

189. Order of Brith Abraham, of Traverse City, Mich., relating to methods of the immigration bureau at the port of New York—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: Petition of A. M. Howard and other retail druggists of Excelsior Springs, Mo., urging the passage of House bill 178, for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of retail druggists of Van Buren County, Mich., favoring the passage of House bill 178, for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEDGE: Petition of Rand Lumber Company and others, of Burlington, Iowa, and vicinity for the repair of levee on the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

By Mr. HOPKINS: Petition of 525 citizens of Sycamore, Ill., against the repeal of the anticanteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: Protest of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Gladstone, N. J., against the repeal of the anticanteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONG: Paper to accompany House bill 6086, for the relief of W. H. De Long—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of Thomas W. Sweeney Post, No. 361, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, favoring House bill 13986, relating to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOODY: Petition of various churches and Christian organizations of Forest Grove, Oreg., in favor of legislation in restraint of the liquor traffic—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Resolution of the common council of Boston, Mass., protesting against a depot for the light-house service on Castle Island—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Papers in support of House bill 17067, to grant a medal to George W. Churchill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Ephraim Cassel and 23 other citizens of Republican City, Nebr., in support of the McCumber bill and in relation to the sale of liquor in immigrant stations, Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of A. McMillen and other druggists of McCook, Nebr., urging the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of W. A. Clark and other druggists of Blissfield, Mich., favoring House bill 178—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Paper to accompany House bill 15788, relating to the claim of G. W. Upton—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 10, 1903.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington.

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

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

COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in response to a resolution of July 1, 1902, certain information concerning the list of national, State, and local commercial organizations and also national, State, and local agricultural associations of the United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4825) to provide for a union railroad station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; further insists upon its amendments numbered 39 and 41, and so much of amendment numbered 57 as relates to striking out of section 13 of the bill and the substitution of matter in lieu thereof, upon which the committee of conference were unable to agree; asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BABCOCK, Mr. MUDD, and Mr. LATIMER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7656) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to amend sections 5191 and 5192 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes;" asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FOWLER, Mr. HILL, and Mr. TALBERT managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15659) granting a pension to Elise Sigel, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. APLIN, Mr. HOLLIDAY, and Mr. NORTON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

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

A bill (H. R. 3504) granting an increase of pension to Grace A. Negley;

A bill (H. R. 5101) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Contal;

A bill (H. R. 7110) granting an increase of pension to Aurelia M. Power;

A bill (H. R. 8663) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles F. Woodford and grant him an honorable discharge;

A bill (H. R. 9107) granting a pension to Austin A. Vore;

A bill (H. R. 10095) for the relief of Levi L. Reed;

A bill (H. R. 10672) granting a pension to Ada S. Kempfer; and

A bill (H. R. 15911) granting an increase of pension to George N. McMurray.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (S. 6773) to expedite the hearing and determination of suits in equity pending or hereafter brought under the act of July 2, 1890, entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies;" "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, or any other act having a like purpose that may hereafter be enacted;

A bill (H. R. 7) authorizing the Secretary of War to cause to be erected monuments and markers on the battlefield of Gettysburg, Pa., to commemorate the valorous deeds of certain regiments and batteries of the United States Army;

A bill (H. R. 2422) for the relief of Edward S. Crill;

A bill (H. R. 3502) for the relief of the estate of M. J. Grealish, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 8287) granting an increase of pension to Peter Johnson;

A bill (H. R. 8288) granting an increase of pension to Scott Case;

A bill (H. R. 11544) to correct the military record of Thomas J. Morman;

A bill (H. R. 12064) for the relief of Lebbeus H. Rogers and the administrators of William B. Moses, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 14047) for the relief of the clerks of circuit and district courts of the United States;

A bill (H. R. 14512) to amend an act to add certain counties in Alabama to the northern district therein, and to divide the said northern district, after the addition of said counties, into two divisions, and to prescribe the times and places for holding courts therein, and for other purposes, approved May 2, 1884;

A bill (H. R. 16646) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Bogue Chitto, in the State of Louisiana; and

A bill (H. R. 16975) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania, by the Eastern Railroad Company.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of J. Bunyon Lemon, of Manchester, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the States the power to deal with intoxicating liquors which may be shipped into their territory from other States, and also to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in immigrant stations and in Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Northeastern Suburban Citizens' Association of Langdon, D. C., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, respecting suffrage in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented memorials of sundry citizens of New Hamburg and Poughkeepsie, in the State of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relative to the interstate transportation of live stock; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fair Haven, N. Y., 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 the W. H. Sawyer Lumber Company, of North Tonawanda, N. Y., praying for the establishment of a department of commerce and labor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of J. G. Ward & Sons, of Ravena, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called pure-food bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Lodge No. 115, of Brooklyn; of Lodge No. 288, of New York City; of Lodge No. 54, of New York City; of Lodge No. 49, of New York City; of Lodge No. 148, of Albany; of Lodge No. 291, of Brooklyn; of the Independent Family Benevolent Association of New York City, and of the congregation of Sons of Israel, People of Kadan, of New York City, all of the Order of B'rith Abraham, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to modify the methods and practice pursued by the immigration officers at the port of New York; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of Seaburg & Johnson, of New York City; of the Employers' Association of Elmira; of the New York Continental Jewell Filtration Company, of New York City; of the Punxsutawney Iron Company, of Buffalo, and of the Campbell Knitting Mill Company, of Elmira, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Iron Molders' Local Union No. 180, of Sandy Hill; of the Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 494, of Corinth; of Musical Union No. 134, of Jamestown; of Local Union No. 508, of Mohawk; of the Central Labor Union of Lockport; of Local Union No. 93, of Rochester, and of Local Union No. 401, of Brooklyn, all of the American Federation of Labor, and of Samuel A. Carlson, of Jamestown, all in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEARNS (for Mr. SCOTT) presented petitions of sundry citizens of Braxton County; of Thomas A. Anderson, of Sistersville, and of James Paull, of Wellsburg, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the States the power to deal with intoxicating liquors which may be shipped into their territory from other States; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. SCOTT) presented a petition of Local Union No. 488, American Federation of Labor, of Grafton, W. Va., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GAMBLE presented the petition of T. B. Roberts and sundry other citizens of Armour, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the importation of breeding animals; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 153, American Federation of Labor, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the giving of presents, coupons, or promises of gifts with cigars and tobaccos; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MASON presented the petition of N. F. Chamberlain & Co., of the United States, praying that an appropriation be made to complete the work of raising the wreck of the battle ship *Maine*; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a petition of Twentieth Century Division, No. 555, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Lake City, Iowa, praying for the passage of the anti-injunction and conspiracy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 312, Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees, of Davenport, Iowa, and a petition of Local Union No. 869, American Federation of Labor, of Boone, Iowa, praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 253, American Federation of Labor, of Argentine, Kans., praying for the repeal of the desert-land law and the commutation clause of the homestead act; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Alma, of the congregation of the Friends' Church of Varck, of H. J. Shaver and sundry other citizens of Phillips County, of F. J. Simpson and sundry other citizens of Norton County, and of H. H. Reed and sundry other citizens of Smith County, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HEITFELD. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of Idaho, relative to the repeal of the stone and timber act and

the commutation clause of the homestead law. I ask that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

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

STATE OF IDAHO, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Will H. Gibson, secretary of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 1, by Flint, which was filed in this office on the 4th day of February, A. D. 1903, 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 4th day of February, A. D. 1903.

[SEAL.]

WILL H. GIBSON, *Secretary of State.*

House joint memorial No. 1, by Flint.

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Idaho, in regular session, do protest against the repeal of the stone and timber act and the commutation clause of the homestead act, or against the passage of any laws depriving the people of the benefit of such acts as now existent.

And your memorialists will ever pray.
The secretary of the State of Idaho is hereby requested to forward this memorial to the Congress of the United States.

This house joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 20th day of January, 1903.

JAMES F. HUNT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 3d day of February, 1903.

JAMES M. STEVENS,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 1 originated in the house of representatives of the legislature of the State of Idaho during the seventh session.

ROBERT M. MCCRACKEN,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

State of Idaho. Received and filed February 4, 1903.

W. H. GIBSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. WARREN. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of Wyoming, relative to the irrigation investigations by the United States Department of Agriculture. I ask that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Wyoming, ss:

I, Fenimore Chatterton, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed has been carefully compared with the original enrolled joint resolution No. 3, senate, State of Wyoming, and is a full, true and correct copy of same and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming. Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 6th day of February, A. D. 1903.

[SEAL.]

FENIMORE CHATTERTON,
Secretary of State.

Enrolled joint resolution No. 3, senate, State of Wyoming. A joint resolution indorsing the irrigation investigation of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Be it resolved by the senate of the State of Wyoming (the house of representatives concurring), Whereas the irrigation investigations by the United States Department of Agriculture have proven to be of the greatest value to the arid and semiarid States; and

Whereas the rapid development of the West through irrigation enterprise has raised many questions which should be investigated at an early date; and

Whereas no other department of the Government is equipped to carry on this work to the best advantage: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we earnestly request and urge the honorable representatives of the State of Wyoming in Congress to support the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Office of Experiment Stations relative to these investigations; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of these resolutions be sent to each of the Congressional delegation from this State, with the request that they urge these appropriations before Congress.

C. A. GUERNSEY,
President of the Senate.
J. S. ATHERLY,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 6, 1903.

DE F. RICHARDS, *Governor.*

Mr. HALE presented a petition of Bangor Lodge, No. 143, Order of B'rith Abraham, of Bangor, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to modify the methods and practice pursued by the immigration officers at the port of New York; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bangor, Me., praying for an impartial enforcement of the law against all offending citizens and corporations and for the immediate creation of new statutes sufficient to establish the power of the law supreme over all parties and interests in the Commonwealth; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR presented resolutions of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the preservation of Castle Island as

a part of the park system of the city of Boston; which were read, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, in the year 1903.

Resolutions relative to the preservation of Castle Island as a part of the park system of the city of Boston.

Whereas the preservation of Castle Island as a part of the Boston park system is of great importance to the health and pleasure of the citizens of Boston and of the vicinity, and said island is an object of interest to visitors from all parts of the Commonwealth; and

Whereas it is proposed to place upon this island a depot for the Light-House Service, which will greatly interfere with the enjoyment of the island by the public: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in general court assembled, That the establishment of such a depot on Castle Island would be an injury to the people of this Commonwealth, and that our Senators and Representatives in Congress are requested to use every honorable means to preserve Castle Island for the enjoyment of the public, and to see that the light-house depot is placed elsewhere in Boston Harbor; and

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, January 23, 1903.

Adopted. Sent up for concurrence.

JAMES W. KIMBALL, Clerk.
SENATE, February 3, 1903.

Adopted in concurrence.

HENRY D. COOLIDGE, Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

JAMES W. KIMBALL,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of Marion Council, No. 8, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Marion, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 7, of Indiana; of Local Union No. 833, of Blackburn, and of the Central Labor Union of Indianapolis, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Indiana, praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 54, American Federation of Labor, of Evansville, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the giving of presents, coupons, or promises of gifts with cigars and tobaccos; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Medical Association of Central New York, of Rochester, N. Y., praying for the establishment of a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of New England District Lodge, No. 7, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron-ship Builders, of Boston, Mass., praying for the passage of the ship subsidy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HEITFELD, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7288) extending the time for making proof and payment for all lands taken under the desert-land laws by the members of the Colorado Cooperative Colony for a further period of three years, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5463) for the extension of School street southward to Kenesaw avenue, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 16361) granting an increase of pension to John W. Chancellor, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6580) to amend the act approved March 15, 1878, entitled "An act for the relief of William A. Hammond, late Surgeon-General of the Army," reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I am directed by the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7142) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the Court of Claims, and for other purposes, to report it with an amendment and to submit a report thereon. As the bill is in the nature of an omnibus bill, I give notice that I will endeavor at the first opportunity to call it up and secure its passage.

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

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

A bill (H. R. 15422) granting an increase of pension to John Mosgrove; and

A bill (H. R. 15812) granting an increase of pension to Lucien B. Love.

Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, to whom was referred the amendment

submitted by Mr. FOSTER of Washington on the 9th instant, proposing to appropriate \$31,000 for the management, protection, and improvement of Mount Rainier National Park, in the State of Washington, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, submitted a favorable report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

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

A bill (H. R. 13323) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Barger;

A bill (H. R. 15443) granting a pension to Eudora Wells;

A bill (H. R. 2264) granting an increase of pension to George H. Higgins;

A bill (H. R. 15964) granting an increase of pension to Michael Murphy;

A bill (H. R. 6719) granting an increase of pension to John H. Hall;

A bill (H. R. 15843) granting an increase of pension to Louis W. Rowe;

A bill (H. R. 13793) granting an increase of pension to Solomon A. Alexander;

A bill (H. R. 7312) granting an increase of pension to James Curley;

A bill (H. R. 14930) granting an increase of pension to William H. Houseal;

A bill (H. R. 16210) granting an increase of pension to John C. Collahan;

A bill (H. R. 7760) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Graham; and

A bill (H. R. 11616) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Harris.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 15873) granting a pension to Minerva Murphy, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I report back favorably from the Committee on Printing the preamble and resolution relating to the proposed intercontinental railway through the three Americas, and I move that it be printed as a document.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER, from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7056) to provide for the disposition of church lands in Porto Rico, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. CLAPP on the 14th ultimo, relating to the distribution of the sets of Federal Cases to the circuit and district courts of the United States, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported it with amendments, submitted a report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. CLAPP on the 14th ultimo, relating to the distribution of sets of the Federal Reporter among the officers of the United States Government, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported it with amendments, submitted a report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9063) to refund certain taxes paid by the Anheuser-Busch Brewing Association, of St. Louis, Mo., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

MAGGIE V. HOLSTEIN.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7100) granting an increase of pension to Magdalena U. Holstein, to report it favorably with an amendment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

The amendment of the Committee on Pensions was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Maggie V. Holstein, widow of Charles L. Holstein, late adjutant Twenty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and captain and assistant adjutant-general, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Maggie V. Holstein."

MARY C. COUCH.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7186) granting a pension to Mary C. Couch, to report it with an amendment. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] is greatly interested in this bill, and I ask consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendment of the Committee on Pensions was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary C. Couch, widow of Darius N. Couch, late major-general, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed, and bound in cloth, 3,000 copies of a Congressional Directory which embraces the biographies of all members of Congress from the Continental Congress to the Fifty-seventh Congress, inclusive, compiled by O. M. Enyart; 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

JOSEPH BART.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12411) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Bart, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph Bart, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

FLORIDA BREWING COMPANY.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am directed by the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10678) for the relief of the Florida Brewing Company, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It directs the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to reopen and reconsider the claim of the Florida Brewing Company, of Tampa, Fla., for the refunding of \$326.52, amount paid for stamps purchased from the collector of internal revenue at Jacksonville, Fla., and affixed to beer exported to Cuba during December, 1898, and January and February, 1899.

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT EVANSTON, WYO.

Mr. WARREN. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7201) to increase the limit of cost for the public building at Evanston, Wyo., to report it favorably with an amendment. The bill consists of but 6 lines, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. The amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, before the word "thousand," in line 8, to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "seventy-nine;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a court-house and post-office building at Evanston, in the State of Wyoming, as fixed by act of Congress approved June 6, 1902, be, and the same is hereby, increased to \$175,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WATER SUPPLY OF MONTROSE, COLO.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 16731) permitting the town of Montrose, Colo., to enter 160 acres of land for reservoir and water purposes, to report it favorably, without amendment.

Mr. TELLER. This is a House bill, local in its nature, and I ask that it may be put on its passage.

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.

ROCHFORD CEMETERY ASSOCIATION.

Mr. GAMBLE. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12952) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the Rochford Cemetery Association to certain lands for cemetery purposes, to report it favorably, without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

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

WILLIAM W. SMITHSON.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10355) granting an increase of pension to William W. Smithson, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William W. Smithson, late sergeant and first lieutenant Companies K and C, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

COLORADO COOPERATIVE COMPANY.

Mr. TELLER. There was a bill reported this morning from the Committee on Public Lands giving an extension of time to complete some desert-land entries in Colorado by a cooperative association. It was reported favorably, and I desire to call it up, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 7288) extending the time for making proof and payment for all lands taken under the desert-land laws by the members of the Colorado Cooperative Colony for a further period of three years. The bill will be read to the Senate for its information.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

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

BILLS AND DEBATES RELATING TO TRUSTS.

Mr. KEAN. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] on the 7th instant, to report it with an amendment and to submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the recent publication of the Department of Justice entitled "Bills and Debates in Congress Relating to Trusts," as corrected and indexed by the compiler, be made a Senate document; that 100 copies of the publication be printed for the immediate use of the Senate, and the compiler receive a compensation of — dollars for the preparation of said index, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was to fill the blank before the word "dollars" by inserting "five hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. BURROWS on the 30th ultimo, reported

it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of \$1,440 per annum until otherwise provided by law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MASON introduced a bill (S. 7304) granting bounty to certain soldiers of the war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MASON. I wish to ask a question for information. I do not know whether the bill should go to the Committee on Military Affairs or to the Committee on Pensions. It proposes to grant a bounty to a certain class of soldiers who served two years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks that it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs. The Chair will inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire whether the bill should go to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER. It should go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MASON. Very well. I present a paper to accompany the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill and accompanying paper will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 7305) granting a pension to Helen L. Wiggin; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7306) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 7307) to provide certain souvenir medallions for the benefit of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7308) for the extension of Massachusetts avenue extended northward between Joliet street and Fairview Heights subdivision, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BURTON introduced a bill (S. 7309) to amend an act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced a bill (S. 7310) to authorize the Anacostia, Surrattsville and Brandywine Electric Railway Company to extend its street railway in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEWART introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 165) to establish market stands in the city of Washington for farmers and others selling produce of their own raising; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 166) to provide for the improvement of the wholesale market square in the city of Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, with the accompanying letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. WARREN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 167) providing for a careful inquiry and report respecting the present operation of certain public-land laws; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for the establishment in California of viticultural experiment stations, intended to be proposed by him to the agricultural appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$20,000 for the purchase of machine guns for the use of vessels in the Revenue-Cutter Service, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FORAKER submitted an amendment relative to the enforcement and carrying into effect of the requirements and objects of the "Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads," approved March 2, 1893, and relating to the equipment of trains with power brakes, intended to be proposed

by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to contract with the Holland Torpedo Boat Company for five of its most improved type of submarine torpedo boats of the *Adder* class, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TELLER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$16,933.83 to be paid to Henry V. Lester, administrator of Thomas Barr, deceased, surviving partner of the firm of Stewart & Barr, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPOONER submitted an amendment proposing to extend the limit of cost of the post-office, court-house, and custom-house at Superior, Wis., from \$225,000 to \$300,000, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CARMACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 7143) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSENGER FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, at an annual salary of \$1,440, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

PORTLAND HARBOR (MAINE) IMPROVEMENT.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to cause an examination and survey to be made of Portland Harbor, Maine, with a view to extending the channel from the present 30-foot contour through Fore River to the Boston and Maine Railroad passenger bridge, with a depth of 30 feet at mean low water;

Also with a view to extending the channel of 30 feet depth at mean low water from the present 30-foot contour to the Grand Trunk Railroad bridge at the entrance to Back Cove, and rectifying the same; and to submit estimates for each of the proposed improvements.

MESSENGER FOR COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS.

Mr. QUARLES submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Census be, and it is hereby, 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.

DISTRIBUTION OF CHEROKEE LANDS.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I ask to have printed as a Senate document a statement made on behalf of the Cherokee Indians relating to the rights of the intermarried citizens of the Cherokee Nation to share equally with native Cherokees in the final distribution of their lands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made. Does the Senator desire any reference of the document?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so referred in the absence of objection.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I desire to say that a bill has been reported on this subject, and I trust the clerks when they get the number of the document will have it referred to on the Calendar for convenience when the measure is taken up by the Senate.

COURTS-MARTIAL IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. LODGE. If the regular order is completed, I ask that the resolution coming over be laid before the Senate, and if there is no further desire to speak on it I should like to have the motion to refer put.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. RAWLINS on the 27th ultimo, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Senate, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to inform the Senate what courts-martial have been ordered and held in the Philippine Islands, and what judgments rendered by them in consequence of the dispatch sent by the Secretary of War to Major-General Chaffee referred to in the memorandum of the Secretary of War for the Adjutant-General under date of April 15, 1902; also what action was taken by the President or the Secretary of War on the judgment of any court-martial so ordered, either approving or disapproving the same.

Also, that the records in full of the several following courts-martial ordered and held in the Philippine Islands be communicated, to wit:
 That on Brig. Gen. Jacob H. Smith.
 That on Maj. Edwin F. Glenn, Fifth Infantry.
 That on Lieut. Edwin A. Hickman, First Cavalry.
 That on Lieut. J. H. A. Day, Marine Corps.
 That on Maj. L. W. T. Waller, of the Marine Corps.
 That on Lieut. Preston Brown, Second Infantry.
 That on Capt. James A. Ryan, Fifteenth Cavalry.
 That on Lieut. ——— Cooke.
 That on Lieut. Julian E. Gaiyot.
 That on Lieut. N. E. Cook, of the Philippine Scouts.
 That on Lieut. W. S. Sinclair, battalion adjutant, Twenty-eighth Infantry.
 Also, any record or reports of investigations which may be on file in the War Department relating to the case of the so-called "Father Augustine," alleged to have been put to death by Cornelius M. Brownell, formerly a captain of the Twenty-sixth Volunteer Infantry, at Banate, island of Panay, province of Iloilo, in December, 1900; also any investigations made by the Department of Justice into the facts of such case, together with any legal conclusions reached thereon and reported to the War Department.

Mr. LODGE. I renew the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. BURTON. Is the morning business through?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is concluded, except that this resolution is a part of the morning business. The Senator from Massachusetts moves the reference of the resolution to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. RAWLINS. I should like to have the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. As he has not voted, I withhold my vote.

Mr. KITTREDGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER], who is absent. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], and withhold my vote.

Mr. QUARLES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. The junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO] is paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT]. We propose to transfer our pairs so that both the Senator from Florida and myself can vote upon this question. I vote "yea."

Mr. TALIAFERRO (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], but under the arrangement proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin, I will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY]. I am informed that it is proper to transfer my pair to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN]. If that is done, I desire to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. BEVERIDGE (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. CLARK]. I voted "yea." I find that the senior Senator from Montana is not here. Therefore I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 23; as follows:

YEAS—36.

Aldrich,	Dolliver,	Hansbrough,	Pritchard,
Alger,	Fairbanks,	Kean,	Proctor,
Allison,	Foraker,	Kearns,	Quarles,
Burnham,	Foster, Wash.	Lodge,	Quay,
Burrows,	Frye,	McComas,	Simon,
Burton,	Gallinger,	McLaurin, S. C.	Spooner,
Clapp,	Gamble,	Millard,	Stewart,
Cullom,	Hale,	Platt, Conn.	Warren,
Depew,	Hanna,	Platt, N. Y.	Wetmore.

NAYS—23.

Bacon,	Cockrell,	McEnery,	Simmons,
Bate,	Daniel,	Mallory,	Taliaferro,
Berry,	Gibson,	Martin,	Teller,
Blackburn,	Heitfeld,	Morgan,	Turner,
Carmack,	Hoar,	Pettus,	Wellington.
Clay,	Jones, Ark.	Rawlins,	

NOT VOTING—29.

Bailey,	Dillingham,	Kittredge,	Penrose,
Bard,	Dryden,	McCumber,	Perkins,
Beveridge,	Dubois,	McLaurin, Miss.	Scott,
Clark, Mont.	Elkins,	Mason,	Tillman,
Clark, Wyo.	Foster, La.	Mitchell,	Vest.
Culbertson,	Harris,	Money,	
Deboe,	Hawley,	Nelson,	
Dietrich,	Jones, Nev.	Patterson,	

So Mr. RAWLINS'S resolution was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

ESTATE OF DARIUS B. RANDALL, DECEASED.

Mr. HEITFELD. I ask for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3622) to provide for the payment to the heirs of Darius B. Randall, deceased, for certain improvements relinquished to the United States for the use of the Nez Perce Indians.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to pay \$3,161 to the heirs of Darius B. Randall, deceased, for certain improvements situated on the Nez Perce Indian Reservation relinquished by said deceased to the United States for the use of the Nez Perce tribe of Indians.

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

OLD POINT COMFORT IMPROVEMENT COMPANY.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 6212) to compensate the Old Point Comfort Improvement Company for the demolition and removal of the Hygeia Hotel property from the Government reservation at Old Point, Va.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to appropriate \$135,000 to compensate the Old Point Comfort Improvement Company for the demolition and removal of the Hygeia Hotel property from the Government reservation at Old Point, Va., in accordance with plans which have been approved by the Secretary of War for improvements on the reservation.

Mr. PETTUS. Is there a report?

Mr. QUARLES. I should like to have the report read in that case.

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

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. KEAN on the 4th instant, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6212) to compensate the Old Point Comfort Improvement Company for the demolition and removal of the Hygeia Hotel property from the Government reservation at Old Point, Virginia, respectfully submit the following report:

It seems that the Secretary of War, by order made on the 7th day of June, 1902, revoked the license under which the Hygeia Hotel and the buildings appurtenant thereto on the military reservation at Fort Monroe, Va., had been erected and maintained, and ordered the hotel company to remove said hotel and its appurtenant buildings within two months. The said order is hereto appended as a part of this report. This hotel property and the appurtenant buildings at the time said order was made were owned by the Old Point Comfort Improvement Company, which company had purchased the same from the Hygeia Hotel Company on the 17th day of April, 1901, paying therefor the sum of \$100,000. Between the said 17th day of April, 1901, and the date of the said order made as aforesaid by the Secretary of War the Old Point Comfort Improvement Company expended in improvements on the said hotel property the sum of \$20,958.39. These facts appear by the affidavit of William Butler Duncan, jr., the president of said company, made on the 19th day of June, 1902, which said affidavit is also made a part of this report.

