citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying that raw sugar be restored to the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Shoe and Leather Board of Trade, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the repeal of the duty on hides; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Tri-State Medical Association of Western Maryland and West Virginia, praying for the establishment of a psycho-physical laboratory in the Department of the Interior; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Monumental Council, No. 13, Daughters of Liberty, of Baltimore, Md., and a petition of Local Union No. 635, United Mine Workers of America, of Vale Summit, Md., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 29, of Baltimore; of Wood Workers' Union No. 6, of Baltimore; of Iron Molders' Union No. 24, of Baltimore, and of Iron Molders' Union No. 211, of Baltimore, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Independent Council, No. 2, Order of United American Mechanics, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress anarchy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the United States Brewers' Association of New York, praying for the repeal of the remainder of the additional war tax superimposed upon the old war tax upon malt liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of Rhode Island Lodge, No. 147, International Association of Machinists, of Providence, R. I., and a petition of Local Union No. 217, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Westerly, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. QUARLES presented a petition of the International Typographical Union of Kenosha, Wis., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Milwaukee Association of Credit Men of Wisconsin, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 474, International Association of Machinists, of South Kaukauna, Wis., praying that an appropriation be made to supply a deficiency in the ordnance fund of the Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Federated Trades Council of Madison, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petition of M. L. Essick and sundry other citizens of Rochester, Ind., praying for the establishment of reciprocal trade relations with Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

He also presented petitions of Cigar Makers' Union No. 31, of Connorsville; of the Central Labor Union of Clinton, and of Rock City Union, No. 242, International Association of Machinists, of Wabash, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GAMBLE presented the petition of J. A. Fuller and 113