The bill was referred by the Committee on Claims of the Senate to the Secretary of War for his investigation and report. The Secretary of War referred the bill to the Judge-Advocate-General for his report thereon. The letter of the Judge-Advocate-General, with the indorsement of the Secretary of War thereon, is filed herewith as a part of this report. It will be noted that both the Judge-Advocate-General and the Secretary of War report that the hotel company did not have under strict legal right a claim against the Government enforceable in court. The Secretary of War, however, reported that—

"In the sense of having a claim for the consideration of Congress, I think the company has one, and that it would be but fair and reasonable treatment for Congress to provide indemnity for the unexpected destruction of value made necessary by the resumption of possession by the United States."

Your committee have come to the same conclusion arrived at by the Secretary of War, and believe that the value of the property unexpectedly destroyed by the Government was the amount actually paid for it and expended on it by the claimant company shortly before it was ordered to be removed by the Secretary of War, viz, the sum of \$120,958.39; and your committee recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the words "thirty-five thousand dollars" in line 3 and inserting in lieu thereof "\$20,958.39;" and that so amended the bill do pass.

Appended hereto as a part of this report is a memorandum showing the various military orders and resolutions of Congress under which these improvements from time to time have been made. It will be noted that the first military order set out in the said memorandum is the order of Maj. Gen. John A. Dix, dated May 1, 1863. It is believed, however, that said order was but the authority for the continuance of a condition which had long existed, for it is very certain that the hotel had been maintained on the reservation during many years long before that time.

The reservation at Fort Monroe consists of 250 acres, and was ceded to the United States by the State of Virginia pursuant to an act of its general assembly passed March 1, 1821, for the purpose of fortification and other objects of national defense. While the Government in granting the license for the erection and maintenance of this hotel reserved the right to vacate the license at its pleasure without liability to any claim for damages, it is equally true that the Government by the long course of dealing has recognized property rights in the licensee and has authorized and invited expenditures of money, creating values which in equity and good conscience should not be destroyed without equitable compensation. The circuit court of the United States in passing on the question as to whether the mechanics who built one of the hotels at Fort Monroe could acquire thereon a mechanics' lien under the laws of Virginia most aptly stated the conditions existing at the place. It said:

"The land at Old Point Comfort, derived by the United States from Virginia, has come, under various influences, to contain a good many inhabitants. Fortress Monroe is, in the inclosed area, one of the largest fortresses known to exist. It has been made the seat of an artillery school of instruction, which brings together an unusually large number of soldiers, officers, and

their families. A very large hotel has been in operation there for many years, established first for the accommodation of army officers and their families, but grown since into a watering place and sanitarium for the general public. The eastern terminus of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad has been established on this land by the consent of Congress and of the State of Virginia. An electric railroad to Newport News of much importance has its eastern terminus on these grounds.

"Under the operation of these causes a considerable number of inhabitants find themselves sojourning, for longer or shorter periods, at Old Point Comfort upon land held by the United States."

It was necessary, in the nature of things, that some provision should be made at this point for the accommodation of persons not actually in the military service, but connected therewith or with persons who were in such service and stationed at the fort. While the proprietor of the hotel no doubt made a legitimate profit in the conduct of his business, it must be borne in mind that the maintenance of such a hotel on the reservation was also indispensable for the purposes of the Government and for the population necessarily on the Government reservation in connection with Government business there. The various licenses were granted in consideration of the necessities of the situation, and not purely for the benefit of the proprietor of the hotel. During the long period during which this hotel has been maintained and conducted, the proprietor of the hotel has been treated as the owner of the property, and has from time to time been assessed as such with a proper share of expenses necessary for maintenance of roads, for pavements, streets, lights, and general police, and for the maintenance of a sewer system. The property rights of the hotel company seem to have been specifically recognized in the act of Congress making appropriation for fortifications and other works of defense, approved on the 1st day of August, 1894, in which provision was made for a permanent system of sewerage on the Government reservation. Said act contained the following provision:

"For one-half of the cost of construction of a sewerage system for all the buildings at Fort Monroe, Va., \$37,500. *Provided*, That the owners of the hotels and other nonmilitary buildings now at Fort Monroe, Va., shall bear one-half of the expense of construction of said sewer, and the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to equitably and justly apportion among, assess against, and collect from the said owners and to expend in the construction of the said sewer the moiety of the estimated cost thereof; and the Secretary of War is hereby further authorized to assess upon vessels using the wharf at Fort Monroe, Va., one-half of the actual cost of repairs rendered necessary by the ordinary wear and tear of said wharf, and any damage done to said wharf by any vessel shall be paid by the owner or owners of said vessels; and he is also authorized and directed from time to time to cause to be assessed upon and collected from the owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and from individuals or corporations engaged in business thereat, other than water navigation companies, one-half of such sum or sums of money as he may deem just, reasonable, and necessary for expenditure upon the repair and operation of such roads, pavements, streets, lights, sewerage, and general police as, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, should be constructed and maintained in order to protect the interests of the United States and the interests, health, and general welfare of the said nonmilitary interests now established or that may hereafter be established at Fort Monroe: *Provided further*, That all funds collected as above provided, or that may be received from other incidental sources, from and after this date, be, and are hereby, made special contingent funds, to be collected and expended for the above purposes in accordance with the rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, who will render annually to Congress a detailed account of all receipts and expenditures.

"And any unexpended balance of the appropriation for the construction of a sewerage system at Fort Monroe made by the sundry civil appropriation act approved March 2, 1889, is hereby covered into the Treasury."

Pursuant to this act the said Hygeia Hotel Company has been annually assessed, under the direction of the War Department, for a certain sum for sewerage, street, etc., and has as regularly paid the same.

The annual amount assessed for the above-named purpose was for 1895-96 \$1,077.95. It has never been less than that sum, and for the past one or two years it has been \$1,220.68 per year. The method of making this annual assessment is evidenced by a copy of the notice furnished the owners of the Hygeia Hotel on the 10th day of July, 1901, by Captain Townsley, quartermaster at Fort Monroe, hereto annexed, marked "No. 1."

In addition to this annual assessment by the United States against this property, the hotel company was called upon by the Government and did actually pay toward the construction of the system of sewerage, etc., the sum of \$10,057.50, all of which will appear by reference to Document No. 42, United States House of Representatives, Fifty-fourth Congress, second session, copy of which is also hereto annexed, marked "No. 2."

It is apparent from the foregoing that the General Government has dealt with this hotel precisely as if it had been fee-simple property. It is impossible to consider its history without reaching the conclusion that it never was the purpose of the Government to order its removal or to otherwise interfere with its use, except to meet some great emergency, such as war, or some manifest necessity for the use of the property for distinctly military purposes, and that the parties in interest had the right to invest their money on that idea and with that understanding.

During the war with Spain it was frequently reported that the exigencies of the situation would require the removal of the hotel, but no such necessity arose. The owners of the property were by that very fact led to believe that they would be left in its undisturbed use and enjoyment. This was so true that only a few months before the order for its demolition was issued by the War Department, the property was sold to the claimant company, who entered into possession of it and made very extensive improvements. It transpires that the order for this removal was not only not necessitated by such an emergency as has been referred to, and that the hotel was not removed to make room for any extension of the fort, but was removed in order that a park might be made on the site whereon the hotel stood.

It must be inferred that it was the knowledge of this particular history of the property and the circumstances attending the order for this removal that the honorable Secretary of War was induced to recommend that the owners of this property should be compensated for it.

It may not be amiss to say that the cost of the hotel and appurtenant buildings was very considerable, as shown by the sale of the same a few years ago for over \$300,000. Owing, however, to the shock which the locality sustained as a health resort by the conditions existing during the Spanish war, and especially in consequence of yellow fever which appeared about the same time at the Soldiers' Home in the vicinity, it was sold to the present owners for the very much smaller sum, which, together with the amount expended in improvements on it, constitute the basis of the present claim.

Hon. Elihu Root, Secretary of War, has recommended that, in view of the circumstances of this removal, compensation be made the owners.

Mr. ALLISON. May I ask if this report relates to the payment of a claim?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It relates to a claim, and the

reading of the report, which is a very long one, has been called for.

Mr. ALLISON. It is manifest that the reading of the report will take considerable time, and I object to the further consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa objects to the further consideration of the bill, and it will be returned to the Calendar.

AMERICAN EXHIBIT, SHANGHAI, CHINA.

Mr. MCCUMBER. On the 26th day of January I gave notice that on the 10th day of February, after the routine morning business, I would address the Senate on the bill (S. 6125) for the erection and maintenance of an exposition building in the city of Shanghai, in the Empire of China, for the appointment of a commissioner in charge thereof, and for other purposes.

I did not know at that time that the statehood bill would have such persistency in holding its place before the Senate. As we have but a few weeks of the session left in which to consider general business and appropriation bills, it seems to me, Mr. President, that time should not be taken up in the consideration of the bill I have named, which I do not expect can be disposed of during this session.

I had proposed, therefore, this morning to ask that I might substitute the pure-food bill for the bill to which I have just referred, to be taken up for discussion during the remainder of the morning hour; but I am informed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] that he has an appropriation bill which he desires to have considered immediately, and so I withdraw my notice of an intention to discuss the other bill this morning and will yield to the Senator from Iowa.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President—

Mr. MCCOMAS. I ask the Senator from Iowa to yield to me so that I may give a notice.

Mr. ALLISON. I will yield in a minute. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 16842) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with, that it may be read for amendment, and that the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations may first be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations shall first receive consideration. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

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

EIGHT-HOUR LAW.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I give notice that on Thursday morning next after the routine morning business—and I desire the attention of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]—I shall move to take up for consideration, not to interfere with the statehood bill, the bill (H. R. 3076) limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States, or any Territory, or the District of Columbia, thereby securing better products, and for other purposes, which was reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with amendments. I shall only ask for the consideration of the bill until the regular order is taken up at 2 o'clock.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I hope very much that the request of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor [Mr. MCCOMAS] will be favorably considered. The bill referred to by him is a very important one, which has passed the other House from session to session. It has now been put into such shape that it is hoped that it may be satisfactory to all concerned. Great labor has been expended upon the measure, and there are a great many people in the country interested in it. I think that it will be very gratifying to many people if the bill shall be considered and passed.

Mr. QUAY. I sympathize with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] in their anxiety for the speedy passage of the bill; but in view of the present condition of affairs in the Senate, I feel it to be my duty to say that I will interpose the statehood bill, and antagonize the other bill if it is called up until a day is fixed for a vote in the Senate on the statehood bill.

Mr. MASON. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to repeat the notice he gave or the request which he submitted. If he will do so, I shall be very much obliged, as I was unable to hear him owing to the confusion in the Chamber.

Mr. QUAY. I said that I would feel it to be my duty to antagonize any proposition to take up what is known as the eight-hour bill, sincerely anxious as I am for its passage, until after we fix a day for a vote upon the statehood bill.

Mr. McCOMAS. I suggest to the Senator—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the District of Columbia appropriation bill. There is nothing before the Senate except that bill.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I call for the regular order, Mr. President.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16842) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes.

Mr. TELLER. I submit at this time an amendment which I intend to propose to the District appropriation bill; and, as the bill is now pending, I do not desire to have the amendment printed, but I ask that it lie upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and lie upon the table. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "General expenses," on page 2, line 17, after the word "each," to insert "temporary employment of additional assistant inspectors for such time as their services may be necessary, \$2,400;" in line 19, after the word "dollars," to strike out "civil engineer or computer, \$1,500," and insert "three civil engineers or computers, at \$1,500 each;" in line 23, before the word "clerk," to strike out "two clerks, at \$900 each," and insert "clerk," \$1,200; clerk, \$900; so as to read:

For executive office: For two Commissioners, at \$5,000 each; Engineer Commissioner, \$924 (to make salary \$5,000); secretary, \$2,160; 2 assistant secretaries to Commissioners, at \$1,200 each; clerk, \$1,500; clerk, \$1,400; 3 clerks, at \$1,200 each; clerk, \$600; messenger, \$600; 2 messengers, at \$480 each; stenographer and typewriter, \$720; 2 drivers, at \$600 each; veterinary surgeon for all horses in the departments of the District government, \$1,200; inspector of buildings, \$2,750; principal assistant inspector of buildings, \$1,600; 5 assistant inspectors of buildings, at \$1,200 each; 5 assistant inspectors of buildings, at \$1,000 each; temporary employment of additional assistant inspectors for such time as their services may be necessary, \$2,400; 3 civil engineers or computers, at \$1,500 each; clerk, \$1,200; clerk, \$900, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 16, to increase the total appropriation for executive office from \$70,664 to \$76,364.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 19, before the word "dollars," to strike out "three thousand five hundred" and insert "four thousand;" on page 4, line 10, after the word "dollars," to insert "temporary clerk hire, \$1,000, of which sum \$500 to be immediately available;" and in line 13, before the word "hundred," to strike out "forty-two thousand one" and insert "forty-three thousand six;" so as to make the clause read:

For assessor's office: For assessor, \$4,000; assistant assessor, \$2,000; assistant assessor, \$1,600; 2 clerks, at \$1,400 each; clerk, arrears division, \$1,400; 4 clerks, at \$1,200 each; draftsman, \$1,200; 4 clerks, at \$1,000 each; assistant or clerk, \$900; clerk in charge of records, \$1,000; 2 clerks, at \$900 each; license clerk, \$1,200; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; inspector of licenses, \$1,200; assistant inspector of licenses, \$1,000; messenger, \$600; 3 assistant assessors, at \$3,000 each; clerk to board of assistant assessors, \$1,500; messenger and driver, for board of assistant assessors, \$600; temporary clerk hire, \$1,000, of which sum \$500 to be immediately available; in all, \$43,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 17, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the auditor of the District of Columbia from \$3,600 to \$4,000; and on page 6, line 1, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the auditor's office from \$22,850 to \$23,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 11, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the engineer of highways, engineer's office, from \$2,750 to \$3,000; on page 8, line 5, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the superintendent of sewers from \$2,750 to \$3,000; and in line 13, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the engineer's office from \$67,012 to \$67,512.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 12, before the word "thousand," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" in line 13, after the word "dollars," to insert "statistician, \$1,400;" in line 14, before the word "dollars," to insert "two hundred;" in line 15, before the word "hundred," to strike out "six" and insert "one thousand two," and in line 16, before the word "hundred,"

to strike out "five thousand six" and insert "eight thousand eight;" so as to make the clause read:

Department of insurance: For superintendent of insurance, \$3,500; examiner, \$1,500; statistician, \$1,400; clerk, \$1,200; temporary clerk hire, \$1,500; in all, \$8,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 23, before the word "thousand," to strike out "thirteen," and insert "twenty," and in line 23, before the word "thousand," to strike out "seventeen," and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the clause read:

For surveyor's office: For surveyor, \$3,000; assistant surveyor, \$1,800; for such additional employees as may be required, in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress making the surveyor of the District of Columbia a salaried officer, \$20,000; in all, \$4,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 7, to increase the number of attendants at \$480 each at the Free Public Library from two to three; in line 8 to increase the number of attendants at \$360 each from two to three; in line 10 to increase the number of pages at \$240 each from two to five, and in line 16 to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Free Public Library from \$18,440 to \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses," on page 12, line 9, after the word "charities," to insert "excise board, personal-tax board;" and in line 13, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty thousand" and insert "thirty-four thousand seven hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, namely: For printing, checks, books, law books, books of reference, and periodicals, stationery; detection of frauds on the revenue; repairs of market houses; painting; surveying instruments and implements; drawing materials; binding, rebinding, repairing, and preservation of records; maintaining and keeping in good order the laboratory and apparatus in the office of the inspector of asphalt and cement; damages; livery, purchase, and care of horses and carriages or buggies not otherwise provided for; horseshoeing; fuel, ice, gas, repairs, repairs to pound and vehicles, and other general necessary expenses of District offices, including the sinking fund office, board of charities, excise board, personal-tax board, harbor master, health department, surveyor's office, sealer of weights and measures' office, police court, and department of insurance, \$34,700; and the Commissioners shall so apportion this sum as to prevent a deficiency therein: *Provided*, That horses and vehicles appropriated for in this act shall be used only for official purposes.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to modify the amendment just stated by inserting "seven" instead of "four," so as to make the total amount of the appropriation \$37,700.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be so modified in the absence of objection. The question is on concurring in the amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 13, line 1, before the word "fire," to strike out "or" and insert "of;" so as to make the clause read:

No part of the money appropriated by this act shall be used for the payment of premiums or other cost of fire insurance.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 14, to increase the appropriation for rent of office for department of insurance from \$540 to \$840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 6, to increase the appropriation for livery of horse or horse hire for coroner's office, jurors' fees, removal of deceased persons, making autopsies, etc., from \$1,200 to \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 19, to insert:

For running and permanently marking the boundary line of the District between the present boundary-line monuments and to mark the limits of the District on the roads leading out of the District, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 24, to insert:

To enable the register of wills to continue the work of preparing a card index of the records of his office, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 2, to insert:

For printing permit books, applications, various forms of permits, and a file case for the applications, stub books, and other records in permit clerk's office, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 5, to insert:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized hereafter, in their discretion, to grant leave of absence, not to exceed thirty days to any individual in any fiscal year, to regular employees appointed directly by the Commissioners and paid out of general appropriations, and whose service is continuous, but who receive per diem compensation.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCOMAS. I will ask the chairman of the Committee on

Appropriations, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], if he will not accept an amendment inserting these words:

Five hundred dollars to pay William S. Torbert for the preparation of an index to the code of the District of Columbia.

I have here a telegram from the court and the Bar Association of the District recommending Mr. Torbert as a most competent indexer. I understand he has very nearly prepared the index. It is well known that the present index of the code adopted by Congress is very deficient and almost unworkable. I have a statement here, which I shall not read, but may ask permission to print, from the leading lawyers of the bar, a request of the bar association, and a request of the court favoring the amendment, which I shall not read, but I trust the chairman of the committee will allow the amendment to go into the bill. As he well said to me, as the indexing has once been provided for, he did not feel like providing for another index unless it was a good one. Therefore I telegraphed to these gentlemen asking them to name a good indexer, and the gentleman I have named was suggested and he has been doing the work, which will be completed in a couple of months.

I hope the amendment I have suggested will be accepted by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. We paid \$500 for indexing the code last year, and the index turned out to be a very poor one. The committee think it wise to wait until we see what sort of an index we are going to have, and, if it be acceptable, it can be paid for next year.

Mr. McCOMAS. The gentleman who is preparing the index, Mr. William S. Torbert, is a very careful and very accurate man. He is making the index at the instance of the Bar Association. If he does not complete it we do not have to pay him, and if he does complete it, and it be approved by the court and the Bar Association, the work will be paid for. I hope the Senator will consent that the amendment may be made.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it would be premature to provide for that work now.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was under the head of "Improvements and repairs," on page 15, line 23, to increase the appropriation for assessment and permit work from \$145,000 to \$175,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 7, to increase the appropriation for work on streets and avenues from \$50,000 to \$150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 12, to increase the appropriation for the Georgetown schedule from \$5,000 to \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 14, to increase the appropriation for the northwest section schedule from \$15,000 to \$41,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 16, to increase the appropriation for the southwest section schedule from \$7,500 to \$22,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 18, to increase the appropriation for the southeast section schedule from \$10,000 to \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 20, to increase the appropriation for the northeast section schedule from \$12,500 to \$41,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 5, to insert:

For paving S street NW., from North Capitol street to Second street, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 10, before the word "cents," to strike out "seventy" and insert "eighty," and in line 19, before the words "per square yard," to strike out "\$1.80" and insert "\$2," so as to make the clause read:

Under appropriations contained in this act no contract shall be made for making or relaying asphalt pavement at a higher price than \$1.80 cents per square yard for a quality equal to the best laid in the District of Columbia prior to July 1, 1886, and with same depth of base: *Provided*, That these conditions as to price and depth of base shall not apply to those streets on which, in the judgment of the Commissioners, by reason of heavy traffic, poor foundation, or other causes, a pavement of more than ordinary strength is required, in which case the limit of price may be increased to \$2 per square yard.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 24, to increase the appropriation for grading streets, alleys, and roads, from \$8,000 to \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 18, to insert:

Condemnation of streets, roads, and alleys: For purchase or condemnation of streets, roads, and alleys, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 7, to increase the appropriation for opening, widening, and extending alleys and minor streets in the District of Columbia, from \$10,000 to \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 17, to insert:

For Rhode Island avenue NE., Fourth to Twelfth street, grade and macadam, provided that all the necessary land within the limits of this portion of Rhode Island avenue as projected be dedicated to public use, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 23, to insert:

For Rhode Island avenue, Florida avenue to First street, pave, \$12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 19, to insert:

For Sixteenth street, Columbia road to Spring road, grade and improve, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 2, to insert:

For Sixteenth street, Morris street to Columbia road, pave, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 4, to insert:

For Twenty-second street, R to Decatur streets, pave, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 6, to insert:

For Twenty-second street, Decatur to S streets, improvement, \$4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 8, to insert:

For California avenue, Columbia road to Phelps place, pave, \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 10, to insert:

For Clifton street, Eleventh to Thirteenth, grade, \$5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 12, to insert:

For Yale street, Thirteenth to Fourteenth, pave, \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 14, to insert:

For Philadelphia street, Brightwood avenue to Eighth street, grade and macadam, \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 17, to insert:

For Woodley road, Wisconsin avenue to Idaho avenue, grade and regulate, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 19, to insert:

For Kansas avenue, in Petworth subdivision, from Trenton to Utica streets, grading, regulating, and macadamizing, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 23, to insert:

For Twentieth street, Queen's Chapel to Brentwood road, grade and macadamize, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 24, to insert:

That upon the dedication of Milwaukee street through the subdivision of Fairview Heights, District of Columbia, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to abandon the portion of Massachusetts avenue bounded by blocks 6, 7, and 8 of Fairview Heights, except where said avenue is included within the plan for a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities, and the portions of said avenue so abandoned shall revert to the owners of the lots abutting thereon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 9, to insert:

That in order to provide better grades and to save in the cost of grading and improving streets in Herman D. Walbridge's subdivision of Ingleside, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to make the following change in the location of streets in said subdivision without cost to the District of Columbia or to the United States, namely, first, to shift the location of Nineteenth street south of Grant street so that it shall run in a southeasterly direction from the intersection of Nineteenth and Grant streets to Kenyon street, and, secondly, to abandon Grant street west of Nineteenth street, the old location of Nineteenth street south of Grant street, and Joliet street west of the new position of Nineteenth street, the land in such abandoned streets to revert to the adjacent owners of the property.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 24, to insert:

For grading and macadamizing Fourteenth street from its present terminus to the northern limit of the Saul tract (or its junction with Piney Branch road) and for paying for such land as may be condemned hereunder for the use of the District of Columbia and the removal of houses or barns not donated, \$49,000: *Provided*, That no portion of the said sum shall be expended until at least 85 per cent of all the land for the extension of said street to the north line of the Saul tract, according to the highway extension plans, be dedicated to the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 10, to insert:

Condemnation proceedings shall be instituted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to condemn such portions or pieces of land as may not be donated, in accordance with sections 484 to 491, both inclusive, of the code of the District of Columbia and as herein set forth: *Provided, however*, That upon the acceptance of any dedication by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the remaining portion of any parcel of land of any party or parties dedicating, or who may have heretofore dedicated, a portion thereof for the widening or opening of said Fourteenth street shall be exempt and exempted from assessment in respect to the cost of condemning any portion of said street and from any assessment or tax for benefits to such remaining land, or any portion thereof, for the condemning or opening, grading, or macadamizing of such highway, as hereby provided for.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 2, to insert:

And the commissioners or jury to appraise, etc., shall assess upon owners not donating benefits as provided in said sections of the code, and including, if said sections do not, benefits to arise from the physical improvements provided for in this amendment; and in making their decision the commissioners, or jury, shall take into consideration whenever a part only is taken the benefit to the remainder of the tract, and shall give verdict accordingly; and whenever their decision is that the benefits exceed the damages, the amount of such excess shall be assessed against the remaining portion of the tract in the same manner that other special assessments are now made in the District of Columbia: *And provided further*, That the cost of securing the land necessary to complete said right of way shall be charged entirely to the revenues of the District of Columbia, and if the same shall exceed \$7,000 the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, in their discretion, reject the award or awards to that effect, and this appropriation shall revert to the Treasury of the United States, except \$500, which shall be chargeable with the costs of the proceedings herein authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 23, to increase the total appropriation for construction of county roads, from \$54,500 to \$225,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 5, to increase the appropriation for current work of repairs of county roads and suburban streets, from \$80,000 to \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 10, to insert:

For continuing the construction of the bridge across Rock Creek on the line of Connecticut avenue extended, \$48,000. Said bridge shall be constructed of concrete on the general plan for a concrete bridge made by George S. Morrison, and found in Senate Document No. 96, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, and shall cost complete, exclusive of appropriation herein and heretofore made, not to exceed \$600,000, and shall be completed within four years from July 1, 1903; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for the construction of said bridge within the time specified and within the limit of cost herein authorized, to be paid for from time to time as appropriations therefor may be made by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the head of "Sewers," on page 26, line 14, before the word "construction," to strike out "continuing" and insert "completing," and in line 16, before the word "twenty-five" to insert "one hundred and;" so as to make the clause read:

For completing construction of the sewage disposal system pumping station, and for machinery therefor, \$125,000.

Mr. ALLISON. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the word "completing" and restoring the word "continuing."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 26, line 21, after the word "dollars," to insert "to be immediately available;" in line 22, after the word "dollars," to insert "for Section C, \$200,000," and in line 23, before the word "hundred," to strike out "four" and insert "six;" so as to make the clause read:

For constructing the B street and New Jersey avenue trunk sewer, namely: For section A, \$200,000, to be immediately available; for section B, \$200,000; for section C, \$200,000; in all, \$600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 26, after line 23, to insert:

Toward constructing outfall sewer and siphon, \$150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the head of "Streets," on page 28, line 1, to increase the appropriation for sprinkling, sweeping, and cleaning streets from \$190,000 to \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 28, line 24, after the word "construction" to insert "maintenance and repair;" so as to make the clause read:

Bathing beach: For the construction, maintenance, and repair of floating baths to be moored in the tidal reservoir or the water front of Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the head of "Electrical department," on page 30, line 8, to increase the appropriation for general supplies, repairs, new batteries, and battery supplies, telephone rental and purchase, etc., in the electrical department from \$14,000 to \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 14, to increase the appropriation for placing wires of fire-alarm telegraph and police

telephone service underground in existing conduits, etc., from \$18,950 to \$43,950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 2, to increase the appropriation toward rebuilding grounded and worn-out police-patrol circuits, including purchase of new boxes to replace old ones, etc., from \$7,500 to \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 14, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thousand" and insert "and nineteen thousand seven hundred;" in line 17, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-four;" in the same line, after the word "painting," to insert "and;" and in line 18, after the word "cleaning," to strike out:

Purchasing and expenses of erecting and maintaining new lamp posts, street designations, lanterns, and fixtures, under any expenditure provided for in this act. And during the fiscal year 1903, and annually thereafter, the price per annum prescribed by Congress for lighting each street lamp in the District of Columbia with gas or oil shall be construed to include the cost of the illuminating material used, lighting and extinguishing lamps, repairing, painting, cleaning, purchasing, and expense of erecting and maintaining lamp-posts, street designations, lanterns, and fixtures.

So as to make the clause read:

Lighting: For illuminating, lighting, extinguishing, repairing, and cleaning public lamps on avenues, streets, roads, and alleys; purchasing and expense of erecting and maintaining new lamp-posts, street designations, lanterns, and fixtures; moving lamp-posts, painting lamp-posts and lanterns; replacing and repairing lamp-posts and lanterns damaged or unfit for service; for rent or storeroom, cartage of material, livery and other necessary items and service, \$219,700: *Provided*, That no more than \$20 per annum for each street lamp shall be paid for gas and no more than \$24 for oil, lighting, extinguishing, repairing, painting, and cleaning.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 12, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "twenty-five;" in line 16, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-seven" and insert "thirty;" and in line 17, after the word "paragraph," to insert:

And provided further, That during the fiscal year, 1904, the illuminating power of the gas furnished by any gas-lighting company, person, or persons in the District of Columbia shall be equal to 22 candles, notwithstanding the requirements as to candlepower prescribed by section 3 of the act regulating the sale of gas in the District of Columbia, approved June 6, 1896.

So as to make the proviso read:

Provided further, That not more than \$25,000 of said appropriation may be expended for lighting, extinguishing, repairing, painting, and cleaning public lamps of a higher candlepower than those provided for above, and not less than 60 candlepower, which lamps shall not cost to exceed \$30 per lamp, and shall otherwise be subject to the restrictions of this paragraph: *And provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1904 the illuminating power of the gas furnished by any gas-lighting company, person, or persons in the District of Columbia shall be equal to 22 candles, notwithstanding the requirements as to candlepower prescribed by section 3 of the act regulating the sale of gas in the District of Columbia, approved June 6, 1896.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 3, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seventy-six thousand" and insert "eighty-two thousand five hundred;" and in line 5, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "eighty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

For electric arc lighting, including necessary inspection, and for extensions of such service, not exceeding \$32,500: *Provided*, That not more than \$55 per annum shall be paid for any electric arc light burning from fifteen minutes after sunset to forty-five minutes before sunrise, and operated wholly by means of underground wire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Washington Aqueduct," on page 33, line 22, before the word "hundred," to strike out "six" and insert "eight;" and in line 23, after the word "expended," to insert:

Provided, That all contracts authorized under appropriations for the slow sand-filtration plant shall provide for the completion of the work on or before December 1, 1904.

So as to make the clause read:

For continuing work on a slow sand-filtration plant, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including the preparation of plans, and for the purchase of such scientific books and periodicals as may be approved by the Secretary of War, \$800,000, to be available immediately and until expended: *Provided*, That all contracts authorized under appropriations for the slow sand-filtration plant shall provide for the completion of the work on or before December 1, 1904.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 3, to insert:

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 9, to increase the appropriation for the care and improvement of Rock Creek Park, from \$2,500 to \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Public schools," on page 34, line 19, after the word "each," to insert "one clerk, \$900," and in the line 21, before the word "hundred," to strike

out "eighteen thousand six" and insert "nineteen thousand five;" so as to make the clause read:

For officers: For 7 members of the board of education, at \$500 each, \$3,500, not more than \$1,750 of which shall be used during the first half of the fiscal year; 1 superintendent of public schools, \$4,000; 2 assistant superintendents, at \$2,500 each; 1 secretary, \$2,000; 1 clerk, \$1,400; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 clerk, \$900; and 1 messenger, \$720; in all, \$19,520.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 24, to increase the number of teachers in the public schools from 1,346 to 1,347.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 3, to increase the number of supervising principals at \$2,000 each from 11 to 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 7, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of five principals of high schools from \$1,600 each to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 9, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the principal of McKinley Manual Training School from \$1,600 to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 11, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the principal of Armstrong Manual Training School from \$1,600 to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 14, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of principals of Normal School No. 1 and Normal School No. 2 from \$1,600 each to \$1,800 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 17, to increase the appropriation for salaries of director of primary instruction, four heads of departments of high schools, and two grammar-school principals, from \$1,500 each to \$1,600 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 19, before the word "principals," to strike out "five" and insert "six;" and in line 21 to strike out "six" and insert "seven;" so as to make the clause read:

For six principals of buildings, and one head of department of English in Manual Training School No. 1, seven in all, at \$1,300 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 5, before the word "high-school," to insert the word "and;" and in line 6, before the word "in," to strike out "and principal of building, three" and insert "two;" so as to make the clause read:

For director of primary work, and high-school teacher, two in all, at \$1,100 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 12, to increase the total appropriation for salaries of teachers of public schools from \$951,775 to \$956,475.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 22, after the word "pupils," to strike out "not over 21 years of age;" so as to make the clause read:

For night schools for pupils, and teachers of night schools may also be teachers in the day schools, \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 2, to increase the appropriation for care of smaller buildings and rented rooms, including cooking and manual training schools wherever located, etc., from \$4,676 to \$5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 12, to increase the appropriation for janitors and care of buildings and grounds from \$85,256 to \$86,080.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 13, to insert:

For medical inspectors: For 12 medical inspectors of public schools, 4 of whom shall be of the colored race, at \$500 each, \$6,000: *Provided*, That said inspectors shall be appointed by the Commissioners only after competitive examination, and shall have had at least five years' experience in the practice of medicine in the District of Columbia, and shall perform their duties under the direction of the health officer and according to rules formulated from time to time by him, which shall be subject to the approval of the board of education and the Commissioners.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 12, to increase the appropriation for the purchase and repair of tools, machinery, material, and apparatus to be used in connection with instruction in manual training, etc., from \$15,000 to \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 2, to increase the appropriation for contingent expenses, including furniture and repairs thereof, books, books of reference, and periodicals, etc., from \$35,000 to \$38,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 22, after the word "cable," to strike out the word "holds" and insert "poles," and in line 24, after the word "dollars," to insert "to be expended under the electrical department;" so as to make the clause read:

For extending the telephone system to the public school buildings within the fire limits, including the cost of the necessary wire, cable, poles, cross-arms, braces, conduit connections, manholes, telephone instruments, extra labor, and other necessary items, \$5,000, to be expended under the electrical department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to insert as a subhead at the top of page 43 the words "Buildings and grounds."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 6, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred and seventy-five" and insert "two hundred and sixty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

Buildings and grounds: Toward the construction of a Business High School building, \$75,000, and the Commissioners are hereby authorized to enter into contract for the construction of said building at a total cost not exceeding \$265,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 6, to insert:

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 8, to insert:

Toward the extension of the McKinley Manual Training School, \$50,000; and the Commissioners are hereby authorized to enter into a contract for such extension at a total cost of \$135,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 13, to insert:

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 17, to insert:

For purchase of lot adjoining Brent School, \$8,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 19, to insert:

For additional amount for reconstructing building at Seventh and G streets SE, \$10,000; and the appropriation of \$15,000 made by the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1902 is hereby continued available for the same purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 4, before the word "thousand," to strike out "sixty" and insert "sixty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

For site for and toward the construction of one eight-room building, second division, \$90,000; and the total cost of said building, including cost of site, under a contract which is hereby authorized therefor, shall not exceed \$65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 9, before the word "thousand," to strike out "sixty" and insert "sixty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

For site for and toward the construction of one eight-room building, sixth division, \$30,000; and the total cost of said building, including cost of site, under a contract which is hereby authorized therefor, shall not exceed \$55,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 11, to increase the appropriation for one four-room addition to the Takoma School from \$20,000 to \$27,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 19, before the word "dollars," to insert "four thousand;" in line 21, before the word "captains," to strike out "four" and insert "five;" on page 46, line 2, before the word "privates," to strike out "fourteen" and insert "twenty;" in line 3, after the word "crime," to strike out "three thousand three hundred and sixty" and insert "four thousand eight hundred;" in line 9, after the word "and," to strike out "forty" and insert "fifty;" in line 12, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "eighty;" in line 15, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eight hundred and forty" and insert "nine hundred and sixty;" in line 25, before the word "drivers," to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twenty-eight;" on page 47, line 3, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty-three thousand one hundred" and insert "sixty-four thousand five hundred and twenty;" so as to make the clause read:

FOR METROPOLITAN POLICE.

For major and superintendent, \$4,000; captain and assistant superintendent, \$1,800; 5 captains, at \$1,500 each; chief clerk, who shall also be property clerk, \$2,000; clerk, \$1,500; clerk, \$900; 2 clerks, at \$720 each; 4 sergeants of the police and fire departments, at \$540 each; additional compensation for 20 privates detailed for special service in the detection and prevention of crime, \$4,800, or so much thereof as may be necessary; 10 lieutenants, at \$1,320 each; 35 sergeants, at \$1,140 each; 350 privates, class 1, at \$900 each; 250 privates, class 2, at \$1,080 each; for 40 additional privates of class 1, who shall receive \$780 per annum each; 3 telephone operators, at \$900 each; 24 station keepers, at \$900 each; janitor for police headquarters, \$720; 13 laborers, at \$800 each; laborer in charge of the morgue, \$680; messenger, \$700; messenger, \$500; major

and superintendent, mounted, \$240; captain, mounted, \$240; 51 lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted, at \$240 each; 64 sergeants and privates, mounted, on bicycles, at \$40 each; 28 drivers, at \$800 each; and 3 police matrons, at \$800 each; in all, \$704,520.

Mr. ALLISON. I move to amend the amendment by striking out "twenty-eight," in line 25, page 46, and restoring "twenty-four;" and by changing the total in line 2, on page 47, by striking out "forty-three thousand one hundred" and inserting "sixty-two thousand one hundred and twenty."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 7, to insert:

For roadway and protection wall along east side Seventh precinct station house, \$800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 9, to insert:

For remodeling rooms in the Second, Fourth, Sixth, and Eighth precinct station houses, and erection of modern cells therein, \$12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 13, to increase the appropriation for miscellaneous expenses of the Metropolitan police from \$41,385 to \$54,685.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 23, before the word "thousand," to strike out "eight" and insert "nine;" so as to make the clause read:

House of detention: To enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide transportation and a suitable place for the reception, transportation, and detention of the children under 17 years of age and in the discretion of the Commissioners of girls and women over 17 years of age, arrested by the police on charge of offense against any law in force in the District of Columbia, or held as witnesses, or held pending final investigation or examination, or otherwise, \$9,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "For the fire department," on page 49, line 4, after the word "dollars," to strike out "and this sum shall not be available to pay a chief engineer who has not had at least five years' experience as a member of some organized municipal fire department," and insert "assistant chief engineer, \$1,500;" in line 8, before the word "assistant," to strike out "three" and insert "two;" and in line 19, before the word "hundred," to strike out "three" and insert "six;" so as to make the clause read:

For chief engineer, \$2,000, assistant chief engineer, \$1,500; 2 assistant chief engineers, at \$1,200 each; clerk, \$1,000; fire marshal, \$1,200; machinist, \$1,000; 26 foremen, at \$1,000 each; 14 engineers, at \$1,000 each; 14 firemen, at \$900 each; 7 tillermen, at \$900 each; 27 drivers, at \$800 each; 186 privates, at \$840 each; 26 watchmen, at \$600 each; and 1 laborer at \$480; in all, \$264,620.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 23, to increase the appropriation for repairs and improvements to engine houses and grounds from \$7,500 to \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 2, to increase the appropriation for fuel for the fire department from \$4,500 to \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 5, to increase the appropriation for forage from \$12,000 to \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 11, to increase the total appropriation for miscellaneous items for the fire department from \$65,860 to \$71,860.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 50, after line 16, to insert:

For house and furniture for a chemical engine company to be located on land in Bennings, D. C., or its vicinity, donated to the District for such purpose, including cost of connecting said house with fire-alarm headquarters, \$23,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 10, to increase the total appropriation for "Increase fire department" from \$39,500 to \$62,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Health department," on page 51, line 19, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" in line 21, before the word "hundred," to strike out "two" and insert "four;" on page 52, line 4, after the word "dollars," to insert "assistant pound master, \$720;" in line 9, before the word "sanitary," to strike out "sanitary and food inspector, who shall be a veterinary surgeon, \$900; six" and insert "seven;" and in line 14, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty-six thousand nine hundred" and insert "forty-eight thousand and twenty;" so as to make the clause read:

For health officer, \$3,500; chief inspector and deputy health officer, \$1,800; 13 sanitary and food inspectors, at \$1,200 each; sanitary and food inspector, who shall also inspect dairy products and shall be a practical chemist, \$2,000;

sanitary and food inspector, who shall be a veterinary surgeon and act as inspector of live stock and dairy farms, \$1,400; inspector of marine products, \$1,200; chief clerk and deputy health officer, \$2,200; clerk, \$1,400; 4 clerks, 2 of whom may act as sanitary and food inspectors, at \$1,200 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; clerk, \$600; messenger and janitor, \$600; pound master, \$1,500; assistant pound master, \$720; laborers, at not exceeding \$40 per month, \$1,920; ambulance driver, \$480; 7 sanitary and food inspectors, 2 of whom shall be veterinary surgeons, to assist in the enforcement of the milk and pure-food laws and the regulations relating thereto, at \$800 each; in all, \$48,020.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 6, to increase the appropriation for the necessary traveling expenses of sanitary and food inspectors while traveling outside of the District of Columbia, etc., from \$1,000 to \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 7, to insert:

For the erection, completion, and equipment of quarantine buildings on the Washington Asylum grounds, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 10, to insert:

For erection and equipment of a stable for the smallpox hospital, including necessary grading and paving, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 2, before the word "dollars," to insert "six hundred;" in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "nine hundred" and insert "one thousand;" in line 9, after the word "assistant," to strike out "janitor" and insert "janitors;" and in line 11, before the word "hundred," to strike out "twenty thousand nine" and insert "twenty-two thousand two;" so as to make the clause read:

For the police court: For two judges, at \$3,000 each; clerk, \$2,000; two deputy clerks, at \$1,500 each; two deputy clerks, at \$1,200 each; deputy clerk, to be known as financial clerk, \$1,500; three bailiffs, at \$300 each; deputy marshal, \$1,000; janitor, \$540; engineer, \$900; assistant janitors, \$450; bailiff, \$600; in all, \$22,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 22, after the word "of," to strike out "jury" and insert "jurors;" so as to make the clause read:

For compensation of jurors, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 7, to insert:

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 1, before the word "dollars," to insert "four hundred," and in line 4, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty-two" and insert "twenty-six;" so as to make the clause read:

Justices of the peace: For 10 justices of the peace, at \$2,400 each, and the further sum of \$250 each for rent, stationery, and other expenses; in all, \$26,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Emergency fund," on page 58, line 9, after the word "cases," to strike out "of" and insert "constituting, in the judgment of the Commissioners, an;" so as to read:

To be expended only in case of emergency, such as riot, pestilence, public insubordinate conditions, calamity by flood or fire, and of like character, and in all cases constituting, in the judgment of the Commissioners, an emergency not otherwise sufficiently provided for, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Charities and corrections," on page 59, line 16, before the word "dollars," to insert "two hundred;" in line 17, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eight hundred and forty" and insert "nine hundred;" in line 18, after the word "dollars," to insert "one inspector, \$840;" in line 19, before the word "inspectors," to strike out "three" and insert "two;" and in line 22, before the word "dollars," to strike out "four hundred" and insert "seven hundred and eighty;" so as to make the clause read:

Board of Charities: For secretary, \$3,000; clerk, \$1,200; stenographer, \$900; messenger, \$300; one inspector, \$840; two inspectors, at \$720 each; traveling expenses, \$400; four drivers, at \$600 each; in all, \$10,780.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reformatories and correctional institutions," on page 60, line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "three hundred and fifty" and insert "four hundred and eighty;" in line 9, before the word "dollars," to insert "and sixty;" in line 11, after the word "each," to strike out "night watchman, five hundred and forty-eight dollars" and insert, "two night watchmen, at five hundred and forty-eight dollars each;" in line 21, before the word "dollars," to strike out "four hundred and eighty" and insert "six hundred;" in line 22, before the word "dollars," to strike out "four hundred and eighty" and insert "six hundred;" on page 61, line 6, after the word "dollars," to insert "laundryman, seven hundred and twenty dollars; two attendants at Old Men's Home, at three hundred

dollars each;" and in line 10, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-seven thousand six hundred and eighteen" and insert "twenty-nine thousand nine hundred and sixteen;" so as to make the clause read:

For Washington Asylum: For intendant, \$1,200; visiting physician, \$1,080; resident physician, \$480; matron, \$600; clerk, \$340; property clerk, \$340; baker, \$420; principal overseer, \$1,200; 15 overseers, at \$60 each; engineer, \$600; assistant engineer, \$480; second assistant engineer, \$370; engineer at hospital for seven and one-half months, at \$50 per month; 2 watchmen, at \$265 each; 2 night watchmen, at \$548 each; blacksmith and woodworker, \$500; carpenter, \$500; driver for dead wagon, \$355; hostler and driver, \$240; keeper at female workhouse, \$300; keeper at male workhouse, \$180; 2 female attendants at almshouse, at \$150 each; hospital cook, \$300; chief cook for almshouse and workhouse, \$300; 2 assistant cooks, at \$180 each; 3 assistant cooks, at \$120 each; trained nurse, who shall act as superintendent of nursing, \$300; graduate nurse, \$365; graduate nurse, for receiving ward, \$265; borderlies, at \$300 each; pupil nurses, not less than 15 in number, \$1,140; registered pharmacist, who shall act as hospital clerk, \$720; laundryman, \$720; 2 attendants at Old Men's Home, at \$300 each; in all, \$29,916.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 16, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty-eight thousand two hundred" and insert "and services, sixty thousand;" so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses, including provisions, fuel, forage, harness and vehicles and repairs to same, gas, ice, shoes, clothing, dry goods, tailoring, drugs and medical supplies, furniture and bedding, kitchen utensils, and other necessary items and services, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 16, to strike out:

The unexpended balance of the appropriations heretofore made for erection of a workhouse for males is hereby made available for the construction of cells in the old workhouse for males.

And to insert:

For continuing the erection of a workhouse for males, \$100,000, and the unexpended balance of the appropriations heretofore made for the erection of a workhouse for males is hereby made available for continuing the work herein provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 5, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the assistant superintendent at the Reform School from \$900 to \$1,200; in line 7, to increase the appropriation for teachers and assistant teachers from \$5,040 to \$5,700; in line 9, to reduce the number of foremen of workshops at \$660 each from three to two; and in line 20, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Reform School from \$16,452 to \$16,752.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for Reform School, on page 63, after line 8, to insert:

For new family building, including heating apparatus, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, after line 10, to insert:

For furnishing the new building, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for Reform School for Girls, on page 64, after line 4, to insert:

For building and equipping brick building to be used to house men employees and for storerooms, \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical charities," on page 65, after line 14, to insert:

To aid in the reconstruction and completion of the building for the National Homeopathic Hospital, \$75,000. *Provided*, That before any part of said amount is paid the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall certify that the sum of \$50,000 in money has been raised privately to be expended for the purpose of said reconstruction.

Mr. ALLISON. The committee desire to modify the amendment as printed by striking out, in line 16, "seventy-five," before "thousand," and inserting "fifty," and by striking out the proviso beginning in line 17; so as to make the paragraph read:

To aid in the reconstruction and completion of building for the National Homeopathic Hospital, \$50,000.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Child-caring institutions," on page 66, after line 22, to insert:

The Board of Children's Guardians is hereby directed to contract for the care and maintenance of 60 wards of the board at the Hart Farm School at the rate of \$200 per annum each, and for this purpose the sum of \$12,000 is hereby appropriated, and the Commissioners are required to report to Congress at the first regular session of the Fifty-eighth Congress a general plan for the future care of the delinquent and dependent children in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before this amendment is adopted, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the language is precisely or substantially the same as was in the appropriation act of last year.

Mr. COCKRELL. No; it is a little more direct.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was hoping that it was.

Mr. COCKRELL. That allowed them and authorized them to do it. This directs them to do it.

Mr. GALLINGER. So the Senator from Missouri has no doubt in his mind, I take it, that those in authority will do precisely what this amendment contemplates?

Mr. COCKRELL. They will have to do it. There is no question about it.

Mr. GALLINGER. They did not seem to carry out the provision in the act of last year.

Mr. COCKRELL. They are now directed to do it, and they will have to do it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am very glad to know that that is the case.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 7, to increase the total appropriation for Board of Children's Guardians from \$54,600 to \$66,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, after line 14, to strike out:

For the care and maintenance of children, under a contract to be made with the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children, by the Board of Children's Guardians, not to exceed \$9,900.

And to insert:

For the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children, maintenance, including repairs, \$9,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 4, to strike out:

For the care and maintenance of children, under a contract made with the German Orphan Asylum by the Board of Children's Guardians, not to exceed \$1,800.

And to insert:

For the care and maintenance of children in German Orphan Asylum, not to exceed \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Temporary Homes," on page 68, line 17, before the word "dollars," to strike out "and Spanish War Veterans, four thousand" and insert "five thousand five hundred;" and in line 18, after the words "District of Columbia," to insert "and ex-soldiers and sailors of the Spanish war shall also be admitted to the Home;" so as to make the clause read:

For Temporary Home for ex-Union Soldiers and Sailors, Grand Army of the Republic, \$5,500, to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and ex-soldiers and sailors of the Spanish war shall also be admitted to the Home.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Water department," on page 72, line 11, after the word "dollars," to strike out "two clerks, at \$1,400 each," and insert, "clerk, \$1,500; clerk, \$1,400;" so as to make the clause read:

For revenue and inspection branch: For water registrar, who shall also perform the duties of chief clerk, \$1,800; clerk, \$1,500; clerk, \$1,400; two clerks, at \$1,000 each; chief inspector, at \$936; eight inspectors; at \$300 each; messenger, \$600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 19, to increase the appropriation for the salary of foreman of the distribution branch, water department, from \$1,400 to \$1,500, and in line 25, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the distribution branch from \$29,706 to \$29,906.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 5, to insert:

For introducing the card record system in the office of the water registrar, including cards, fixtures, labor, and other items necessary to install the same, \$2,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 9, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 3. That until and including June 30, 1904, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to advance, on the requisition of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, made in the manner now prescribed by law, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary from time to time to meet the general expenses of said District, as provided by Congress, and to reimburse the Treasury for the portion of said advances payable by the District of Columbia out of the taxes and revenues collected for the support of the government thereof. *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall be so construed as to require the United States to bear any part of the cost of street extensions, and all advances heretofore or hereafter made for this purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be repaid in full from the revenues of the District of Columbia; *Provided*, That all advances made under this act not reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States on or before June 30, 1904, shall be reimbursed to said Treasury from time to time out of the surplus revenues of the District of Columbia, beginning July 1, 1904, together with interest thereon at the rate of 2 per cent per annum until so reimbursed; and all advances heretofore made under the act of February 11, 1901, and the act of July 1, 1902, and all other acts making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia shall also be reimbursed from time to time out of said surplus revenues. *Provided*, That interest on advances made prior to

June 30, 1902, shall in the accounts of the District of Columbia with the United States be computed for the fiscal year 1903, and if not reimbursed shall be stated then as part of the principal sum and so charged annually in said accounts until reimbursed, and the same rule of computation shall apply to all advances made for the fiscal year 1904 and subsequent years, and said interest shall be so charged annually hereafter. The Auditor for the State and other Departments and the auditor for the District of Columbia shall each annually report the amount of such advances, stating each fiscal year separately, and also the reimbursements made under this section, and the balance due the United States, if any.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 4, to change the number of the section from 3 to 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER. The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] submitted an amendment which I should like to have offered now.

Mr. TELLER. It is an amendment relating to Euclid place.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After line 24, page 23, insert:

For the purchase of land necessary to extend Euclid street, in block 18, Meridian Hill, \$18,664, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that it should read "Euclid place" instead of "Euclid street." I made that mistake in drawing the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be so modified. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Iowa whether he has any amendments to offer?

Mr. ALLISON. I have no amendment to offer that I know of.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have two or three amendments which I should like to offer to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendments have been completed?

Mr. ALLISON. The committee amendments have been completed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I offer an amendment, and I wish to make a single observation concerning it.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I think the regular order had better be formally laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 12543) to enable the people of Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico to form constitutions and State governments and be admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside that the consideration of the appropriation bill may be proceeded with.

Mr. SPOONER. It is subject anyway to appropriation bills.

Mr. QUAY. There is no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside that the consideration of the appropriation bill may be continued.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Is not the unanimous-consent agreement in regard to the statehood bill subject to appropriation bills?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair it is not. To proceed to the consideration of an appropriation bill is a privileged motion, but the privilege extends no further.

Mr. QUAY. There is no objection whatever to laying aside the pending order temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 26, after line 6, insert:

For continuing work on Arizona avenue sewer, \$75,000.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I desire to say a word respecting the amendment.

The Committee on Appropriations considered the amendment very carefully, and for the reason that it will not be available after the sum is expended and that a considerable sum in addition will be required to finish this sewer, and it can not be used until it is finished, the committee thought it best to recommend larger appropriations for other sewers and to leave this entirely until next year, when we hope to recommend an appropriation sufficient to complete the sewer. It is a proper work, but money expended on it this year would be of no value until a further sum is expended next year. For that reason the committee did not recommend the sum estimated in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, upon that statement I am

inclined to withdraw the amendment, but before doing it I wish to emphasize the necessity for this work. It is in Tennallytown, where there are 2,000 people, and they have no sewerage system. Typhoid fever has prevailed there to a very considerable extent, and beyond a question because of the fact that they are without sewerage.

I trust that this very desirable improvement will be amply provided for next year. It ought to be done. I withdraw the amendment, however, upon the statement made by the chairman.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire withdraws the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. I offer an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for grading and improving Wisconsin avenue.

I will say that the Commissioners have recommended this improvement, and I trust that the chairman of the committee will allow it to go into the bill for consideration by the committee of conference. It is a very desirable improvement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After line 19, page 19, insert:

For grading and improving Wisconsin avenue, \$10,000.

Mr. ALLISON. I will not object to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is a section of the city which is in great need of an improvement. It is in the vicinity of the Sprague property, on the way from the Soldiers' Home, as Senators will recall. Citizens have made a very important contribution by dedicating streets to the District or to the Government. The Commissioners say:

Since the date of their previous report in this case the abutting property owners have donated for public use that portion of Cincinnati street between Central avenue and a point a short distance south of Cincinnati street, and also the whole of Cincinnati street between Fourth and Seventh streets, so that practically the whole of the land proposed to be improved is under the control of the Commissioners, as indicated on the inclosed plat. It is understood that arrangements have been completed also for the donation of the triangular area in Seventh street near Keokuk, whereupon a continuous right of way will be had from the Bunker Hill road by way of Seventh and Cincinnati streets to Fourth street NE.

I think this matter was not presented to the Committee on Appropriations—at least this dedication had not been made when I offered the amendment. The Committee on the District of Columbia favorably acted upon it and recommend it to the Committee on Appropriations. It calls for an appropriation of \$7,500. I ask that it may be allowed. I hope the amendment may go into the bill for further consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. After the word "dollars," in line 12, page 17—

Mr. GALLINGER. The line and page were very likely stated before the bill was reprinted. The clerks will put in the amendment at the right place.

The SECRETARY. At the top of page 19 insert:

To grade, regulate, and improve Seventh street NE., from Michigan avenue (Bunker Hill road) to Rhode Island avenue, and Cincinnati street NE., from Seventh street NE. to Fourth street NW., \$7,500.

Mr. ALLISON. The Committee on Appropriations did not examine this question, their attention not having been called to it. So of course I can have no knowledge of such a specific character that would justify me in saying that the committee favor its going into the bill. I will not object to the amendment being placed in the bill for further consideration.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is all I ask.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. On page 46, line 6, before the word "dollars," I move to strike out "thirteen hundred and twenty" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "fourteen hundred." The effect of this amendment will give to the lieutenants of police of this city, a limited number, \$80 a year more than they are now receiving. That is all there is of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 46, line 6, before the word "dollars," strike out "one thousand three hundred and twenty" and insert in lieu thereof the words "one thousand four hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That changes the total. The clerks will change the total to correspond with the last amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. The clerks will, I hope, change the total.

Mr. MCOMAS. On page 15, after line 2, I move to insert:

Five hundred dollars to pay William S. Torbert for the preparation of an index to the Code of the District of Columbia, this sum to be paid after such index shall have been approved by the court of appeals and by the supreme court of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALLISON. I have only to repeat what I said before. This was not estimated for. This work has not been completed. The person who prepared the index before was paid \$500, and he made a very imperfect index. I had hoped the Senator from Maryland would allow this matter to go over until the work is completed. I shall offer no objection to it, however.

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

Mr. MCCOMAS. Since I spoke to the Senator on this subject I have had a communication which makes just that statement. At that time I did not know it. I had a telegram saying that the "Court and Bar Association recommend William S. Torbert as indexer." The suggestion was very properly made as I thought. There was an index before, but it is a very bad one. It simply makes the code very useless as it is now. But I have now received a letter which really complies with the very reasonable suggestion of the distinguished chairman of the committee.

It seems that a Mr. William S. Torbert—and I know him well enough to know that he is a very painstaking, industrious man, well fitted to prepare digests and indexes—has been induced by some of the court and bar to prepare a new and a good index. Here is what some of the leading members of the bar—Mr. William F. Mattingly, Mr. A. S. Worthington, Mr. C. C. Cole, Mr. J. J. Darlington, and Mr. R. Ross Perry—say of this index:

We, as members of the bar of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, desire to bring to your attention the necessity for a proper index to the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, especially in view of the fact that a resolution is now pending in the Senate for the printing of 2,500 copies of the code.

I think I am right in saying that an order has already passed for the printing of those copies of the code. This is a necessary and proper provision now that they are to be printed. These leading men and the bar association and the court, I have no doubt, fully concur in this statement with the Senator from Iowa. They say:

The present index is unsatisfactory, inaccurate, and incomplete, and of but little value.

Mr. President, if the index could be examined for a half hour it would be seen to be, what the Senator from Iowa has said, a very poor piece of work.

Now, that is the organic law of this District, and it is made inaccessible by a bad index. Who made it I do not know. I have tried to find out. It was probably given here to somebody in the Capitol who knows nothing about indexing and, it may be, wanted \$500; but the work was very poorly done.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, just at that point I feel that I ought to say a word, inasmuch as the work was done under the direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia. The late Senator McMillan, who was a very careful man in all matters which came under his observation, and the very accomplished clerk of that committee are, I think, responsible for that work. They, I think, selected a gentleman whom they believed qualified to do the work. Now, I am not going to offer an opinion as to whether it was well done or poorly done, but it was not given to a clerk around the Capitol simply to give him a job.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I did not mean to say that it was. I said that somebody wanted the money and made the index. Now, the late Senator from Michigan, or his clerk, the most efficient I ever knew in the history of Government work, would ordinarily do the best thing to do, but the man who made this index was not that accomplished and most useful chairman nor that very able clerk. The man who made the index made a very bad index. The proof is the index itself. It makes the code inaccessible to the people who need it and wish to know what is in it. Of course, the value of the code—

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not understand that there has been any objection made to the amendment. Why does not the Senator allow his amendment to be acted upon and have it passed at once, without any further discussion?

Mr. MCCOMAS. I will not say a word further.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will make a point of order on it if he does not.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I only hope that in conference this amendment will be retained, because the index ought to be in the copies of the code now being printed. I have nothing further to say, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Was a point of order raised? Mr. COCKRELL. No; I did not make the point of order, if the Senator from Maryland would not discuss it further.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

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

The SECRETARY. On page 19, after line 4, it is proposed to insert:

For paving old Sixteenth street from Columbia road to Kenesaw avenue, \$5,000.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from Washington will explain this amendment. I understand that it has been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia and that it is to pave what is known as old Sixteenth street. I had supposed that the old Sixteenth street had been merged into the new Sixteenth street, and that we were providing for all there was of Sixteenth street. If there is a part of old Sixteenth street which it is desired to have paved, I wish the Senator from Washington would explain the necessity for it. I certainly had no knowledge that there was any portion of Sixteenth street not already provided for in the bill.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington. What was formerly Sixteenth street above this particular point is now termed old Sixteenth street. New Sixteenth street is provided for in the appropriations made for paving. There is a large number of people living on what is called old Sixteenth street, many houses have been erected there, and the residents on that street are extremely anxious that it shall be paved. Hence the favorable report which was made on the improvement. The amendment was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, which has authorized me to report in favor of it. I hope the Senator from Iowa will not object to its adoption.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from Washington will furnish the facts upon which the conferees on the part of the Senate can defend this amendment if it is put into the bill. They have no knowledge of it now.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington. The principal facts in favor of the amendment are that a great many people live on the street, that new buildings are going up there, and those people are urging the improvement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. There is one other amendment which I desire to offer, which I send to the desk—to increase the compensation of the deputy collector of the district.

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

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 4, after the words "deputy collector," it is proposed to strike out "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" so as to read:

Deputy collector, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. In the same clause, in line 12, I move to increase the total from "\$19,400" to "\$19,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, for what I think is an adequate reason, and which I believe the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations understands, I will make the request that the further consideration of this bill be postponed until to-morrow morning. There is one matter which I feel quite confident I shall want to bring to the attention of the Senate in connection with this bill, but it will not be in shape for me to do so this afternoon.

Mr. ALLISON. Will it not suit the purpose of the Senator from New Hampshire to allow the bill to be reported to the Senate and the amendments which have been agreed to as in Committee of the Whole concurred in in the Senate?

Mr. GALLINGER. That will be entirely agreeable to me, Mr. President.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] now asks that the bill lie over until to-morrow morning. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COURTS IN UTAH.

Mr. RAWLINS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 149) to provide for holding terms of court in the district of Utah, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments to said act, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

Strike out the words "September, January, and," in line 6 of the said Senate act, and insert after the word "April," in line 6, the following: "and November and at Ogden City on the second Monday in March and September."

Insert in line 7, before the word "terms," the word "other," and insert after the word "at," in line 7, the following: "said Salt Lake City and."

Further amend line 7 by striking out the word "or," after the word "City" and before the word "other," and inserting the words "and at;" so that the said act, when so amended, will read as follows:

"That the State of Utah constitutes one judicial district, which is known as the district of Utah. Terms of the district court shall be held in Salt Lake City on the second Monday in April and November and at Ogden City on the second Monday in March and September of each year: *Provided*, That other

terms of said court may be held at said Salt Lake City and Ogden City and at other places in said district when deemed necessary by the judge."

GEO. F. HOAR,
JO. C. S. BLACKBURN,
J. L. RAWLINS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
JOHN J. JENKINS,
R. WAYNE PARKER,
D. A. DE ARMOND,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 9th instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 3546) for the relief of L. A. Noyes; and
An act (S. 6278) to extend the provisions of chapter 8, Title XXXII, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, entitled "Reservation and sale of town sites on the public lands," to the ceded Indian lands in the State of Minnesota.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had on this day approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

An act (S. 1471) for the relief of Henry G. Rogers;
An act (S. 2450) to establish a fog bell and lens-lantern light on the southeastern end of Southampton Shoal, San Francisco Bay, California;

An act (S. 4222) authorizing the appointment of John Russell Bartlett, a captain on the retired list of the Navy, as a rear-admiral on the retired list of the Navy; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 156) dedicating to the city of Columbus, in the State of Ohio, for uses and purposes of the public streets, part of the property conveyed to the United States by Robert Neil by deed dated February 17, 1863, recorded in Deed Book 76, page 572, etc., Franklin County records.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 569) to establish a department of commerce and labor.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 5678) providing for record of deeds and other conveyances and instruments of writing in Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

UNION RAILROAD STATION.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4825) to provide for a union railroad station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreements of the amendments of the House numbered 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 4, 42, 45, and 47.
Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Between the words "railroads" and "properties," in said amendment, insert a comma; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 3 of the act, line 22, strike out "United States Reform School" and insert "Reform School of the District of Columbia;" and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 7 of the act, line 3, strike out "company" and insert "companies;" and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In said amendment strike out "Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington" and insert "Baltimore and Potomac;" and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 12 of the act, line 5, strike out beginning with "in the city of Washington" down to and including all of line 11, and in lieu thereof insert: "Also, in the city of Washington, the following named streets are hereby vacated, abandoned, and closed, to wit, Ivy street, between South Capitol street and a point 220 feet east thereof; Second street NE., between N street and Delaware avenue, and between the north side of M street and the south side of L street, so much of the bed of Delaware avenue as lies west of a line drawn parallel with the east building line of said avenue and 40 feet westerly therefrom;" and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the section strike out the period, and at the beginning of the new matter strike out "except" and insert: "Provided, That;" and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to so much of the amendment of the House numbered 57 as involves striking out section 12 of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted to stand as section 12 insert the following:

"SEC. 12. That the Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company shall establish and maintain a substation with suitable accommodation

for passenger travel at a convenient location north of the Long Bridge and at a point to be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

And the House agree to the same.
On amendments numbered 33 and 41, and on so much of amendment numbered 57 as relates to the striking out of section 13 of the bill and the substitution of matter in lieu thereof, the committee of conference have been unable to agree.

J. H. GALLINGER,
W. P. DILLINGHAM,
THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
J. W. BABCOCK,
SYDNEY E. MUDD,
ADOLPH MEYER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I want to make a single observation. The conferees on this bill have agreed as to all matters in dispute except the one item of a proposed reduction on the part of the other House of the amount of money to be contributed by the Government and the District of Columbia to these two railroads. That matter is still in dispute.

I have supposed, Mr. President, that it was not the proper thing, in presenting a conference report, to state the action of the conferees when they were considering a matter of this kind, but inasmuch as certain statements were made on yesterday in another place, to the effect that if this matter went back to conference again there would be no difficulty in securing a recession by the conferees on the part of the Senate, I desire to put myself on record as saying that the conferees on the part of the Senate have never said anything or suggested anything which would warrant that statement. The matter goes back to conference with that point of disagreement absolutely open for further consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee of conference.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments which are still in disagreement, and agree to the conference asked for by the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. DILLINGHAM, and Mr. MARTIN were appointed.

ELISE SIGEL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15659) granting a pension to Elise Sigel, and asking for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agree to the conference asked for by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. FOSTER of Washington, and Mr. TURNER were appointed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7245) amending the act of June 19, 1888, providing for the erection of a public building at Bridgeport, Conn., to report it favorably without amendment. It is a very brief bill, and it is important that it should be passed immediately, for the work of construction can not proceed on the building without the passage of a bill amending the existing law. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him, which will be read to the Senate in full for its information.

Mr. QUAY. Before the bill is laid before the Senate, I desire to say that, in view of the statement of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS], I shall not object to its consideration, but I shall object to the injection of any other bills into the belly of the statehood discussion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read for information, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that for the purpose of permitting the construction, upon lands now belonging to the United States, of the extension to the post-office building at Bridgeport, Conn., authorized by the act of Congress approved June 4, 1897, so much of the act of Congress entitled "An act for the erecting of a public building at Bridgeport, Conn.," approved June 19, 1888, as provides that "the site

purchased shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet, including streets and alleys," shall be repealed.

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

NATIONAL-BANK RESERVES.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to House bill 7659.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7659) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to amend sections 5191 and 5192 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes," and asking for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

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

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. ALLISON, Mr. ALDRICH, and Mr. JONES of Arkansas were appointed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

Mr. HANNA submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 569) "to establish the department of commerce and labor," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 8, of the amendment, strike out all after the word "Congress" to the end of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and the Auditor for the State and other departments shall receive and examine all accounts of salaries and incidental expenses of the office of the secretary of commerce and labor and of all bureaus and offices under his direction, all accounts relating to the Light-House Board, Steamboat-Inspection Service, Immigration, Navigation, Alaskan fur-seal fisheries, the National Bureau of Standards, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Census, Department of Labor, Fish Commission, and to all other business within the jurisdiction of the department of commerce and labor, and certify the balances arising thereon to the division of bookkeeping and warrants and send forthwith a copy of each certificate to the secretary of commerce and labor."

Page 3, line 15, of the amendment, insert after the word "Establishment" the following: "the Steamboat-Inspection Service, the Bureau of Navigation, the United States Shipping Commissioners."

Page 4, line 3, of the amendment, strike out the word "Commissioners" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Commission."

Strike out all of section 6 and insert in lieu the following:

"Sec. 6. That there shall be in the department of commerce and labor a bureau to be called the bureau of corporations, and a commissioner of corporations who shall be the head of said bureau, to be appointed by the President, who shall receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum. There shall also be in said bureau a deputy commissioner who shall receive a salary of \$3,500 per annum, and who shall in the absence of the commissioner act as, and perform the duties of, the commissioner of corporations, and who shall also perform such other duties as may be assigned to him by the secretary of commerce and labor or by the said commissioner. There shall also be in the said bureau a chief clerk and such special agents, clerks, and other employees as may be authorized by law.

"The said commissioner shall have power and authority to make, under the direction and control of the secretary of commerce and labor, diligent investigation into the organization, conduct, and management of the business of any corporation, joint stock company, or corporate combination engaged in commerce among the several States and with foreign nations excepting common carriers subject to 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and to gather such information and data as will enable the President of the United States to make recommendations to Congress for legislation for the regulation of such commerce, and to report such data to the President from time to time as he shall require; and the information so obtained, or as much thereof as the President may direct, shall be made public.

"In order to accomplish the purposes declared in the foregoing part of this section, the said commissioner shall have and exercise the same power and authority in respect to corporations, joint-stock companies, and combinations subject to the provisions hereof as is conferred on the Interstate Commerce Commission in said 'act to regulate commerce' and the amendments thereto in respect to common carriers so far as the same may be applicable, including the right to subpoena and compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence and to administer oaths.

"All the requirements, obligations, liabilities, and immunities imposed or conferred by said 'Act to regulate commerce' and by 'An act in relation to testimony before the Interstate Commerce Commission,' etc., approved February 11, 1893, supplemental to said 'Act to regulate commerce,' shall also apply to all persons who may be subpoenaed to testify as witnesses or to produce documentary evidence in pursuance of the authority conferred by this section.

"It shall also be the province and duty of said Bureau, under the direction of the secretary of commerce and labor, to gather, compile, publish, and supply useful information concerning corporations doing business within the limits of the United States as shall engage in interstate commerce or in commerce between the United States and any foreign country, including corporations engaged in insurance, and to attend to such other duties as may be hereafter provided by law."

Page 6, line 8, of the amendment, after the word "required," insert the words "by the secretary of commerce and labor."

Page 7, line 7, of the amendment, after the word "labor," insert the following: "Provided, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter the method of collecting and accounting for the head tax prescribed by section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to regulate immigration,' approved August 3, 1882."

Page 8, line 25, of the amendment, after the word "in," insert the words "or by."

In lieu of section 10 of the amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 10. That all duties performed and all power and authority now possessed or exercised by the head of any executive department in and over any bureau, office, officer, board, branch, or division of the public service by this act transferred to the department of commerce and labor, or any business arising therefrom or pertaining thereto, or in relation to the duties performed by and authority conferred by law upon such bureau, officer, office, board, branch, or division of the public service, whether of an appellate or revisory character or otherwise, shall hereafter be vested in and exercised by the head of the said department of commerce and labor.

"All duties, power, authority, and jurisdiction, whether supervisory, appellate, or otherwise, now imposed or conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury by acts of Congress relating to merchant vessels or yachts, their measurement, numbers, names, registers, enrollments, licenses, commissions, records, mortgages, bills of sale, transfers, entry, clearance, movements, and transportation of their cargoes and passengers, owners, officers, seamen, passengers, fees, inspection, equipment for the better security of life, and by acts of Congress relating to tonnage tax, boilers on steam vessels, the carrying of inflammable, explosive, or dangerous cargo on vessels, the use of petroleum or other similar substances to produce motive power, and relating to the remission or refund of fines, penalties, forfeitures, exactions, or charges incurred for violating any provision of law relating to vessels or seamen or to informer's shares of such fines, and by acts of Congress relating to the Commissioner and Bureau of Navigation, shipping commissioners, their officers and employees, Steamboat-Inspection Service and any of the officials thereof, shall be, and hereby are, transferred to and imposed and conferred upon the secretary of commerce and labor from and after the time of the transfer of the Bureau of Navigation, the shipping commissioners, and the Steamboat-Inspection Service to the department of commerce and labor, and shall not thereafter be imposed upon or exercised by the Secretary of the Treasury. And all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are, so far as inconsistent, hereby repealed."

Page 10, line 12 of the amendment, strike out the words "or the Interstate Commerce Commission" and insert the following: "from the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of War, the Department of Justice, the Post-Office Department, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Interior."

Page 11, line 6 of the amendment, after the word "act," insert the words: "other than those of section 12."

And the House agree to the same.

M. A. HANNA,
KNUTE NELSON,
A. S. CLAY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
W. P. HEPBURN,
JAMES R. MANN,
WILLIAM RICHARDSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senate agree to the conference report?

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator, who is the chairman of the committee of conference, and who submitted this report, that it is a report of exceeding importance, and, if it concurs with his better judgment, that he allow it to be printed and go over until to-morrow. I expect to vote with the Senator for the adoption of the report, but I should like first to know exactly what I am voting for.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks that the conference report may be printed and go over until tomorrow. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

STATEHOOD BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12543) to enable the people of Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico to form constitutions and State governments and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. RAWLINS. I present a memorial of the governor and the legislature of the State of Utah bearing upon the statehood bill now pending, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah asks that the memorial which he sends to the desk may be read. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Senate joint memorial, memorializing Congress to pass the omnibus statehood bill, admitting Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma as States in the Union.

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

Your memorialists, the governor and legislature of the State of Utah, respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to pass the bill now pending in Congress to admit the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma as States in the Union.

EDWARD M. ALLISON, Jr.,
President of the Senate.

THOMAS HULL,
Speaker of the House.

Approved this 2d day of February, 1903.

HEBER M. WELLS, Governor.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] would like to proceed at this time. I have no objection to his doing so, and I gladly yield to him.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I do not like to interfere with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] in the delivery of his continuous speech, which has so far been interrupted with a few parentheses of somewhat protracted character; and I would much prefer, if the Senator will do so, that he should conclude his remarks before I speak, because he has said some things here that I

desire to answer, and I should like to have the benefit of all of the Senator's remarks before proceeding, if I could do so. I always feel uncomfortable in speaking in the time of another Senator for fear that I might possibly intrude upon his patience by the length of my own remarks, which are sometimes a little more protracted than other people like to have them. If the Senator from New Jersey will conclude his remarks—

Mr. KEAN. It is always a pleasure to listen to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, I know; but it might not be so great a pleasure if I had the opportunity of replying to all the Senator has said and intends to say. However, if the Senator is entirely satisfied for me to occupy the floor as in my own time, of course without depriving him of the privilege, I will proceed with what I have to say.

I have for a long time, Mr. President, been an interested student, I may say, of the situation of the country that is called the arid part of America—west of the Rio Grande River and the country extending to the north of it. When a proposition was brought in here for the admission of the State of Washington into the Union I was very heartily in favor of it. The ground upon which I took a stand in favor of the admission of Washington State was, first, that it was a national duty. It must have been a national contemplation or expectation when we adopted the Constitution of the United States and had the Northwestern Territory as a part of the assets, I may say, of the old government—the government of the Confederation—which were turned over to us, that we would extend to the people of the different Territories then acquired or thereafter to be acquired all of the rights that the Constitution provides as belonging to citizenship of the United States.

Those rights as they existed in the original thirteen States and were transferred into the constitutions of the other States that followed them, now to the number of forty-five, were peculiar. They were important. They had never existed in any other country but this in concrete form. And the aggregation of those rights in what we call statehood was considered by our fathers to be the highest reach of human endeavor in the direction of free republican government.

Those original States, formed out of the colonies, had exercised many of the powers of sovereignty before the Union was formed. They had exercised full powers of sovereignty for eleven years, through their representatives in the Congress of the Confederation—much broader powers of sovereignty, indeed, than were left to them after the Constitution was adopted. They had conjointly exercised fully the powers of sovereignty in making treaties with Indians, and also in having systems of coinage, and in exercising various of the attributes of absolute and unqualified sovereignty.

When they were congregated into the Union, first 10 of them and then 3 more, they formed a Constitution, which was intended thereafter to demark, to delimit, and to define all the privileges of American citizens, and the American citizen who does not enjoy all the fullness of that liberty can not be said to be an American citizen in the proper meaning of that term.

The thirteen original States, recently colonies of Great Britain, were required to give up to the Federal Government, which was to be located in the District of Columbia, certain of their sovereign powers, particularly those which related to dealings with foreign countries. But for the purpose of providing for themselves, under the separate sovereignties that they enjoyed, they had the unquestioned right to elect all their officers, legislative, judicial, and executive, and to choose them in their own manner, so that the manner of choice should be republican in form.

It was considered that this combination between the two great sovereign powers, the one residing in the States and the other in the Federal Government, was, for purposes of domestic security and enjoyment and for purposes of external or foreign protection and progress, the very acme, the highest possible reach of free republican government; and so, Mr. President, it has been all the time since.

When the State of Washington was applying for admission into the Union with a feeble rap at our doors, and expecting possibly to be turned away without being admitted into these high privileges and rights, I thought it was for our own security as a nation, for our own development, for the benefit of the people of Washington, and for the promotion of their happiness, that it should be admitted as a sovereign State into the American Union.

I further thought, Mr. President, and so expressed myself, I believe, that the State of Washington, situated at the extreme northwest of our possessions, and looking across Puget Sound upon the possessions of Great Britain, would form a bulwark in that quarter which not only would attract the attention of the world, but would give needed strength to our institutions, physical, political, and moral, and that that was the place of all others in the United States where it was most necessary that all the aggre-

gated powers of statehood and Federal sovereignty should be combined into a sovereign State to be admitted into the American Union. For these reasons I took great pride and pleasure in my advocacy of the admission of Washington into the Union.

At that time the political situation in Washington was unsettled, and there were hopes of Democratic success in the coming Presidential elections which were somewhat flattering, and I was somewhat berated by my Democratic colleagues because I did not pay sufficient attention to the probable dominance in the State of the Republican ticket in national elections. Nevertheless, I got my consent to go on with what I believed to be a duty to the entire country that rose above what other gentlemen supposed was my duty to my party.

Following on after that, within nine months, I think it was, from the date of the admission of Washington, five other great States were admitted into the Union. Thereupon I, having stood my ground and having voted for all of them upon the principles which I thought ought to control my action, the admonitions that came from my party were a little more pointed and a little more severe, as if I were really assisting in transferring the power from the hands of the Democracy, as it was expected, into the hands of the Republican party. I still held to my course because I believed it to be right.

Since that time, Mr. President, I have been amply rewarded for what sagacity I possessed, in seeing gentlemen on this floor who are Democrats, coming from those Northwestern States, and now I do not remember that we have any Democrat on the floor from that northern section of the country—I am now speaking of the isothermal line that runs across our country, the line of ancient division in our politics—who does not come from the mountain region of the six States admitted within the period of nine months.

Now, my position with regard to Arizona and New Mexico and Oklahoma has not the slightest taint of politics in it. I desire the admission of these States into the Union for the practical reason, the economic reason, for the national reason, for the reason of state, that influenced my vote in favor of Washington and her five sister States, admitted into the Union from the Northwest. So the gentlemen who choose to follow me in my remarks or to read them hereafter, if they ever shall undertake to do so, must exonerate me on this occasion from any expected political gain to my party as influencing me in the slightest degree.

But, being free to act myself, Mr. President, I will not make accusation against the gentlemen who are trying to keep these Territories out of the Union that they are controlled by party considerations. At the same time, they will have to confront accusations of that kind, whether they are just or unjust, because the people believe that that is exactly what is going on; that this is a play of politics and nothing else but a play of politics; that there is no reason of statesmanship which excludes these States from admission into the Union, and that if they are excluded now, having waited some sixty years to get them into a condition that might possibly suit the refined ideas of certain gentlemen as to what a people ought to be to have the blessings of American liberty, no one knows how long they will have to wait, at the rate we have been going, provided those Senators have a correct idea of the degradation which they insist has been suffered in New Mexico and Arizona, by granting to these people Territorial government and permitting them to ravel down at the heel in the way that they have done in the last sixty years.

When will they get any better, and when will we be ready to admit them? I think it will come to a pass after a while where we will have to exclude States from the American Union and turn others outside of the Union because we can not find any material that is good enough for these exacting to associate with. I judge that will be the result.

Now, this debate has been going on here, some one said yesterday, for six weeks—I believe it is two months—sawing along in the most leisurely possible way that I think I have ever seen in the Senate, and the Democrats have been so silent about it that I am afraid they are nearly dumb for want of exercise in the use of their voice in speech. They have been locked in here by what I may call a peaceful political blockade.

Mr. TELLER. A pacific blockade.

Mr. MORGAN. A pacific political blockade. It has been conducted in the very best of humor. Scarcely a ripple has arisen on the surface to agitate anybody at all, but the blockade has been kept up, and we do not know when it is going to end. Whether we shall have to refer it to some Hague which we will ourselves constitute to settle when this thing is to end and what is to become of it I do not know. We are, like the British and Germans in Venezuela, being starved to death to gratify the arrogant pride of our own guardians, the leaders, it seems, of the Republican party in the Senate. The country is stopped from the exercise of its own Government, to make a capricious minority more disagreeably conspicuous.

Here is the Senate of the United States engaged upon propositions which Senators have undertaken to discuss to their utmost, bringing up every possible phase and circumstance that can be thought of connected with almost everybody in these three Territories, beginning with the people, running up through the magistrates and justices of the peace, and judges of the courts, and the sheriffs and constables, and the legislatures and local administrations, and all manner of things, getting even into the religion of the people out there and their alleged taint of Mormonism. They are going through and trying to instruct the people of the United States in a knowledge of the situation in Arizona and New Mexico and Oklahoma, about which the people know practically ten times as much as any Senator on this floor; wasting the time of the Government, which is said to be precious, and keeping us from engaging in that discussion of a real topic which is looming up behind this matter—the trusts—which have afflicted the people of this country to the extent almost of absolute starvation in many places and of actual freezing in many others.

The discussion of the trusts has been kept back, and will be kept back until it gets too late for us to have any that is fair or intelligent, and we will be forced to accept a proposition that is coming to us from the House, possibly without amendment, and without the opportunity of explaining our votes against it if we do not agree with it, when we know and the whole world knows that that trust bill is nothing more than a mush poultice put upon some little pimple for the purpose of soothing some slight pain, when the disease is a cancer of the whole body politic.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Which trust bill?

Mr. MORGAN. The one that is coming to us.

Mr. President, the object of this long delay is not so much to defeat the statehood of these Territories. It is to defeat something else that lies behind it. It is utterly unjustifiable. There is no excuse for it, and so the people of the United States will pronounce when they get a chance to express their opinion upon it.

We have stood here in the presence of a solemn treaty duty for two months, after having stood in its presence for many years, and we have deliberately refused to perform it without having just cause or excuse. There is no substantial reason why these States should not be admitted into the Union. You may take Arizona or New Mexico and take all the Mexicans and all the Indians in those two Territories and replace them with negroes taken from Alabama and Mississippi and you will not have so enlightened a population as you have there now. Yet, I suppose that if Alabama or Mississippi or Louisiana were to ask for admission into the American Union now no objection would be made on account of the population, at least four-tenths of which in some of those States and a majority in others are negroes—uneducated, uninformed, incapable of participating intelligently in a republican and complex form of government.

In some of the Southern States the negroes are in the majority. So in Louisiana, so in Mississippi. What would become of those States, or Territories like them, if they were here asking to be admitted into the Union now, upon the basis of unfitness for participation in statehood? Who will not say that the Mexicans and the Indians in New Mexico and in Arizona are more intelligent, better fitted for participation in republican government than the negroes of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, or South Carolina?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not want to be interrupted by the Senator.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then I will not interrupt the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama declines to yield.

Mr. MORGAN. I like to see the Senator on the floor, but he has been so much on it that I prefer to speak without being interrupted.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will not ask the Senator to yield.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, we ought to have in this country, since we have got to be 125 years old or more under the Constitution, some sobriety of judgment and some respect for truth and facts, and we ought not to be led off by the demands of party requirements and under party alignment to do absurd and false things that are against the sentiment of the American people and are opposed to the Constitution of the United States.

Very little has been said about the basic fact which underlies our action here, and about the requirement of an obligation that rests upon us with a burden we can not possibly shake off if we have any possible self-respect. I propose to go into the subject of that duty: to ascertain where it comes from; to ascertain the measure of it, and to see if I can not persuade these gentlemen to join me in trying to perform it.

When we made the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo with Mexico, by the terms of which we acquired vast territory to the west of

us, which was done in 1848, we put into it the ninth article, which reads as follows:

The Mexicans who, in the territories aforesaid, shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican Republic conformably with what is stipulated in the preceding article, shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States and be admitted at the proper time (to be judged by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States, according to the principles of the Constitution, and in the meantime shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction.

Three years later, when the Gadsden treaty came to be negotiated and we wanted more land down there, including a large portion of that which is now New Mexico and Arizona, we presented through our negotiators another stipulation which takes the place of the one I have just read, to make it more obligatory and broader. They say in that protocol:

The American Government, by suppressing the ninth article of the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo and substituting the third article of the treaty of Louisiana, did not intend to diminish in any way what was agreed upon by the aforesaid article 9 in favor of the inhabitants of the Territories ceded by Mexico. Its understanding is that all of that agreement is contained in the third article of the treaty of Louisiana. In consequence all the privileges and guarantees, civil, political, and religious, which would have been possessed by the inhabitants of the ceded Territories, if the ninth article of the treaty had been retained, will be enjoyed by them without any difference under the article which has been substituted.

Now, let us see what it was that we guaranteed in the third article of the treaty for the Louisiana Purchase, which is substituted for the ninth article in the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo by a protocol that was three years younger than this:

The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States and admitted as soon as possible according to the principles of the Federal Constitution to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States; and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess.

This can mean nothing else than a pledge of their admission to statehood ("in the Union of the United States") and that they shall be admitted "as soon as possible," not as soon as it may be convenient in a Presidential election.

Now, what else can that mean, when we say in this protocol that we do not change anything in the ninth article of the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo relating to the rights and liberties belonging to the people we took in there, and gave them the option of becoming citizens of the United States, and then we go and add to it what I have just read here from the third article of the treaty of Louisiana? Admitted to what? Citizenship. At the discretion of Congress as it was in the ninth article? No. The discretion is stricken out. It is a national obligation that they shall be admitted. Admitted to what? Statehood.

These very people comprised a part of one of the States of Mexico at the time they were admitted into our Union—the State of Sonora. The State of Sonora had its representatives in the National Congress of the Republic of Mexico. They had also their local government and governors elected by them. They had the right to the ballot, and there is not a male citizen 21 years of age in Mexico to-day—Indian, negro, white man, or Mexican—who is not entitled to vote in every election, and there never has been since the Republic was first established.

We took those people, citizens of a sovereign State of Mexico, with far greater powers of sovereignty than our States possess—very far greater—we bought them from Santa Anna; we paid him \$10,000,000 additional for the Gadsden Purchase. But the question arose, What is to become of those people whom we were denationalizing and depriving of the liberties which they enjoyed under the Mexican constitution?

The treaty provided that they should have the option to remain in these Territories and own and keep their property under all circumstances. In addition to that, that they should have the option of becoming citizens of the United States or they should have the option of remaining citizens of Mexico. If they should prefer the last proposition, what they had to do is substantially what we required the people of Cuba to do. They shall register as Mexican citizens, that is all.

They expected to get as many liberties, as well secured by constitutional guaranties, under this Government as they had under Mexico. They had in Mexico all the blessings and benefits of statehood that we propose to extend to them. Was it our agreement that we should take them out of that statehood which they enjoyed in Mexico under a liberal constitution, where they were not sovereign in respect to foreign powers, but had all those rights and privileges which our States here enjoy; and, more, was it understood that we were to take these Mexicans out from under their constitutions, State and Federal, and transfer them to this lower condition of Territorial subordination and keep them there until it pleased the politicians of the United States, and in particular of New England, that they might come into the Union?

They could not deal with the United States personally. They were a conquered people. We made solemn promises to their

Government to protect all the rights and liberties they enjoyed by giving them the full powers of citizenship of States in our Union, and because they were impotent to force our compliance with our pledges we upbraid them and rebuke them with scorn and contempt, because they even dare to petition us.

Our political assurances are as strong as possible, but our performance is contemptuous refusal.

Did we promise them perpetual subordination, as Territories, that should receive all their officers as gifts from the President? No, sir; no such contemplation was in that treaty; just the reverse of it; and when we fail to execute in behalf of the Mexican citizens there this third article of the treaty of Louisiana we violate our obligations to the Government, to God, and to man. That is what we are doing here.

We are denying the privileges that we solemnly promised them in the treaty, and we talk about it, Mr. President, as twittingly as we would to a canary bird that sings its song in a cage. What we shall do with these people is a mere by-play. They are supposed to be in the same condition as the Indians that we found on this continent when we landed here, and we are treating them just as if they were aboriginal Indian tribes. We are treating them precisely as Massachusetts and Connecticut and all New England down to Rhode Island treated the Indians when they first landed there, as the occupants of a soil that God had set apart for His elect, and then they voted themselves to be the elect and proceeded to govern it. That is the situation.

We agreed to treat them as citizens of the United States, and kept the promise by treating them as we did the alleged savages.

It is true, Mr. President, that there is no one to confront us with a demand that we shall do this right to these Mexican people, because Mexico is not able to do it. But if we had acquired these people from Great Britain or from Germany, with this guaranty in their favor, and had waited fifty or sixty years and then announced our determination to admit them whenever it suited a certain political party and not before, an inquiry would be instituted here. Why have you violated the obligation of that treaty? Why have you done it? What do you mean by putting those obligations in the treaty and then turning on your heel and saying that you would not execute it until the politics of your party got to suit your tastes in this matter? But we are compelled by a minority to stand here and violate these obligations in a cowardly way because we think that Mexico can not compel us to comply with them. That is what we are doing.

Now, what is a treaty with a foreign country? The Constitution of the United States defines it to be the supreme law of the United States. I can think of no higher grade of legislative enactment than that. I can conceive no duty that is more obligatory upon the citizens and upon the States than to obey the supreme law enacted by the Congress of the United States and the laws that are declared supreme by the Constitution of the United States; and treaties are so expressly declared to be supreme.

Can we evade these, Mr. President? What are we doing when we take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States if we intend to except from it all the treaty obligations with foreign countries that do not suit us? What becomes of that personal duty?

I ask again, what is a treaty? I have given one definition that ought to satisfy any American mind as to what it is and the obligations that it imposes. I will go further and I will inquire into the manner in which it is negotiated. A treaty with a foreign power is negotiated by a separate constitutional department of the United States. It is not the President, it is not the Senate, it is not Congress. It is the President and the Senate cooperating together as a special tribunal, the Senate acting by a vote of two-thirds of the majority of a quorum, advising and consenting as to what shall be done in respect of the ratification of a treaty that the President has negotiated as a convenience of the diplomatic part of our Government and has brought to us and submitted with a view to its ratification. That is the tribunal—peculiar, separate, having powers of its own—that enacts supreme law on our part.

Who is the other party to the legislative procedure by which this becomes supreme law? The foreign government. It may be Santo Domingo or Haiti; it may be Cuba; it may be Mexico; it may be some other country. That country, acting according to its own laws, whatever they may be in respect of the creation of treaties, informs us of its willingness to consider a proposition for a treaty proposed by the President of the United States, and thereupon the plan of the negotiation is drawn up and concluded, and the President submits it to the Senate of the United States, where it must get a two-thirds majority of a quorum; otherwise we can not ratify it and it can not become a law. Then it is taken to the other contracting party, and, according to the laws of that government, whatever they may be, it is acted upon there.

So whatever those laws may be, Mr. President, we invite that foreign government to cooperate with the Senate of the United

States in the enactment of a law which will be the supreme law of the United States, and which, if it is violated on the part of the other contracting party, will be made supreme law over them at the mouths of our cannon if they refuse to comply with it. The real sanction of every treaty is arms, war, and nothing else.

This majestic system of laws thus pronounced upon by the Constitution of the United States in cooperation with a foreign government does not have a marshal or a sheriff to enforce it or a hangman to execute it. It has the power of the Army and Navy behind it, and either of the contracting parties has a right to resort to that power whenever that treaty is broken.

We thus get some conception of what is meant by these obligations, their majesty, their importance, the imperious duty of obeying them.

What is the reason that Mexico can not say to us to-day, "Why is it that you have delayed so long in bringing these people into the Union?" "It is because these two Territories are full of Greasers—full of Mexicans," we answer. "Who were there when you bought that country and made this promise? These same Mexicans," Mexico replies. "These men are the children and the grandsons of the very men with whom you made this stipulation, and it was their representatives in the Government of Mexico who entered into this engagement."

Now, we come and answer Mexico upon a demand of that sort and say, "That country is all full of Greasers, Mexicans, Indians, and Mormons, and we are under no obligation to admit such people as those into our Union." Mexico again replies: "If you are under no obligation, why did you make it? Why did you undertake it, and what are you doing but preying upon the imbecility of these people to help themselves and the disposition of Mexico to keep peace with you, or else because she thinks that the sacrifice is not worth the dangers that she will have to encounter before she gets through." These are not actual situations, Mr. President, but they would be actual if justice was done to these people.

We can not answer for this matter entirely to ourselves, because it is a treaty obligation and two Governments are parties to that treaty, and the Government of Mexico has as much right to say that that treaty and our promises under it shall be enforced as we have. The world has the right to accuse us.

We have a great many treaties, Mr. President. Under the express language of the Constitution we have made and ratified by the Senate of the United States 365 treaties with Indian tribes in this country, besides a number of contracts that we have made with them of equal obligation on our part since we changed the laws so that the tribal relation of Indians should not longer be consulted in making contracts with them, and all dealings with them have become a matter of private and personal contract, subject to the ratification of the two Houses of Congress.

The 365 treaties that I refer to were ratified by the Senate. The House had not anything to do with them. Up to that period of time we regarded them as nationalities, subordinate of course, appended to our nationality, our great Republic, but at the same time endowed by our Constitution with sufficient power and right to make a treaty with us; and a treaty meant a treaty with them as well as it did with Mexico. So it had to be ratified by the Senate.

When, however, wars with the Indians had progressed to that extent that we could declare by law, as we did in effect in the law we then enacted, that tribal organization no longer existed so as to authorize them to enter into treaty relations with the United States, from that time forward we ceased to make treaties to be ratified by the Senate, and we took up the subject and ratified them by law, and since that time there have been at least another hundred contracts made with Indian tribes, they voting by majorities, etc.

Now, we have made no contract with any Indian tribe, by treaty or otherwise, that is more obligatory upon us than this engagement that we made with the Government of Mexico. This engagement when it was made was first in the form that inured to the individual Mexican citizen, leaving his political rights out of consideration and subject to be dealt with and disposed of by Congress. Then we changed that and adopted for the government of this situation the third article of the Louisiana treaty, as I have read it, changing their rights from personal rights into political rights, so as to bring them up in the United States to the same standard they occupied under their own Government of Mexico, where they had rights as citizens of States and rights as citizens of a Republic. This change was agreed to by Mexico. I do not know by which of the contracting parties it was demanded.

So, Mr. President, the obligation of this treaty is more binding upon us, more imperative, than the obligations of the treaties we made with the Indian tribes, these 365 treaties that the Senate has ratified or those that have since been made and which have

been adopted by acts of Congress, because the Mexicans were not under our power when we made it.

Now, Mr. President, are these trifling matters? Are these ordinary duties and privileges of legislation that we can kick off like an old shoe and go along quietly and suppose ourselves to be in the discharge of a duty? When we keep the Congress of the United States and the whole country for two months at a time in a state of mental anxiety and distress we refuse to do our duty and give no sufficient excuse for it. That is what we are doing.

All the political elections, resolutions, and conventions that will assemble from now until doomsday can not wash out this thing, Mr. President. Possibly it may carry elections; we do not know. But that is a poor atonement for a broken conscience and a wounded public spirit. An American Senator ought not to think of it for one second, especially when all political parties have pledged themselves to this plain duty.

What are these objections to statehood? Mr. President, if I were to go through the whole list I would have to take up everything imaginable and unimaginable that could be uttered in the form of an objection to admitting these people to statehood. To read these debates one would think, first of all, that they were entirely unfit, personally, physically, morally, mentally, and religiously, to keep company with the people in certain parts of the American Union. It could not be admitted for a second that they were fit people to keep company with the negroes in Alabama. Certainly not.

I represent the negroes in Alabama. If I were influenced by the same ideas these gentlemen have taken so much pains to speak about here, and who seem to feel the situation so sensitively, do you suppose, Mr. President, that I would ever permit the greasers from Mexico who made this treaty with us, who sold us this land, to come into the State of Alabama, or into our Union, and enjoy the rights of citizenship and associate with my constituents from Africa? How could I permit such a thing as that? It would offend the whole of my Congo constituency that such people coming from these degraded Territories into Alabama should presume to take their place by our side as citizens of the State and of the United States. They are such by the Constitution, but that is all a mere jest, an hallucination, that must have been put in there to deceive somebody. It was not a promise made in good faith, for the reason that it has not been kept. The best test whether a promise is made in good faith is whether it has been kept. I do not know of any other test that is as good as that. If we do not keep a promise, it must be because we never intended to keep it.

Here we are turning up our sanctified noses and refusing to admit to citizenship in the United States or to any sort of recognition the very men with whom we made that treaty. Many of those people were soldiers in arms, who fought us at Buena Vista, Palo Alto, and other places, preceding this great cataclysm in Mexico. New Mexico and Arizona, then a part of Sonora, furnished their quota of soldiers to the Mexican army, just as we were told here the other day by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] of three Mexican regiments that went out from New Mexico and behaved with remarkable courage and sagacity and endurance during our great civil war. We were dealing with men then, and we are dealing with them or their descendants now, who bore the arms of Mexico in battle, and for whom Mexico felt the deepest grief on parting and undertook to provide by treaty with an honorable nation that their people should have privileges in the United States equivalent to those they left under their own banner.

Some of the brightest and best spirits, Mr. President, on the continent of America were amongst that class of people, even in New Mexico and Arizona. They are there now—men of great ability; men of courage, accomplishments, of fine taste and high knowledge of statesmanship and legislation, and a still higher knowledge of honor, a sentiment that they claim and are entitled to claim—something that is not to be laughed at, Mr. President, or thrown aside at will.

The Indians in New Mexico are spoken of as a thriftless, vagabond race, unfit for participation in civil government, who can not understand the ballot, and who do not know enough to go through a court as a witness with credit; who can not perform any of the functions of social life without a prompter or an interpreter—a set of people who are better off, to be taken care of by the Government of the United States, than they would be inside of a State where they would be required to take care of themselves.

We condemn them to political ostracism and fix no period in the future for their restoration to civil rights until it shall suit the policy of certain States or certain statesmen who aspire to the Presidency of the United States.

Senators forget, Mr. President, if they ever knew—and I do not think they ever knew—the differences in the tribes of Indians in this country. Do they not know that the Mexican Indians whom we obtained under these treaties have been always self-

sustaining people and are yet, and have never drawn any support from the Government of the United States, unless it might be at some moment when dire distress and famine had come upon them in a way that would excite the commiseration and pity of the hardest heart?

Take the Arapaho and their old chief, Geronimo; and take the Zuffi and their houses built up in the cliffs, the cliff dwellers, and the Navaho. Go amongst them as we have been going amongst them for fifty years, and what do we find? We find the Arapaho and Navaho out grazing their flocks of sheep, shearing off the wool, dyeing it with most beautiful colors, making it into blankets that they can sell at from \$15 to \$20. We find them and the Zuffi gathering melons and harvests of grain and storing it away in receptacles that they have carved in the rocks, and they keep it there from year to year, sometimes having as much as two years' supply on hand at one time. We find them going out and digging a hole in the ground 3 feet deep, planting grains of corn in them, and getting the moisture of the soil in that way, so that when the corn is in full ear and tassel it is just a little above the top of the ground, and out of such a soil in such a country making a good support, and coming here with no petitions even for support.

If the balance of the American Indians had been as industrious and thrifty as these Navahos and Arapahoes and Zuffis this Government would have been saved millions upon millions of money, and we would have a much more stalwart and self-dependent Indian population than we have to-day.

They have set us a high example, Mr. President, in Indian life and in Indian progress. They have arts to which we are strangers; they have facilities of handiwork and hand decoration that put us to the blush. They have had the courage to stand there and battle with the hot winds of the desert and the colder winds of winter through ages and ages. We can not trace their history back to its fountain source.

There they are, a steadfast, honest, God-fearing people. When I say "God-fearing," Mr. President, I mean that they have a God of their own, and he is a very good one for an Indian—a good moral contrivance, with a code of justice and mercy. They show both genius and skill in the creation of their divinities. They worship them with profound devotion, and it has been that worship which has kept those people to their duty, which has kept them in the line which the Almighty intended everybody to go—that is, of self-preservation and hard, honest, good work. When they are ready to receive it, and when we have done our duty, they will read from the sacred Scriptures with joy what they now learn from nature "as through a glass darkly."

Mr. President, we have not been doing justice to the Indian tribes in the United States. We have in recent years been very benevolent toward them, since we got rich, and this Senate has been the theater of some splendid actions in their behalf. There was one distinguished Senator, who has recently gone to his long and honored rest, who for forty years in Congress toiled and worked with his brethren to get them to have some idea of compassion upon the Indian people and to provide some measures suited to their convenience, their growth, and their progress, and at last he was the man to break down the Indian wars.

It was not our knives, our guns, our torches, or even our whisky that broke down those nations and caused them to submit to the rule of temperance, peace, and prosperity; it was the good labors of a noble heart like Henry L. Dawes, aided as he has been in a most conspicuous manner by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]; but until those two great Senators got their hands and hearts together upon the work the knife, the cartridge, the torch, and the whisky jug were the weapons with which we always attacked the Indians all over this country. That has been changed. The homesteads which those Senators have caused the Indians to make, many of them, are blooming with prosperity and peace and contentment to-day. First one Indian went out, took his homestead, and made his selection upon the domains of a reservation where he had been located and kept in prison bounds, he and his tribe, for years and years together.

Then others came, and gradually this system has supplanted the old one, even in the estimation of the Indians themselves, until they have concluded it is best not to earn a living by hunting and by killing white people, but to earn it by cultivating the ground.

What has worked this great revolution in this land until now we never dream of such a thing as an Indian uprising? It is not because the Indian has changed his nature; it is not because he has become a coward; it is not because he has forgotten the enticements of the hunt or the foray, but it is because these men, and others working with them, have set such an example to the individual man that, seeing the better way, they follow it.

Mr. President, it is appropriate, just in point, for me to make some observations upon Indian characteristics at large and some slight allusion to the great currents of history that they have

been floating in and upon for near four hundred years. It has been about four centuries that we have been dealing with those people. In 1620, or about that time, was the first encounter we ever had with them of a belligerent nature—four hundred years, practically—and in that time far more has been told than I could tell, and far more could be told than ever will be told to their credit, because the facts have disappeared. But we have been the historians of the Indians.

They have written no books; they could not write a book; they had to rely upon us for their history, and the men who have engaged in campaigns with Indian warriors and in teaching them have collected volumes of tradition of which I was speaking a while ago, have studied them closely, and learned their history, which has been most intensely interesting always. They have given us books. I do not know any Indian history in the United States which has acquired a character for being either uncertain or unreliable. I therefore go to our own historians to find out what the Indians did and what they said and how they said it and what sort of characters they were, and I propose to take a little time to-day to do that.

But before proceeding to do this, Mr. President, I wish to draw attention to a contrast between our method of dealing with the Indians and that of the Spaniards. The Spaniards were much wiser in their dealing with the Indians than we have been. Perhaps they had better reasons for being so, inasmuch as there was not much of actual Spanish colonization upon either the Northern and Southern Hemispheres of America or in Central America. What they got and what they held they had to hold by the strength of local Indian power—a very different situation. What we got up in New England and everywhere we got by the sword; we drove the Indians back.

England could spread her population over this country with ships and reinforce her colonies. That plan they had begun at Plymouth Rock or in that vicinity, and it has pushed its way, carrying the Indians in a body before it, until now it has reached across the continent to the Pacific Ocean, and we have got the Indians huddled up in the interior of the country, in the arid lands chiefly. But the Spaniards, Mr. President, knowing that the empire conducted by them must have the support of the local population, began by giving to all the Indians their homesteads, their localities, and their rights. I do not remember any Spanish history—and I do not believe anybody can cite an instance—where a tribe of Indians was taken by the Spanish Government and removed from one location to another.

Now, if there is any Senator within the sound of my voice who will cite me to an instance of that kind, I shall be very much obliged to him. My reading has not shown me any such instance, and I do not believe it exists. When the Spaniards found the Indians in a particular locality, they allowed them to remain there; they set apart homes for them, protected them in their homes, and gave them all the rights of citizenship so far as their property was concerned. Voting did not amount to much, for the Spanish monarchy was not controlled by elections and voting. There was no voting done in that country.

But another thing took place. The Spaniards are the only people in the world who have ever been able to make the American Indian give up his natural dialect and adopt their language. You may begin at the northern boundary of Mexico, amongst the blackest and poorest of Indians in that country, and go down to Patagonia, all through South America and Central America, and you will not find an Indian in all that country who can not speak more or less Spanish, and who does not use that as his mother tongue really. The Spanish language diffused itself throughout all the tribes of this vast country lying between Mexico—which then reached up far north of California, if it did not reach to Oregon, and they say it did, and rightfully, too—clear down through both continents and through Central America to Patagonia.

We have tried to get the Indians to speak our language, but we have had no success. They have refused to do it. I have been myself in Indian schools. I have been on the Indian Committee for a long time. We used to take little excursions down into the Indian country. We visited those establishments that the Government has built. One of them was away out above Fort Reno, in what is now Oklahoma—a handsome boarding house where the children were all taken care of, boys and girls.

The Indians around there were living in tepees. There was not an Indian in all that country who had a house; they all lived under tents. We would see these little boys and girls go to the blackboards and write off exercises in English, do sums in arithmetic, and make maps, and the like of that, the English teachers telling them what to do, what particular exercise to engage in, until we supposed it was really so, that they understood the English language very well, quite well enough to converse in it fluently; but if we spoke in English to those same little fellows out of doors they would no more listen to us than if they had

been a lot of pigs. Nothing could induce them to say a word of English. They despise it, and they never would speak it unless it was under the rod of the schoolmaster. So it was and so it is with the grown-up Indian.

I recollect on one occasion we went on one of these excursions, looking into the condition of the Indian tribes, and we went down to the Creek country. A large, fine-looking man came in, black as he could be, evidently negroid—either that or else he belonged to some of those Moorish North African families. He was introduced to us as the speaker of the house of representatives, and we were told that he spoke the English language fluently and understood every word, but he brought an interpreter with him and set the interpreter down by his side. We put questions to him and the interpreter had to translate them to him, although he knew just as well as the interpreter exactly what we said, but it had to be done before we could get anything out of him.

He would answer us through the interpreter again and would ask the interpreter to put his answer into English. This went on a good while, when some of us objected and said: "Why, here, you can speak the English language, and you ought to do it; it is hardly fair to have this rigmarole going on of having the interpreter interpret our questions to you and your answering him, and he interpreting the answer back to us, when you know every word we say." All he said in reply was just this: "Gentlemen, you will have to excuse me;" and we did have to excuse him. They will not speak the English language, the reason being that they have got a contempt and an abhorrence for the men who speak it. That is the only version of it. I have known many an Indian who knew how to speak English well who would not say a word of it.

It is quite different with Spanish. The Indians do not have that feeling toward the Spaniards; they do not feel as if the Spaniards had entered their country for the purpose of robbing them of their homes and driving them off; and that is the difference between the two.

Now, I want to read from an accepted historian some little parts of their history, not very extensive any of them. I want to show that these people that we say are unfit for statehood, unfit to participate in civil government, and all that, have the characteristics that belong to true republicans. When you educate them they are not only intelligent, but they are true, virtuous, and reliable. Such are their natural characteristics.

I wish to quote from Turner's *Traits of Indian Character*. These are very old writings, written away back in 1834 and 1836; not new inventions by any means.

In civilized life, where the happiness and, indeed, almost existence of man depends so much upon the opinion of his fellow-men, he is constantly acting a studied part—

Putting on, as the girls say—

The bold, peculiar traits of native character are refined away or softened down by the leveling influence of what is called good breeding, and he practices so many deceptions and affects so many generous sentiments for the purposes of popularity that it is difficult to distinguish his real from his artificial character.

The Indian, on the contrary, free from the restraints and refinements of polished life and, in a great degree, a solitary and independent being, obeys the impulses of his inclination or the dictates of his judgment, and thus the attributes of his nature, being freely indulged, grow singularly great and striking. Society is like a lawn where every roughness is smoothed, every bramble eradicated, and where the eye is delighted by the smiling verdure of a velvet surface. He, however, who would study nature in its wildness and variety must plunge into the forest, must explore the glen, must stem the torrent, and dare the precipice.

These reflections arose on casually looking through a volume of early colonial history, wherein are recorded with great bitterness the outrages of the Indians and their wars upon the settlers of New England. It is painful to perceive, even from these partial narratives, how the footsteps of civilization may be traced in the blood of the aborigines; how easily the colonists were moved to hostility by the lust of conquest; how merciless and exterminating was their warfare. The imagination shrinks at the idea—how many intellectual beings were hunted from the earth, how many brave and noble hearts of nature's sterling coinage were broken down and trampled in the dust!

Such was the fate of Philip of Pokanoket, an Indian warrior, whose name was once a terror throughout Massachusetts and Connecticut. He was the most distinguished of a number of contemporary sachems who reigned over the Pequods, the Narragansets, Wappanoags, and the other Eastern tribes, at the time of the first settlement of New England—a band of native, untaught heroes who made the most generous struggles of which human nature is capable; fighting to the last gasp in the cause of their country, without a hope of victory or a thought of renown. Worthy of an age of poetry, and fit subjects for local story and romantic fiction, they have left scarcely any authentic traces on the page of history, but stalk like gigantic shadows in the dim twilight of tradition.

I ask leave to insert in my remarks some further extracts from this work. I do not want to weary the Senate by reading them, but Senators can read them for themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLARD in the chair). The extracts referred to by the Senator from Alabama will be printed in the RECORD, in the absence of objection.

The extracts referred to are as follows:

When the Pilgrims (as the Plymouth settlers are called by their descendants) first took refuge on the shores of the New World from the religious persecutions of the Old, their situation was, to the last degree, gloomy and

disheartening. Few in number, and that number rapidly perishing away through sickness and hardships, surrounded by a howling wilderness and savage tribes, exposed to the rigors of an almost arctic winter and the vicissitudes of an ever shifting climate, their minds were filled with doleful forebodings, and nothing preserved them from sinking into despondency but the strong excitement of religious enthusiasm.

In this forlorn situation they were visited by Massasoit, chief sagamore of the Wampanoags, a powerful chief who reigned over a great extent of country. Instead of taking advantage of the scanty number of the strangers and expelling them from his territories, into which they had intruded, he seemed at once to conceive for them a generous friendship, and extended toward them the rites of primitive hospitality. He came early in the spring to their settlement of New Plymouth, attended by a mere handful of followers, entered into a solemn league of peace and amity, sold them a portion of the soil, and promised to secure for them the good will of his savage allies.

Whatever may be said of Indian perfidy, certain it is that the good faith and integrity of Massasoit have never been impeached. He continued a firm and magnanimous friend of the white men, suffering them to extend their possessions and to strengthen themselves in the land, and betraying no jealousy of their increasing power and prosperity. Such was Massasoit.

Shortly before his death he came once more to New Plymouth, with his son Alexander, for the purpose of renewing the covenant of peace and securing it to his posterity. At this conference he endeavored to protect the religion of his forefathers from the encroaching zeal of the missionaries, and stipulated that no further attempt should be made to draw off his people from their ancient faith. But, finding the English obstinately opposed to any such condition, he mildly relinquished the demand.

Almost the last act of his life was to bring his two sons, Alexander and Philip (as they had been named by the English), to the residence of the principal settler, recommending mutual kindness and covenants, and entreating that the same love and amity which had existed between the white men and himself might be continued afterwards with his children. The good old sachem died in peace, and was happily gathered to his fathers before sorrow came upon his tribe. His children remained behind, but experienced the ingratitude of white men.

His eldest son, Alexander, succeeded him. He was of a quick and impetuous temper and proudly tenacious of his hereditary rights and dignity. The intrusive policy and dictatorial conduct of the strangers excited his indignation, and he beheld with uneasiness their exterminating wars with the neighboring tribes. He was doomed soon to incur their hostility, being accused of plotting with the Narragansetts to rise against the English and drive them from the land. It is impossible to say whether this accusation was warranted by facts or was grounded on mere suspicions. It is evident, however, by the violent and overbearing measures of the settlers, that they had, by this time, begun to feel conscious of the rapid increase of their power and to grow harsh and inconsiderate in their treatment of the natives.

They dispatched an armed force to seize upon Alexander and to bring him before their court. He was traced to his woodland haunts and surprised at a hunting house, where he was reposing with a band of his followers, unarmed, after the toils of the chase. The suddenness of his arrest and the outrage offered to his sovereign dignity so preyed upon the irascible feelings of this proud savage as to throw him into a raging fever. He was permitted to return home on condition of sending his son as a pledge for his reappearance. But the blow his feelings had received was fatal, and before he reached his home he fell a victim to the agonies of a wounded spirit.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, Mr. President, I want to read from our historians some things that might possibly be called anecdotes. They are short statements of very important truths relating to the Indians, but they will serve, because the cases are perfectly authentic and the names are perfectly known, to show that in dealing with these people we have not treated them according to their natural characteristics and gifts, but we have treated them always as if they were not only inferiors, but as if they deserved to be kicked out of the world, and their homes, of course, taken away from them. They would not have deserved that if they had not had good lands, a pretty country, nice streams, magnificent forests, and good crop lands.

The first man to whom I call the attention of the Senate is the man for whom those beautiful mountains and the beautiful river beyond the Potomac were named—old Shenandoah.

This celebrated chief, whose life measured a century, died in 1816. He was well known in the wars which occurred while the United States were British colonies, and also in the war of the Revolution, as the undeviating friend of the Americans.

In his youth he was very savage and addicted to drunkenness, but by the force of reflection and the benevolent exhortations of a missionary to the tribe he lived a reformed man for more than sixty years and died in Christian hope.

In 1775 Shennandoh was present at a treaty made in Albany.

That treaty was made by Brandt.

At night he was exceedingly drunk, and in the morning found himself in the street, stripped of all his ornaments and every article of clothing. His pride revolted at his self-degradation, and he resolved never more to deliver himself over to the power "of strong water."

But Shenandoah remembered, as every other Indian has remembered, through his whole life that it was the white man who made the whisky. The Indian did not know how to make it. He could only die at the hands of the white man through that serpentine and insidious agent. That is the worst shame we have ever inflicted upon ourselves as well as upon the Indians.

Shenandoah's person was tall and muscular, but well made. His countenance was intelligent and beamed with all the ingenuous dignity of an Indian chief. In youth, he was brave and intrepid; in his riper years, one of the ablest counselors among the North American tribes. He possessed a strong and vigorous mind, and though terrible as the tornado in war, he was bland and mild as the zephyr in peace. With the cunning of the fox, the hungry perseverance of the wolf, the agility of the mountain cat, he watched and repelled—

What?

Canadian invasion. His vigilance once preserved from massacre the inhabitants of the then infant settlements of the German flats. His influence brought his tribe to assist the Americans in their war of the Revolution.

His many friendly actions in their behalf gained for him among the Indian tribes the appellation of the "white man's friend."

To a friend who called to see him in his wane—he was then blind—he thus expressed himself:

"I am an aged hemlock—the winds of a hundred winters have whistled through my branches—I am dead at the top. The generation to which I belong have run away and left me. Why I live the Great Spirit alone knows. Pray to my Jesus that I may have patience to wait for my appointed time to die."

There is not a man, perhaps, in this Senate who could speak a prayer more intelligently or more touchingly than grand old Shenandoah spoke that prayer. He had been the friend of the white man, because he saw that the white man's road led to prosperity.

I will now read you the petition of Peter Harris to the legislature of South Carolina. I am trying to find what these men were thinking about and how they regarded the world around them, what opinions they formed of men and things as they went through in their careers.

The following touching petition from Peter Harris, one of the surviving remnants of the powerful Catawba Nation in South Carolina, was presented to the legislature of that State several years after the war of the Revolution:

To the council of South Carolina:

I am one of the lingering embers of an almost expired race. Our graves will soon be our habitation. I am one of the few stalks that still remain in the field, when the tempest of the revolution is past. I fought against the British for your sake. The British have disappeared, and you are free. Yet from me the British took nothing, nor have I gained anything by their defeat. I pursue deer for my subsistence; the deer are disappearing, and I must starve. God ordained me for the forest, and my habitation is the shade. But the strength of my arm decays and my feet falter in the chase. The hand which fought for your liberty is now open for your relief. In my youth I bled in battle that you might be independent, but let not my heart in my old age bleed for the want of your commiseration.

PETER HARRIS.

We may say that Peter Harris got somebody to write that. He may have done so; I do not know; but yet there were orators whose sayings were recorded by such men as Lewis Cass, De Witt Clinton, and others, who spoke quite as eloquently as this. But it was true. There was a man who, because he was an Indian, in his old age, like old Shenandoah, passed off out of the reach of history until some reason made it necessary, for the love of truth, and now permits me, to recall it here in the Senate of the United States. I thank God that it is my right, Mr. President, to speak a word for Shenandoah and Peter Harris in the midst of this august assembly.

The Indian sense of honor stood above every trait of his character. I knew it when I was a child. It was my fortune, Mr. President, to be thrown amongst the Indians for years when I was a boy from 8 to 12 years old, and I knew them well, particularly the Creeks and the Cherokees. I lived on the border line between the two, away far removed from any towns or settlements. I knew them in their homes. I knew them in a way that a boy knows a man when he begins to love him for his kindness, for his virtues, and for his goodness.

I am not a stranger to these people, and amongst them, from the very beginning of my experience, I saw, as everybody who ever had contact with them saw, that it was their personal integrity which they rested upon. Integrity was the Indian's standard of manhood, and he would put up with no man who deceived him and he would deceive no man except an enemy. With the man with whom he was engaged in a fight he would take the same liberties that our generals take in strategy and strict warfare, but beyond that he would not go.

I will read a little incident that occurred in the year 1824:

In the year 1824, while far in the interior of the country in surveying the initiatory ceremonies of the Indian Mertyay—one of their mystic societies—we ourselves saw a Chippewa whose grave and serious demeanor attracted our attention. His appearance led to the inquiry whether any peculiarity in his situation impressed upon his deportment the air of seriousness—it was too evident to be mistaken. It was ascertained that he had killed a Pottawatomie Indian during the preceding season, and the Pottawatomies had made the usual demand for his surrender.

On a representation, however, that he was deeply in debt and that his immediate death would cause much injustice to some of the traders, the injured tribe at length agreed to postpone his execution until another season; so that the products of his winter's hunt might be applied to the discharge of his debts. He had been successful in his exertions and had paid the claims against him. He was about to leave his friends and to receive—with the fortitude of a warrior—the doom which awaited him. He was now for the last time enjoying the society of all who were dear to him. No man doubted his resolution—no man doubted his fate. Instructions, however, were given to the proper officer to redeem his life at the expense of the United States.

That may be said to be an antiquated case. Some persons have not heard of such virtues amongst the modern Indians. The Senator from Indiana probably did not inquire amongst the Indians to find whether anything of that kind had occurred in Arizona or New Mexico. I know that such things have occurred in the Indian Territory. They are sworn to and proven by witnesses of the highest possible repute.

A young Indian was condemned to death for murder there. He was condemned to be shot. They shoot their murderers instead of hanging them. He took his case to the supreme court of the

Cherokee Nation. They have a supreme court consisting of three judges, who render written opinions, and they have all the paraphernalia of any State supreme court. The judges are men of ability. The judgment in his case was affirmed. The conviction stood. He was to die. They did not confine him. They discharged him on his own recognizance. They fixed the day of his death. They required him to attend on that day to be shot, and he came to Fort Gibson on that day in pursuance of that judgment and was executed.

Mr. President, what was that? It was not cowardice. It was not the expectation that he could not flee into the woods and escape his pursuers, nor was it the hope that some pity might spring up for him from some unexpected source. It was not that. He went there because he had given his word as a man that he would go and stand the ordeal, whatever it might be, and that word was worth more to him than all the world.

I can not conceive of a higher phase of human integrity than that, and I would risk that man as my boon companion and fellow-citizen with my life before I would risk many a white man I know of.

There is another case of that sort. I am a little particular about proving this fact, because I want to show that in the Indian character there is native integrity. Individuals may fail, of course, as we see amongst ourselves, but I want to show that that race of men have as characteristics high motives and proper ideas of the very highest capacities and the highest duties of mankind. No Indian ever broke a treaty, and few wars have occurred in the United States that have not been predicated by the Indians upon the very proposition that we broke some treaty. From the beginning, in the days of Philip, down to the present time that has been the question; and, Mr. President, we have suffered by it in history.

An Indian, some time since, guilty of the murder of Old Philip, another Indian, was taken into custody by the deputy sheriff in 1827 or 1828. He had been apprehended by his countrymen and taken to the nation, where he underwent his trial, was found guilty, and brought back to the spot where the crime was committed to undergo punishment.

On his arrival he was suffered to go at large till the day appointed for his execution, and during the interim appeared to enjoy himself as much as his comrades. On the appointed day he walked to the spot selected by himself, situated back of this town, decorated with ribands, and after digging his grave, danced around it, singing his death song.

From the Galena Advertiser, published, I suppose, when Galena was in a Territory many years ago, there is this extract:

There is no class of beings on earth who hold a pledge more sacred and binding than do the North American Indians. A sample of this was witnessed during the Winnebago war of 1827, in the person of Dek ker re, a celebrated chief of that nation, who, among four other Indians of his tribe, was taken prisoner at Prairie du Chien.

Colonel Snellin, of the Fifth Regiment of Infantry, who then commanded that garrison, dispatched a young Indian into the nation with orders to inform the other chiefs of Dek ker re's band that unless those Indians who were the perpetrators of the horrid murders of some of our citizens were brought to the fort and given up within ten days Dek ker re and the other four Indians who were detained as hostages would be shot at the end of that time. This awful sentence was pronounced in the presence of Dek ker re, who, though protesting his innocence of the outrage which had been committed by others of his nation, exclaimed that he feared not death, though it would be attended with serious consequences, inasmuch as he had two affectionate wives and a large family of small children who were entirely dependent on him for their support, but if necessary he was willing to die for the honor of his nation.

The young Indian had been gone several days, and no intelligence was yet received from the murderers. The dreadful day being near at hand and Dek ker re being in a bad state of health, asked permission of the colonel to go to the river to indulge in his long accustomed habit of bathing in order to improve his health. Upon which Colonel S. told him that if he would promise on the honor of a chief that he would not leave the town he might have his liberty, and enjoy all his privileges until the day of the appointed execution. Accordingly he first gave his hand to the colonel, thanked him for his friendly offer, then raised both his hands aloft and in the most solemn adjuration promised that he would not leave the bounds prescribed; and said "if he had a hundred lives he would sooner lose them all than forfeit his word or detract from his proud nation one particle of its boasted honor." He was then set at liberty.

He was advised to flee to the wilderness and make his escape. "But no," said he. "Do you think I prize life above honor or that I would betray a confidence reposed in me for the sake of saving my life?" He then complacently remained until nine days of the ten which he had to live had elapsed; and nothing heard from the nation with regard to the apprehension of the murderers, his immediate death became apparent. But no alteration could be seen in the countenance of the chief. It so happened that on that day General Atkinson arrived with his troops from Jefferson Barracks, and the order for the execution was countermanded and the Indians were permitted to repair to their homes.

I will cite another authentic case:

In March, 1823, a Choctaw savage, calling himself Dr. Sibley, belonging to a wandering tribe of his nation in the Arkansas Territory, while in a state of intoxication stabbed to the heart another Indian, who instantly expired. This act called for revenge, founded on the lex talionis—that invariable custom of the aborigines. A brother of the deceased called upon Sibley and told him that he was come to take his life in atonement for the death of his brother. With the composure of a philosopher and the courage of a Roman, Sibley, readily and without a murmur, yielded assent, only desiring the execution might be postponed until the following morning. This was granted, the execution was postponed, and Sibley left at large under no restraint whatever.

When the morning came Sibley went out with the rest of the party and with perfect apathy aided in digging a grave for the murdered Indian. The work being finished, he calmly observed to the bystanders that he thought

it large enough to contain two bodies, signifying at the same time a wish to be buried in the same grave. This, too, was granted; and the murderer deliberately took a standing position over the grave with outstretched arms, and giving the signal to fire, the brother drove a rifle ball through his heart, and he dropped into the hole he had assisted to make. Such are the wonderful workings of the human mind from impressions early instilled into it, as is the custom of savage life.

[We are told nothing here of the death song, but we are confident it must have taken place, as it is held indispensable under such circumstances.—Ed.]

I have read enough to show the intrepidity of these men, even to the sacrifice of their lives, in maintaining their word, and of course men who have such an idea as that of the strict faith of obligation naturally become aroused, indignant, and ferocious when they treat with a great neighbor and that neighbor, after being paid in full for all that he promises, turns his back on the Indian and scouts him and treats him as a usurper and as a man whose rights are to be taken from him just as may suit the neighbor's pleasure.

It is transactions of this kind which have kept in organization the great society of the most eminent men in the United States, and women, too, from the earliest stages of our history down to this date, who have their annual conventions in a place in New York, the name of which I do not remember for the moment, and who are headed by some of the bravest, ablest, truest, and some of the wealthiest men in America. What is it they are trying to do? To ameliorate the condition of the Indian. That has been their purpose always—to help the Indians along in civil life, so that they may follow, as they say, the white man's road and become accustomed to it in a way that will make them contented and happy.

These men have brought instance after instance in the history of Indians, perfectly authenticated, to the attention of this Government. I have been on the Indian Committee now for twenty-five years in this body, and have heard the story from year to year until I have become thoroughly convinced that much the larger part if not nearly all the wars we have engaged in with the Indians, which number hundreds and hundreds of splendid battlefields, have been the result of the Indians attributing to us that we had broken faith with them in our treaties.

That is a terrible burden of accusation, Mr. President. I do not bring it. These American citizens, male and female, organizing themselves into committees, with annual meetings and meetings still more frequent than that, bring these complaints to us and urge them upon this body and upon the House and upon the President from year to year; and there must be something in all this worthy of our consideration, Mr. President.

Let me say something more about leading Indian chieftains.

Chief McIntosh lived in Alabama, what was then the great Mississippi territory. He was a very noted man. The McIntoshs and the McGillivays and others of the Creek Indians there seem to have intermixed with the Scotch immigrants who came in, and all of those men became very distinguished. McIntosh was one of the first Indians in that tribe who ever sold any land to the United States, and the Indians were so suspicious of the United States at that time and so opposed to the mutilation of their domain that one of them killed McIntosh. It created, perhaps, the greatest excitement that ever occurred amongst the Muscogee tribe of Indians, then a very powerful body of men.

I read from Turner's books on Indian characteristics:

This address was pronounced by a chief, the leader of a party concerned in the murder of McIntosh, principal chief of the same nation with himself. McIntosh had been the prime instigator of forming a treaty with the United States, by which a portion of the Indian country was ceded to the States, a transaction which gave great umbrage to a numerous party in the Indian nation.

When I was a boy I heard of this great affair of McIntosh. The Indian who committed that crime—who killed McIntosh—makes this justification at a council of his tribe:

Brothers, McIntosh is dead. He broke the law of the nation—the law which he made himself. His face was turned to the white men who wished to take our land from us. His back was to his own people. His ears were shut to the cry of our women and children. His heart was estranged from us. The words of his talk were deceitful. They came to us like the sickly breeze that flies over the great river.

Brothers, McIntosh was brave. The deeds of his youth were valiant. But his heart became changed. He spoke the words of deceitfulness. He walked in crooked paths which his brothers knew not—paths which led down to death. He deceived us, and we slew him. The land is red with his blood and with the blood of his friends. Our vengeance is satisfied. We bury the hatchet of revenge. Let us obey the Great Spirit, that he may lead his children to the path of their wandering.

Who but a man who understood all the terrible blackness of treason to his tribe and to his God could have made that speech, and who but a great man could have made it? Brutus when he slew Cæsar could not have had imputed to him by the bard of the world prouder expressions and more eloquent language than that.

Joseph Brandt was a very highly educated man; for an Indian, he was remarkably well educated. He belonged to a Canadian tribe. But Joseph Brandt was the friend of the white man, and

he has planted upon the history of this country monuments for himself grander than any we will ever be able to build for him in marble, and yet Joseph Brandt's name has gone down with infamy to coming generations because he dared to fight for his own people. I wish to read an incident in his life:

At the battle of "The Cedars," 30 miles above Montreal, on the St. Lawrence, Colonel McKinstry—then a captain in Patterson's regiment of Continental troops—being twice wounded, was taken prisoner by the Indians. The intrepidity of McKinstry as a partisan had rendered him alike the object of their fears and unforgiving resentment. The British officers were too much in dread of their savage allies, on account of their vast superiority of numbers, to risk an interposition of their authority to prevent the horrid sacrifice they saw preparing. Already had the devoted victim been bound to the tree and surrounded by the faggots intended for his immolation. Hope had fled, and, in the agony of despair, he uttered that mystic appeal which the Brotherhood of Masons never disregard.

He was a Freemason.

When, as if heaven had interposed for his preservation, the Chieftain Brandt understood him and saved him.

Brandt had been educated in Europe, and had there been initiated into the mysteries of Freemasonry. The advantages of education and his native strength of mind gave him an ascendancy over the uncultured sons of the forest that few other chiefs possessed. Situated as he was, the impending danger of a Masonic brother must have forcibly brought to mind his obligation to support him in the time of peril. His utmost endeavors were accordingly used, and they were, happily, successful in obtaining for him an immediate respite and an eventual ransom.

We can not suppose that a man like Brandt, who would do a thing of that sort, could go off for the mere sake of murder or mischief or arson or cruelty and perpetrate wrongs and hardships upon innocent people belonging to the white race. You can not suppose it. It is inconsistent with his character and his nature. But it was entirely consistent with the laws of war as they were understood by the Indians. They had their laws of war as we have ours. They practiced them. Yet in their practice they were scarcely more cruel than some of the practices we have inflicted upon people in the progress of their civilization in the Philippine Islands and elsewhere.

Here is a story told by General Knox. I am reading these things for the purpose of illustration and to bring the minds of Senators to an appreciation of the actual characteristics of these people.

In the city of New York, 1789, General Knox, then Secretary at War, gave a dinner to a number of Indians who had come on a mission from their nation to the President of the United States. A little before dinner was served up, two or three of the sachems, with their chief or principal men, ascended to a balcony which commanded a view of the city, the harbor, and Long Island.

They remained but a short time and returned apparently dejected—especially the chief. This was noticed by the Secretary, who said to him, "Brother, what has happened? You look sorry. Is there anything to distress you?" "I'll tell you, brother," said the chief. "I have been looking at your beautiful city, the great water, your fine country, and I see how you are situated. But I could not help reflecting that this fine country and that great water were once ours."

"Our forefathers lived here. They enjoyed it as their own domain. It was a gift from the Great Spirit to them and their children. At length the white people (meaning the Dutch) came in a great canoe and only requested permission to tie it to a tree, lest the waters should carry it away. We consented. They next said that some of their people were sick and they were desirous to land them under the shade of the trees. Their desire was granted. The ice now came and they could not go away. So they begged for a piece of ground on which to build a wigwam for shelter against the cold and storms of winter. This was also granted. They next asked for some corn, they promising to go away when the ice was gone. The corn was given. And when the ice was gone our fathers told them they must go away with their big canoe. But they pointed to their big guns around their wigwams and said they would stay there and we could not make them go away."

"Afterwards more came. They brought with them strong and maddening drink, of which the red people became very fond. They persuaded the red people to sell them some land. Finally, they drove them back, time after time, into the wilderness, far from the water and fish and oysters. They have destroyed the game. Our people have wasted away, and now we live miserably and wretched, while you are enjoying our fine and beautiful country. This makes me sorry, brother, and I can not help it."

Mr. President, that was the city of New York, where these people were located. The sale of a hundred acres in the heart of the city of New York to-day would yield more money to the United States than we paid out for every acre of ground we bought from the Indians east of the Mississippi River. If you will measure off a hundred acres in the city of San Francisco, it will sell for more money than enough to pay for every acre of ground that we have ever bought from the Indians from the Pacific to the crest of the Rocky Mountains.

It makes no difference whether our civilization has brought this about, what right have we to say that if we had conceded to these people the rights of human beings even, if we had won them by exhibiting before them our integrity and our sense of justice, that they would not have cooperated with us in these works as fully and freely and have done as much service or more service than the African negroes brought from the coast of Guinea?

No, sir; our policy was laid out in the wars of King Philip in New England. The first fight we had there was an outrage upon the Indians and a violation of plighted faith in return for hospitality. It spread and spread until Philip, the king of those tribes, had to take the matter in charge, and when he took it in charge then began all the methods of Indian warfare which have spread

out through this country, and the result of every war of any prominence has been that the Indians must move from the ground where the battle was fought and yield it and their country to the white people.

The Mexicans when they had wars with the Indians did not do that. They allowed them to remain upon the ground where they lived, and learn their language and cultivate their good will, and that is the reason why Porfirio Diaz, who has 90 per cent of Indian blood in his veins, and why Juarez, who was a full-blooded Indian born of an ordinary family in Queretaro, was able to marshal those Indian forces against the powers of Europe and drive them from his coast.

And Castro, another Indian in Venezuela, has a hold upon those Indians who live at the foot of the Andes to such an extent that the pacific blockade is going to be more and more peaceful until it ceases, not because they have not the power to bombard those forts and destroy them, but because Germany and England combined will not dare to ascend those mountains and engage in a conflict with those Indians commanded by Castro. There is heroism and power in their character because there is integrity among them in respect of their national rights. I return to our Indians.

Captain Bryan was the commander of an excursion that went out to make some surveys and examinations among the Virginia military land lying in the territory northwest of the Ohio.

While engaged in completing a chain of surveys extending from the headwaters of Brush Creek to those of Paint Creek (now the central part of the State of Ohio) his provisions became scant, and at length entirely exhausted. He directed his hunter—who had been unsuccessful on a recent excursion—to make another attempt to procure subsistence, and to meet him at a particular point then designated, where, after closing the labor of the day, he should encamp with his chainmen and marker.

Toward evening the men became exhausted with hunger. They were in the heart of a solitary wilderness, and every circumstance was calculated to produce the greatest dejection of spirit. After making great exertions to reach the point designated, where they were to encamp upon their arrival, they met their hunter, who had been again unsuccessful. Feeling for himself and his comrades every emotion of a noble heart, he was alarmed for their situation. The hunter declared he had used every exertion in pursuit of game, but all his attempts were of no avail; that the whole forest appeared to him to be entirely destitute both of birds and beasts. Under these awful apprehensions of starvation, he knew that it would be a vain attempt to reach the settlement; he trembled, and shed tears.

Captain Bryan, at this critical juncture, felt his spirits roused at the reflection of their desperate situation; he thrust his Jacob's staff in the earth and ordered his men to prepare camp and make a good fire; he seized the gun and ammunition of the unsuccessful hunter and darted forth in pursuit of game. The weather had become exceedingly cold, for it was in the depth of winter—every rivulet was bound in ice. He had not proceeded far before he was gratified with the cheering sight of three elks, making toward him. He succeeded in killing two, and shortly after a bear. He now called for his men and ordered his game to be carried to the camp. No one but those similarly situated can conceive the feelings excited on such an occasion.

But, perilous as the situation of the surveyor and his party might appear, there were others who were threatened with the like appalling distress. Three or four Indians, who had been out on a hunting excursion, hearing the report of Captain Bryan's gun, made immediately in that direction, and had arrived at the camp before Bryan returned. On his appearance there they informed him, as well as they could (some of them speaking a little English), of their wretched situation. They told him that for three days their whole party had subsisted on one skunk, and that was exhausted. They described the absence of the game, in the language of the hunter, as if "the whole forest was entirely destitute both of birds and beasts."

There came along a party of Indians, who were mistaken for enemies, and their approach was watched with very great caution. But after a while they made it known that they were very harmless, and Bryan determined that he would welcome them to his feast of venison and elk meat and bear. They told of their sufferings and described the difficulty of obtaining any meat by their hunting, and they were nearly starved.

They were informed by Captain Bryan that he had plenty for himself, his men, and themselves; desired them to fix their camp, make a good fire, and assist his men in flaying the bear and elks, which were now brought into camp, and then to cut, carve, and cook for themselves. Their very looks were expressive of joy—they now felt for a deliverance so unexpected; nor did they spare the provisions. Their hunger was such that as soon as one round was served, another, another, and another, in succession, was greedily devoured.

A fine-looking, tall, dignified savage then approached the surveyors' camp—rather young in appearance than otherwise. He very gracefully stepped up to Captain Bryan (who was now reposing in his camp on account of rheumatism occasioned by his recent exposure) and informed him that the old man in his camp was a chief; that he felt under great obligations to the Great and Good Spirit for so signal an interposition in their favor; that he was about to make a prayer and address the Good Spirit and thank Him; that it was the custom on such occasions for the Indians to stand up in their camp, and that his chief requested the captain and his men to conform in like manner by standing up in their camp.

The captain replied that his men would all conform and order should be observed, but as for himself his affliction would compel him to keep his seat, but this must not be construed into disrespect. The captain remarked to me that he was not himself a religious character, though a man of feeling.

The old chief raised himself upon his feet, as did those around him, and, lifting up his hands, commenced his prayer and thanksgiving in an audible voice. And such an address to Deity, on such an occasion—as far as I could understand him—I never before heard flow from mortal lips. The tone, the modulation of his voice, the gestures, all corresponded to make a very deep impression upon us.

In the course of his thanksgiving—as I gathered from the Indians—he recapitulated the doleful situation in which they were so recently placed, the awful horrors of starvation with which they were threatened, the vain attempts they had made to procure food, until He, the Great and Good Spirit,

had sent that good white man and had crowned his exertions with success, and so directed him and them to meet and to find plenty.

Who can fully describe the abundant overflowings of a grateful heart! He continued in his vehement strain for about half an hour, "when," remarked Captain B., "my own men, reflecting on their own recent situation, retrospectively what had taken place, and beholding the pious gratitude of a 'Child of the Forest,' feeling the same sensations, they were melted into tenderness—if not into tears."

The person who so gracefully addressed Captain Bryan in behalf of his Chief was Tecumseh.

The young Indian who was wandering in the forest and came up to this party at that time and became an interposer for the sake of humanity was Tecumseh, the man who was sent by the Northern nations from the North down to the South to stir up the Creek and the Cherokee and other Indians to hostility. He succeeded with the Creek and Seminole and the Choctaw and Chickasaw to some extent.

Tecumseh had then become not only a great warrior but a great prophet. He told those Indians that on a certain day the sun would be darkened. He was an informed man and knew that an eclipse was to take place. He told them the sun would be darkened, and that it would be because the black banner of war had been spread by the Six Nations in the North, and it would be the signal for those Indians in the South to join him. The eclipse came and proved to the satisfaction of the Indians that he was a prophet.

An earthquake had occurred, a terrible earthquake, that sank more than half of a county in southeast Missouri. They asked him what was it that made that great commotion in the world and "shook the very body of the earth until we could not stand on our feet." What was it? He said it was the voice proclaimed by the Six Nations that peace had ended and war had begun.

Thus availing himself of these two natural phenomena, Tecumseh, with an eloquence and a power and an influence that few men have possessed, caused the Creeks to go into that bloody war, which, it seemed, was the opportunity of bringing to the front the greatest man who has lived in the United States, next to George Washington—Andrew Jackson. It required Jackson, with his intrepidity and skill and power of endurance and combination, to conquer those people.

Mr. President, I feel a greater interest in these things, because I lived upon the ground where Jackson fought his second battle. His first battle was at Tallahassee and his second at Talladega. I lived there upon the ground where he fought his battle, so I happen to have a knowledge of the situation. I knew about Tecumseh. I knew how that war had been started. I knew Opothle Yoholo, his great right-hand man, and Osceola, and other great Indians who were in his command.

So, Mr. President, I have not grown up with the impression that these were inferior men like the negro race, but that they were men of power and spirit, and that they showed their spirit in their work, their power in their arms, in war, and their honor and integrity on all occasions and under all conditions.

The Indian character has been illustrated by the examples I have read to the Senate. I will now read how Tecumseh appeared at Vincennes:

In the meantime—

Says the author—

We shall transcribe here some gratifying information derived from a Tennessee periodical published in the spring of 1826—

Their own periodical, published as far back as 1826—

Some curiosity having been expressed as to the laws of the Cherokee Nation, the following sketch of them may not be unacceptable to our readers: They prohibit the introduction by white men of spirituous liquors into the nation.

As far back as 1826.

They have laws establishing and regulating turnpikes, prohibiting theft and rape; requiring white men if they take a Cherokee wife to be legally married to her, and then the property of the wife is not thrown into the hands of the husband but remains at her own disposal; nor do they permit one man to have more than one wife.

This shows the characteristics of those people in their legislation.

Now, we have what Tecumseh said illustrative of these views in an interview that he had at Vincennes:

It is said that, at the last conference at Vincennes, he found himself at the end of a long and animated speech unprovided with a seat. Observing the neglect, Governor Harrison directed a chair to be placed for him and requested him to accept it. "Your father," said the interpreter, "requests you to take the chair." "My father," replied the chief; "the sun is my father and the earth is my mother; I will repose upon her bosom," and saying this, he adjusted himself on the ground in the Indian manner.

A qualified remark has been made upon his courage; but the manner in which he conducted himself during the war is sufficient to establish the point beyond controversy.

The same may be said of the fearlessness shown in his visits to Vincennes and especially in the exposure of himself upon that occasion, though he must have perceived that he was feared, suspected, and even guarded by bodies of troops drawn out for that express purpose. It is very illustrative of the apparent diversity in the character of Eiskwatowa and his own in this respect that when the Delawares sent a deputation of chiefs to break up the prophet's settlement at Tippecanoe the latter would not deign to give them an inter-

view, but dispatched his brother to them, whose threats or persuasions were sufficient to drive back the chiefs with strong indications of apprehension and terror.

When General Proctor began to prepare for retreating from Malden, Tecumseh, having learned his intention, demurred, and, in the name of all the Indians, delivered an animated speech. If the spirit which it manifests could have had its intended effect in inducing the General to fight before he retreated, the result must have been at least less inglorious to his cause.

Father, he began, listen to your children. You have them all now before you. The war before this our British father gave the hatchet to his red children, when our old chiefs were alive. They are now dead. In that war our father was thrown on his back by the Americans, and our father took them by the hand without our knowledge. We are afraid he will do so again this time.

Listen! When war (the last war) was declared, our father stood up and gave us the tomahawk and told us he was then ready to strike the Americans; that he wanted our assistance; that he would certainly get us our land back which the Americans had taken from us.

Listen! When we last met at the rapids, it is true, we gave you little assistance. It is hard to fight people who live like groundhogs (alluding to the American fortifications).

Father, listen! Our fleet has gone out; we know they have fought. We have heard the great guns [Perry's victory], but we know not what has become of our father with one arm [Commodore Barclay]. Our ships have gone one way, and we are astonished to see our father tying up everything and preparing to run away the other without letting his red children know of his intentions. You always told us you never draw your foot off British ground. But now, father, we see you are drawing back, and we are sorry to see our father doing so without seeing the enemy. We must compare our father's conduct to that of a fat dog, that carries its tail upon its back; but, when frightened, drops it between its legs and runs off.

Father, listen! The Americans have not beaten us by land; we are not sure that they have by water. We wish, therefore, to remain here and fight. If they defeat us, we will then retreat with our father.

Father! You have got the arms and ammunition which our Great Father sent for his red children. If you have an idea of going away, give them to us and you may go, and welcome, for us. Our lives are in the hands of the Great Spirit; we are determined to defend our lands, and, if it be His will, we wish to leave our bones upon them.

That was Tecumseh's speech at Vincennes. That is enough to show that he was a very much greater man than the Englishman whom he was speaking to.

Mr. President, my observations of the tribe of Creek Indians, whose language I spoke when I was a boy, extends from that time to the present state of their development, when they have a king or a ruler elected by themselves, a written constitution written by themselves. They have institutions of justice, a supreme court, circuit courts, judges of ordinary, magistrates, and a mounted constabulary that rides over the entire district.

They have several very handsome institutions of learning, endowed by themselves, furnished comfortably for schoolrooms, large buildings, in which there are pianos and blackboards and other appliances for the instruction of their children. Their native girls are required to produce nothing for their support but their clothing, which is a uniform. Their tuition is given to them free. Their books are provided for them, and their board is free. They educate their children in that way, following our example, but having their own institutions.

I have been inside of their schoolhouses, and they were models of neatness and excellence as schoolhouses.

These people have a regard for me because I can trace my life back to childhood and identify it with many of their Indians. I have told them the story of Arkeeche, the little son of Forsachfixico, who was an old Indian chief who lived upon a beautiful piece of land not more than a mile from the town where the land office was kept, and where quite a number, probably 700 or 800 people, of the white race were assembled to deal with them for their lands.

This little boy Arkeeche was hunting blackberries with me one day and he was bitten by a rattlesnake and died. Dr. Holman, a Presbyterian divine, a most noble, worthy, excellent, and amiable gentleman, came to see Forsachfixico, and spoke to him familiarly, for he knew him. He tried to administer some of the comforts of Christian consolation to him, and asked him if he did not believe in Jesus Christ.

He says, "Is that the man you speak of as your God?" "Yes." "Was he a white man?" "Yes; he was a white man." "Did the white men kill him?" "Yes; they killed him." "An Indian never killed his God. I have no faith in a white man's God if he killed him. An Indian can not kill his God. He never sees him. He sees the resemblance to him." "Well," says Mr. Holman, "we will not dispute about that. I have come here to sympathize with you. Are you not very sorry about losing Ar kee che?" "No; I am not sorry." "Are you mad?" "No; I am not mad." "How do you feel?" "I am damned 'shamed.'" "What makes you ashamed?" "That reptile, that snake, bit my beautiful Ar kee che, and the Great Spirit let him go, not because he hated Ar kee che, but because he wanted my boy."

Now, of course, a man raised under these ideas and learning the language of those people and finding them when he comes into the Senate of the United States appealing to him for justice can not very well meet the burden of that demand without explaining to his fellow-Senators the reasons that move him to demand justice for these people. They deserve it, whether we feel it or not.

There was Red Jacket. I want to read a speech Red Jacket made at Buffalo Creek. He was of the Northern Indians:

At a council of Indians held on Buffalo Creek in the spring of 1811, application was made for the purchase of their rights to certain reservations of lands lying within the territory, commonly called "the Holland purchase." The application was answered by a speech from a chief of the Seneca Nation named Sagoua Hah (i. e., The Keeper Awake), but whom the whites called Red Jacket. It was delivered with great emphasis, and which, together with another that follows it, may be accounted literary curiosities.

Brother!

We opened our ears to the talk you lately delivered to us at council fire. In doing important business it is best not to tell long stories, but to come to it in a few words. We therefore shall not repeat your talk, which is fresh in our minds. We have thoroughly considered it and the advantages and disadvantages of your offers. We claim your attention to our answer, which is not from the speaker alone, but from all the sachems and chiefs now around our council fire.

Brother!

We know that great men as well as great nations have different interests, have different minds, and do not see the same object in the same light, but we trust our answer will be agreeable to you and your employers.

Brother!

Your application for the purchase of our lands is, in our minds, very extraordinary; it has been made in a crooked manner; you have not walked in the straight path pointed out by the great council of your nation. You have no writings from your great father, the President. In making up our minds we have looked back and remember how the Yorkers purchased our lands in former times. They bought them, piece after piece, for a little money, paid to a few men in our nation and not to all our brethren, until our planting and hunting grounds have become very small; and if we sell them we know not where to spread our blankets.

Brother!

You tell us your employer has purchased of the council of Yorkers a right to buy our lands. We do not understand how this can be. The lands do not belong to the Yorkers; they are ours and were given to us by the Great Spirit.

Brother!

We think it strange that you should jump over the lands of our brethren in the East to come to our council fire so far off to get our lands. When we sold our lands in the East to the white people we determined never to sell those we kept—which are as small as we can live comfortably on.

Brother!

You want us to travel with you and look for new lands. If we should sell our lands and move off into a distant country toward the setting sun we should be looked upon in the country to which we go as foreigners and strangers, and be despised by the red as well as by the white men, and we should soon be surrounded by the white people who will there also kill our game, come upon our lands, and try to get them from us.

Brother!

We are determined not to sell our lands but to continue on them. We like them—they are fruitful and produce us corn in abundance for the support of our women and children and grass and herbs for our cattle.

Brother!

At the treaties for the purchase of our lands the white men, with sweet voices and smiling faces, told us they loved us, and that they would not cheat us, but that the King's children on the other side of the lake would cheat us. When we go on the other side of the lake the King's children tell us your people will cheat us. These things puzzle our heads, and we believe the Indians must take care of themselves and not trust either in your people or in the King's children.

Brother!

At a late council we instructed our agents to tell you that we would not sell our lands, and we think you have not spoken to our agents, or they would have told you so, and we should not have met you at our council fire at this time.

Brother!

The white people buy and sell false rights to our lands, and your employers, have, you say, paid a great price for their rights. They must have a plenty of money to spend it in buying false rights to lands belonging to Indians. The loss of it will not hurt them. But our lands are of great value to us; and we wish you to go back with our talk to your employers and to tell them and the Yorkers that they have no right to buy and sell false rights to our lands.

Brother!

We hope you clearly comprehend the ideas we have offered. This is all we have to say.

Red Jacket went to war and the whole northern frontier, including Canada, felt the stroke when Red Jacket struck, for he was a great man. A man who speaks that way about his rights is bound to be a great man if he has got any manhood in him at all.

I could read many, many authenticated stories and speeches of these people, but I will not detain the Senate to do so.

Red Jacket made another speech at Albany, N. Y. He was the chief of the Seneca tribe, and in the last four or five days the Senate has been legislating about the Seneca tribe and their lands.

At a council held for the purpose of purchasing from his tribe the reservation commonly called the "Holland Purchase," Red Jacket made a shrewd and very able speech in opposition to the sale. The spirit and eloquence with which he invariably resisted the efforts of the priests to Christianize his tribe may be gathered from the following extract from one of his speeches, delivered at Albany:

Here he met with the priesthood, and spoke to them in his Indian way:

Brother!

Listen to what we have to say. These men (the priests) do us no good. They deceive everybody. They deny the Great Spirit whom we, and our fathers before us, have looked upon as our Creator. They disturb us in our worship. They tell our children they must not believe like our fathers and mothers, and tell us many things we do not understand, and can not believe. They tell us we must be like white people, but they are lazy and won't work, nor do teach our young men to do so. The habits of our women are worse than they were before these men came among us, and our young men drink more whisky. We are willing to be taught to read and write and work, but not by people who have done us so much injury.

Brother!

We wish you to lay before the council fire the wishes of your red brethren. We ask our brothers not to blot out the law which has made us peaceable and happy, and not force a strange religion upon us. We ask to be let alone and, like the white people, to worship the Great Spirit as we think best; we shall then be happy in filling the little space in life which is left us, and shall go down to our fathers in peace.

That was a protest, Mr. President, against an invasion that no ignorant race and scarcely any civilized race has ever yet been able to resist—the priesthood.

I have now closed with respect to the characteristics of these Indians, but I beg leave to call the attention of the Senate to a few names that you will remember, for they have become historical. They had no pen with which to write their own praises; they had to take them from the lips of their enemies. They forced the praises of the men whom they fought; and there can scarcely be a higher tribute to humanity or a higher achievement than that.

Black Hawk.
Brandt.
Canastogo.
Comanche.
Egeromont.
Ensamore.
Jim Fife.
George Sagamore.
George Guess.

He was a Cherokee. When I was a little boy George Guess was pointed out to me. He was then a middle-aged man, and I was told that he had invented an alphabet. He was a Cherokee and lived not far from my father's house, not more than 5 or 8 miles. He was a spare man, a rather ungainly looking Indian, and very dark. He had invented an alphabet, I think, of 48 characters, an alphabet not of letters, but of syllables. He syllabized the Cherokee language, much of which is guttural, hard to express in letters, and hard to spell.

This man's analysis ran through the whole course of the language. He was entirely without learning; he did not know the English alphabet or that of any other language. He adopted some of the English characters or very nearly so—the Roman characters of that alphabet. He is now known as Sequoia, and the big trees in California, the largest in the world, are named for George Guess, whose Indian name was Sequoia.

How did he happen to invent this alphabet?

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator will allow me, several Senators have suggested that they desire an executive session.

Mr. MORGAN. In one moment, when I get through with this little narrative, I will yield.

How did George Guess happen to write that alphabet? After General Jackson's triumph at New Orleans, when the news came back and spread over the country as to how Jackson had assembled his forces at New Orleans, Guess said he did it by writing some characters on a paper. "I can do that; I can write characters which the Cherokees can read." And he wrote them. It is stated in a book which I have before me, and it was stated then, that a Cherokee youth in three days after he got hold of the characters of that alphabet could write a letter to his friends, so simple was it, so perfectly natural, so perfectly adapted to the syllabic pronunciation of the Cherokee language.

George Guess passed off in poverty, and his very place of burial is lost; nobody knows it; and yet no greater man lived in this country than George Guess, tried by the tests with which we measure human capacity.

When I saw him and looked at him and was told he had written an alphabet I could not quite well understand it. I tried to comprehend that he had written our alphabet, and was told that was not so. I could not comprehend how there could be two alphabets in the world. I doubt if he knew that there were others.

Now I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

EFFICIENCY OF THE ARMY.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President—

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator from Illinois yield to me so that I may submit a conference report?

Mr. CULLOM. I yield to the Senator from Missouri for that purpose.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present the conference report on what is known as the staff bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15449) to increase the efficiency of the Army, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2, page 3 of the bill, after the word "emergency," insert the word "or;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the

Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "or" of said amendment insert the word "of;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

After the word "and," in the second line of said amendment, insert the following: "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;" and after the word "brigadier-general," in line 3 of said amendment, insert the following:

"And when the next vacancy occurs in the office of brigadier-general of the line, it shall not be filled, and thereafter the number of brigadier-generals of the line, exclusive of the Chief of Artillery, shall not exceed 14;" and the Senate agree to the same.

F. M. COCKRELL,
J. V. QUARLES,
J. B. FORAKER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
J. A. T. HULL,
RICHARD WAYNE PARKER,
WM. SULZER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SPOONER. What is the language employed there as to the Secretary of War in the part we amended the other day?

Mr. COCKRELL. The way it reads now is:

That the chief of staff under the direction of the President or of the Secretary of War under the direction of the President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 11, 1903, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10, 1903.

CONSUL.

Richard M. Bartleman, of Massachusetts, now consul at Valencia, Spain, to be consul of the United States at Cadiz, Spain, vice John Howell Carroll, deceased.

AUDITOR FOR THE ISLAND OF PORTO RICO.

Regis H. Post, of New York, to be auditor of the island of Porto Rico, to succeed John R. Garrison, whose resignation has been accepted to take effect on April 30, 1903.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander William P. Randall, United States Navy (retired), to be a commander in the Navy, on the retired list, from February 5, 1903, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 5, 1903.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Infantry Arm.

Maj. William B. Wheeler, Eighteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, February 4, 1903, vice Hoyt, Tenth Infantry, detailed as assistant adjutant-general.

Capt. Henry Kirby, Tenth Infantry, to be major, February 4, 1903, vice Wheeler, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

To be brigadier-generals.

Col. Joseph P. Farley, Ordnance Department, vice Davis, to be retired from active service.

Col. Morris C. Foote, Twenty-eighth Infantry, vice Farley, to be retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. George W. Baird, deputy paymaster-general, vice Foote, to be retired from active service.

Col. Samuel M. Mansfield, Corps of Engineers, vice Baird, to be retired from active service.

Col. Tully McCrea, Artillery Corps, vice Mansfield, to be retired from active service.

Col. Eli L. Huggins, Second Cavalry, vice McCrea, to be retired from active service.

Col. Greenleaf A. Goodale, Seventeenth Infantry, vice Huggins, to be retired from active service.

Col. John V. Furey, assistant quartermaster-general, vice Goodale, to be retired from active service.

Col. Francis Moore, Eleventh Cavalry, vice Furey, to be retired from active service.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 10, 1903.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

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

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

THE RECORD.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to a special order adopted on the 5th of February, wherein leave to print was given in the following words:

And that all members have leave for five days to print on the subjects of either of the bills referred to in this order.

Now, sir, on page 2006 of to-day's RECORD there begins a matter—I suppose it is called a speech—which amounts to vituperation and vilification of a successful candidate for membership of this House, and not one single word in the whole speech is directed to the subject in accordance with the order.

Now, to save what is in that speech, or any part of it, from going into the permanent RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the whole speech, beginning on page 2006 and ending on page 2012, be stricken from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] asks unanimous consent to strike from the RECORD of the proceedings of February 9 the speech of Hon. JOSEPH A. CONRY—

Mr. STEELE. I did not mention the gentleman's name.

The SPEAKER. But that statement will be necessary in order to make clear the motion of the gentleman from Indiana. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to strike from the RECORD of the proceedings of February 9 the speech of Hon. JOSEPH A. CONRY as having been made in violation of the order of the House. Is there objection?

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. CONRY] is not here this morning. I do not rise for the purpose of objecting to the motion of the gentleman from Indiana further than to suggest that it be made when my colleague can be present and can make his own statement with reference to the matter. I am as much surprised at the speech as anybody—

The SPEAKER. Without objection, this matter will go over to another day.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONRY] is not here, I object to the motion of the gentleman from Indiana, in order that the matter may go over until the gentleman from Massachusetts is present.

The SPEAKER. Without losing its place—this is a matter of privilege—it will, if there be no objection, go over until a subsequent day. The Chair hears no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF A CONFEREE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a telegram, which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., February 9, 1903.

HON. ROBERT C. DAVEY,
Washington, D. C.:

Account serious illness my brother am detained here. Please ask leave absence for me.

ADOLPH MEYER.

The SPEAKER. Leave of absence was granted last evening to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER]. The absence of that gentleman causes a vacancy upon the conference committee on what are called the "terminal matters," and hence it is necessary that the Chair appoint another conferee. The next gentleman to the gentleman from Louisiana upon the committee is the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LATIMER], whom the Chair designates as a conferee in the place of the gentleman from Louisiana.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES OF LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXPOSITION COMPANY.

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 Industrial Arts and Expositions, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, covering a statement showing the receipts and disbursements of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company for the month of December, 1902, furnished by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission, in pursuance of section 11 of the "Act to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory," etc., approved March 3, 1901.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, February 9, 1903.

DEATH OF HON. THOMAS H. TONGUE.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the House to fix a time for memorial addresses upon the life, character, and services of Hon. THOMAS H. TONGUE, deceased, late a member of this body. For that purpose I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House meet on Sunday, the 22d day of February, at 12 o'clock noon, for eulogies upon the life, character, and services of the Hon. THOMAS H. TONGUE, deceased, late a member of this House from the First Congressional district of Oregon.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the resolution; which was adopted.

CHARLES F. WOODFORD.

The SPEAKER laid before the House, with an amendment of the Senate, the bill (H. R. 8663) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles F. Woodford and grant him an honorable discharge.

The amendment of the Senate was read.

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

The motion was agreed to.

LEVI L. REED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House, with an amendment of the Senate, the bill (H. R. 10095) for the relief of Levi L. Reed. The amendment of the Senate was read.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I move that the amendment of the Senate be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

ELISE SIGEL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House, with an amendment of the Senate, the bill (H. R. 15659) granting a pension to Elise Sigel.

The amendment of the Senate was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I move that the House nonconcur in this amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. APLIN, Mr. HOLLIDAY, and Mr. NORTON as conferees on the part of the House.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House, with amendments of the Senate, the bill (H. R. 7659) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to amend sections 5191 and 5192 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes."

The amendments of the Senate were read.

Mr. FOWLER. I move that the House nonconcur in the amendments of the Senate, and ask a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. FOWLER, Mr. HILL, and Mr. TALBERT as conferees on the part of the House.

GEORGE N. M'MURRAY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 15911) granting an increase of pension to George N. McMurray, with a Senate amendment, which was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Hampshire that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

AURELIA M. POWER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 7110) granting an increase of pension to Aurelia M. Power, with a Senate amendment, which was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ADA S. KAEMPFER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 10672) granting an increase of pension to Ada S. Kaempfer, with Senate amendments, which were read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move concurrence in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

AUSTIN A. VORE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 9107) granting a pension to Austin A. Vore, with a Senate amendment, which was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move concurrence in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

BENJAMIN CONTAL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 5101) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Contal, with a Senate amendment, which was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move concurrence in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

GRACE A. NEGLEY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 3504) granting an increase of pension to Grace A. Negley, with a Senate amendment, which was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move concurrence in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

OPENING OF LANDS IN OKLAHOMA TERRITORY.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave to file the views of the minority on the bill (H. R. 16280) to open for settlement 505,000 acres of land in the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian reservations, in Oklahoma Territory.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the minority may file views on the bill H. R. 16280, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16280) to open for settlement 505,000 acres of land in the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian reservations, in Oklahoma Territory.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, this request will be granted. [After a pause.] The chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REGULATION OF COMMERCE BETWEEN STATES AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for reprint of the report, No. 3377, of the following bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for a reprint of the report of the bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House bill 15331, to amend an act to limit the effect of regulations of commerce between the several States and with foreign countries in certain cases, approved August 8, 1890.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, this request will be granted.

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask that 10,000 copies be printed, 5,000 for the use of the Judiciary Committee and 5,000 for the use of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the additional request that the reprint consist of 10,000 copies of this report, 5,000 for the House, and 5,000 for the Judiciary Committee. Is there objection?

Mr. HEATWOLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman what this bill is?

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, what is the title of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the title of the bill be again reported to the House.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the Clerk will again report the title of the bill.

The Clerk again reported the title of the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask whether it is the bill or the report that the gentleman desires to have reprinted.

The SPEAKER. The request is that there be a reprint of the report. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say to the gentleman that if this printing costs more than \$500, it can not be ordered by the House by simple resolution.

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa. There are only two pages of the report.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. If there are 10,000 copies to be printed it may cost more than that.

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa. There are only two pages to the report.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I have no objection to it.

Mr. STEELE. I should just like to ask the gentleman if he does not think he ought to have 8,000 copies for the use of the committee and only 2,000 for the House?

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa. No; I think not.

Mr. STEELE. Just so you can get along. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE RUMPLE.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That when the House meets on Sunday, the 22d day of February, it shall consider appropriate resolutions and hear eulogies upon the life, public services, and character of the Hon. JOHN N. W. RUMPLE, deceased, late a member of the House of Representatives from the Second Congressional district of the State of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.
The resolution was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H. R. 569. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the report be dispensed with and that the statement be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up a privileged report. The Clerk will report the title of the bill upon which this report is made.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 569) to establish the department of commerce and labor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to omit the reading of the report, and that the statement only be read. If there is no objection this course will be pursued. The Clerk will read the statement.

The Clerk read the statement.

[For text of the conference report and statement see record of the House proceedings of February 9, 1903.]

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield five minutes to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. First, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know whether the gentleman from Iowa will allow a separate vote on section 6, which is known as the Nelson substitute.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think it is impossible to do that. I have no power to do so.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. By unanimous consent will you allow it?

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, I think not. I think it had better go in the usual course.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Will you be willing, if the report of the conferees is voted down, to instruct the conferees to leave out section 6, which is the Nelson substitute?

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, I do not care to make any contracts or agreements of that kind.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I suggest to my colleague that if we vote down the conference report, then it would be in order to instruct the conferees; but you would first have to vote down the conference report.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I understand that to be the parliamentary rule, and I ask, further, of my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] that he allow me more than five minutes for the discussion of that substitute.

Mr. HEPBURN. How much time does the gentleman want?
Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Not an unreasonable time. I should like an hour.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not think we ought to do that.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. We were in conference a week on this question, and I would like very much to have that time allowed me to express my views fairly of what is known as the Nelson substitute.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would not be inclined to extend the time so as to give the gentleman all of my time. That is all of the time I have. I want to reserve a few minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I hope the gentleman will not be so uncharitable as to limit me to only five minutes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, no; I have no desire to do that. I will yield to the gentleman thirty minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I was unable to agree with the distinguished conferees with whom I have been associated, representing the majority of this House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], on the measure known as the Nelson substitute; but after a conference extending over several days I found myself in a position of radical difference with those gentlemen upon the natural, fair, and just construction that I think this substitute justly bears. I shall not resort, Mr. Speaker, to strained construction to arrive at the true meaning of the substitute. It speaks for itself in its own words.

I take this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to say that I do not believe that any Democrat can sustain himself before the people in opposition to a measure that proposes to give any relief against the evils of trusts and monopolies simply because it has a Republican origin or comes to us with a Republican stamp and Republican approval. I go still further than that. I do not believe that any Republican can hereafter give a satisfactory explanation to the people as to why he supported a measure that on its face claims to regulate and control trusts and monopolies and suppress their evils, when in fact the measure does not regulate and does not control, but leaves the trusts to the enjoyment of all their lawless

powers and abundant opportunities to accumulate unparalleled wealth at the expense of the toiling masses of this country, as they have been doing with our people for years past.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this country in all sections of the Union are sufficiently intelligent and sufficiently informed as to the workings, management, and effect of the evils of the trusts—and to know that they are not only a menace, but an actual injury to their interests—to place the responsibility where it properly belongs if we fail to grant the relief that they demand from the evils of these trusts. We may stand here on the floor of the House to our heart's content and applaud the fervid expressions on either side of the Chamber. The able and distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] may repeat, as he has heretofore stated on this floor, "To undertake to revise the tariff at this period of unparalleled prosperity would be the height of legislative madness." The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] only a few days since said in the presence of this House, in substance, that the Dingley schedules were so sacred and hallowed that they ought not to be touched by the hand of revision. He warned us to be careful, but he failed to suggest anything looking to the relief of the onerous burdens of the people.

These matters will all come before the people of this country very soon—to pass upon our honesty and sincerity and the opportunities we had to give relief, and whether we met or failed to come up to the full measure of our duties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I dissent most earnestly and sincerely from this Nelson substitute. I believe it to be an ultra dilution of a homeopathic dose of so-called antitrust legislation. I believe it to be a travesty upon what its friends represent and claim to be its only virtue—publicity. Why do I say that? I am in no manner responsible for the studied efforts that you and I on both sides of this House fully understand are being made to make it appear that this Nelson substitute is hostile to the trusts, and especially to the Standard Oil Company. Gentlemen of this House will not be influenced by this consideration. They look at it for themselves. In my opinion, the trusts, the corporations, the combines, and all other monopolies of all characters and description have no reason to fear any harm from this Nelson substitute. I will now read section 6 in the House bill for which the Nelson amendment is a substitute, and will read also the Nelson substitute.

SEC. 6. That there shall be in the department of commerce and labor a bureau to be called the bureau of corporations, and the chief of said bureau shall be appointed by the President and shall receive a salary of \$4,000 per annum. There shall also be in said bureau such clerks and assistants as may from time to time be authorized by law. It shall be the province and duty of said bureau, under the direction of the secretary of commerce and labor, to gather, compile, publish, and supply useful information concerning such corporations doing business within the limits of the United States as shall engage in interstate commerce or in commerce between the United States and any foreign country, and to attend to such other duties as may be hereafter provided by law.

This is the Nelson substitute:

Strike out all of section 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. That there shall be in the department of commerce and labor a bureau to be called the bureau of corporations, and a commissioner of corporations, who shall be the head of said bureau, to be appointed by the President, who shall receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum. There shall also be in said bureau a deputy commissioner, who shall receive a salary of \$3,500 per annum and who shall in the absence of the commissioner act as and perform the duties of the commissioner of corporations, and who shall also perform such other duties as may be assigned to him by the secretary of commerce and labor or by the said commissioner. There shall also be in the said bureau a chief clerk and such special agents, clerks, and other employees as may be authorized by law.

"The said commissioner shall have power and authority to make, under the direction and control of the secretary of commerce and labor, diligent investigation into the organization, conduct, and management of the business of any corporation, joint-stock company, or corporate combination engaged in commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, excepting common carriers subject to 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and to gather such information and data as will enable the President of the United States to make recommendations to Congress for legislation for the regulation of such commerce, and to report such data to the President from time to time as he shall require; and the information so obtained, or as much thereof as the President may direct, shall be made public.

"In order to accomplish the purposes declared in the foregoing part of this section, the said commissioner shall have and exercise the same power and authority in respect to corporations, joint-stock companies, and combinations subject to the provisions hereof as is conferred on the Interstate Commerce Commission in said 'act to regulate commerce' and the amendments thereto in respect to common carriers so far as the same may be applicable, including the right to subpoena and compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence and to administer oaths. All the requirements, obligations, liabilities, and immunities imposed or conferred by said 'act to regulate commerce,' and by 'an act in relation to testimony before the Interstate Commerce Commission,' etc., approved February 11, 1893, supplemental to said 'act to regulate commerce,' shall also apply to all persons who may be subpoenaed to testify as witnesses or to produce documentary evidence in pursuance of the authority conferred by this section.

"It shall also be the province and duty of said bureau, under the direction of the secretary of commerce and labor, to gather, compile, publish, and supply useful information concerning corporations doing business within the limits of the United States as shall engage in interstate commerce or in commerce between the United States and any foreign country, including corporations engaged in insurance, and to attend to such other duties as may be hereafter provided by law."

There can be no question that this section 6, that the Nelson bill is a substitute for, provides for publicity. Does the substitute provide for publicity? Let us analyze it from a standpoint of plain common sense. It is before you, and you have read it. No law has ever been enacted yet that has not an aim and an end in it. What is this? I propound it to both sides of this House. The purpose and object of this measure or of this substitute is to enable the President of the United States to do what? To take, under the supervision of the secretary of commerce and labor, action against the trusts? No. It is to provide a way to gather such information and data as will enable the President of the United States to make recommendations to Congress for legislation. I say that this substitute has the same characteristic that the chased and pursued fawn instinctively possesses that is being hotly chased by the hunter. After being pursued through circuitous route, through the woods, over the hills, and through the valleys, it returns at evening to the place where it started. When all the conditions precedent are complied with and the President sees proper, he will, in the sweet by and by, ask Congress for legislation to regulate commerce trusts. We are to pass the Nelson substitute, and when the President gathers up the data, under the qualifications and limitations that I have explained, he is to come back to Congress and ask for additional legislation.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that condition is directly antagonistic and contrary to every declaration that has been made, and the threats that we have been regaled with in the morning papers at the breakfast table—at the dinner table—that if some legislation is not enacted by this Congress, the present Congress, that will enable us really to regulate the trusts and subordinate them to the laws of the country that an extra session of Congress will be held.

Now, Mr. Speaker—

The said commissioner shall have power and authority to make, under the direction and control of the secretary of commerce and labor, diligent investigation into the organization, conduct, and management of the business of any corporation, joint stock company, or corporate combination.

For what?

So as to enable the President of the United States to make recommendations to Congress for legislation.

Why not enact that legislation to-day? The country knows the conditions. Congress should act at this session. Why delay? What reason and occasion is there for us to ask the President of the United States to secure data about the great steel trust. Suppose he should find out in his investigation that the products now made and controlled by the steel trust are sold cheaper in Europe than they are to our home folks. If he should ascertain the fact that the steel trust last year exported fully ninety-three millions of their products to foreign countries, and, after paying expenses of transportation, sold these products cheaper to foreigners than to our own people, that would be no news, no startling intelligence. If he should further get data showing that in March of last year the beef trust sent abroad nearly \$9,000,000 worth of American meats, and yet beef in April following sold at 14 cents a pound in London and brought 24 cents per pound in New York City, do we not all know that now? It is shown by current price lists. Why go to the superfluous and the meaningless task and delay of requiring the data about that which shows as plain as the sun above our heads? We know, and the country knows, the vast difference in the price in foreign markets and the price at home of plows, cultivators, wire nails, and other necessities of life.

I say that this measure, with all due regard for the honesty, ingenuity, and ability of the conferees who framed and ratified it, is entitled to be characterized as a pretext and subterfuge; and if I do not characterize it as that, I will say, at least, that in my humble opinion it is but an echo and expression of the opinion of that great Republican who has announced the Republican policy relative to all antitrust legislation to be "stand pat," do nothing. This substitute comes up to the full measure of that policy. In that connection I beg leave to read a statement, and I consider it as a semi-official Administration statement. It comes from the Evening Star, and it is about this Nelson substitute.

PUBLICITY FOR THE TRUSTS.

However, the chief interest in the action of the Commerce Committee is in the adoption of a sort of publicity feature for all corporations except railroads. The opinion prevails that if this amendment becomes law it will constitute about all the antitrust legislation which can be expected at this session of Congress, besides the paragraph in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill. The text of the section as perfected by the committee is as follows:

You will note the Star says significantly and somewhat authoritatively, "It will constitute about all the antitrust legislation which can be expected at this Congress," etc.

A "sort" of publicity! What does "sort" mean in the English language? Why, it means a "feint," it means a pretense, it means a stagger at something that you say you are going to do, but do not intend to do. It implies under the most charitable construction a doubt as to whether the thing claimed is there. All on

earth that the friends claim for this substitute is a "sort" of publicity. It provides for no penalties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go a little further in a fair and just analysis. I was glad, a few days since, when I saw a solid vote, a remarkable spectacle in the House of Representatives of the United States. The House—Republicans and Democrats—gave a solid vote for a real, genuine antitrust act—the Littlefield bill. I was glad that a united and solid Democratic vote stood for that measure, because it relieves us forever of the false and groundless charge that we are here simply as a party of objection, a party of obstruction. We have come and joined hands with the Republicans, who, after months of labor and toil and after many consultations of their ablest statesmen, reported the Littlefield bill, and said to them, we join you in this measure to relieve our country of the evils of the trust. It is true that the bill did not fully meet the requirements and demands of our side of the House, but it was a long step in the right direction.

Take this Nelson substitute and compare it in the matter of publicity with the first section of the Littlefield bill, which reads as follows:

That every corporation which may be hereafter organized shall, at the time of engaging in interstate or foreign commerce, file the return herein-after provided for, and every corporation, whenever organized, and engaged in interstate or foreign commerce shall file a return with the Interstate Commerce Commission for the year ending December 31, whenever, and at such time, as requested by said Commission, stating its name, date of organization, where and when organized, giving statutes under which it is organized, and all amendments thereof; if consolidated, naming constituent companies and where and when organized, with the same information as to such constituent companies, so far as applicable, as is herein required of such corporation; if reorganized, name of original corporation or corporations, with full reference to laws under which all the reorganizations have taken place, with the same information as to all prior companies in the chain of reorganization, so far as applicable, as is herein required of such corporation; amount of bonds issued and outstanding; amount of authorized capital stock, shares into which it is divided, par value, whether common or preferred, and distinction between each; amount issued and outstanding; amount paid in; how much, if any, paid in cash, and how much, if any, in property; if any part in property, describing in detail the kind, character, and location, with its cash market value at the time it was received in payment, giving the elements upon which said market value is based, and especially whether in whole or in part upon the capitalization of earnings, earning capacity, or economies, with the date and the cash price paid therefor at its last sale; the name and address of each officer, managing agent, and director; a true and correct copy of its articles of incorporation; a full, true, and correct copy of any and all rules, regulations, and by-laws adopted for the management and control of its business and the direction of its officers, managing agents, and directors. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as relieving any corporation from making, in addition to the foregoing, such returns as are now required by the "Act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all amendments thereof; but the provisions of this act, as to signing and making oath to returns and making answers on oath to written inquiries, shall be applicable to returns and such answers made under said act and amendments thereof.

So far as any return may be a duplicate of one already filed, that fact may be stated, and the details, which are in such case duplicates, need not be repeated. Upon its being made to appear to the satisfaction of the Commission that without fault on its part it is impracticable for such corporation to furnish any of the items aforesaid, it may, by a written order of said Commission, be excused from furnishing such item or items.

Said Commission shall cause to be prepared a blank return for the use of such corporations, containing the foregoing requirements, and shall make such rules and regulations as may, in its judgment, be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The President, treasurer, and a majority of the directors of such corporation shall make oath in writing on said return that said return is true. The treasurer, or other officer of such corporation having the requisite knowledge, shall answer on oath all inquiries that may be made in writing on the direction of said Commission in relation to said return. Any corporation failing to make such return, or whose treasurer or other officer shall fail to make the answers aforesaid, may be restrained, on the suit of the United States, from engaging in interstate commerce until such return is made. Suit may be brought in any district of the United States at the election of the Attorney-General.

I ask the members of this House and the country to compare this diluted dose of antitrust legislation with sections 5, 6, 7, and 11 of the Littlefield bill which has some gist in it. The comparison exposes what this substitute is. It pales into absolute insignificance. Compare it with the eleventh section of the Littlefield bill which gives any injured citizen, regardless of the President of the country or anyone else, the right to go into the courts and complain of the workings of these trusts. These sections are as follows:

SEC. 5. That any person, carrier, lessee, trustee, receiver, officer, agent, or representative of a carrier, subject to the act to regulate commerce, who, or which, shall offer, grant give, solicit, accept, or receive any rebate, concession, facilities, or service, in respect to the transportation of any property, in interstate or foreign commerce, by any common carrier subject to said act, whereby any such property shall, by any device whatever, be transported at a less rate than that named in the tariffs published and filed by such carrier, as is required by said act to regulate commerce, or shall receive any advantage by way of facilities or service, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not less than \$1,000.

SEC. 6. That no corporation engaged in the production, manufacture, or sale of any article of commerce, violating any of the provisions of section 5 of this act, or attempting to monopolize or control the production, manufacture, or sale thereof, in any particular locality, by discrimination in prices, or by giving special privileges or rebates or otherwise, in order to destroy competition therein, in such locality, shall use, either directly or indirectly, any of the facilities or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or in any way engage in interstate commerce, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating, either directly or indirectly, such production, manufacture, or sale, with such intent; nor shall any other person or corporation use any of the facilities or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or in any way engage in

interstate commerce, in buying, selling, or disposing of any such article of commerce, for the purpose of enabling such first-mentioned corporation to engage or to continue to engage in such production, manufacture, sale, or control, with such intent. Every corporation or person violating the provisions of this section shall be punished, on conviction, by a fine of not less than \$500 and not exceeding \$5,000.

SEC. 7. That any common carrier, lessee, trustee, receiver, or transportation company, engaged in interstate commerce, now subject to the provisions of said act to regulate commerce, knowingly transporting any property produced, manufactured, or sold in violation of the provisions of this act, or in violation of the provisions of "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, in interstate commerce, shall be subject to a penalty of not less than \$1,000, to be recovered by the United States, in any court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof, which suit may be brought in any district in which such common carrier, lessee, trustee, or receiver, or transportation company has an office or conducts business.

SEC. 8. That all prosecutions, hearings, and proceedings under the provisions of this act, and under the provisions of "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, whether civil or criminal, no person shall be excused from attending and testifying, or from producing books, papers, contracts, agreements, and documents before the courts of the United States, or the commissioners thereof, or the Interstate Commerce Commission, or in obedience to the subpoena of the same, on the ground, or for the reason, that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him, may tend to criminate him, or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for, or on account of, any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he may testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, before said courts, commissioners, or Commission, or in obedience to the subpoena of either of them, in any such case or proceeding.

Testimony of witnesses under the provisions of the act to regulate interstate commerce and amendments thereof, and of this act, before said Commission, or any member thereof, shall be on oath, and either of the members of said Commission may administer oaths and affirmations and sign subpoenas.

SEC. 11. That any person or corporation injured in business or property, by any other person or corporation, by reason of anything forbidden or declared to be unlawful by this act, may sue therefor in any circuit court of the United States in the district in which the defendant or defendants reside or are found, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages sustained and the costs of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

Now, Mr. Speaker—

To gather such information and data as will enable the President of the United States to make recommendations to Congress for legislation for the regulation of such commerce and to report such data to the President when, from time to time, as he shall require—

and the information so obtained, or as much thereof as the President may direct, shall be made public. I ask most solemnly, if anything is really contemplated by this substitute, why not require the President to turn over his information to his Attorney-General and require him to act at once? The cloven foot shows itself here.

I appeal to the honest construction that any man will give to the ordinary English language—what does that mean? "As much thereof as the President may direct shall be made public." He can suppress all data, every scintilla of information. He can hold it secret and stand pat and say and do nothing, and no law can move him. Is that publicity? Do you propose to put into the hands of one man the autocratic power to pass on the question that involves the great interests and welfare of all the people? What wonderful power do you place in one man's hands. It can be used in a most dangerous manner. Suppose Carroll D. Wright, whose Department has been transferred to the department of commerce and labor, should appeal to the President for data concerning the cost of transportation and the cost of producing coal.

The Department of Labor has been transferred to the department of commerce and labor. It is under the supervision of the secretary of that department. It is a part and parcel of this great new department of commerce that is to be established. Yet, if Mr. Wright, the Commissioner of Labor, should seek such information upon the vital matter of the costs of the transportation of coal in order to compare it with cost of production, he would be told that he would have to look elsewhere for his information, because the Nelson substitute "excepts common carriers" from its provisions. Then, again, if Commissioner Wright went to work and undertook to get up data and information, the President could forbid the publication "of the information so obtained, or as much thereof as the President may direct," because the Nelson substitute in its relation to "An act to regulate commerce" is limited by the words "subject to the provisions hereof"—that is the Nelson measure.

The Labor Department has had the right to gather its own statistics. There it is subjected to the crucible of the will of the President. I say that autocratic power placed in the hands of one man is against the spirit and policy of our free American institutions. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is a power that ought to be put in the hands of no man under our republican form of government. How do you or I know who is to be President? It is frequently said to me, "The President is honest and sincere." I am far above making any criticism of him. How do you know, how do I know, that the present incumbent will be the next President of the United States? We are not legislating for any man. Suppose a great trust magnate were to be made Pres-

ident under the power of this law. What investigation could follow; what inquiries could be made? How helpless the country would be.

Why, Mr. Speaker, that latter clause, "or so much thereof as the President may direct shall be made public," is not publicity. Does any man contend that it is publicity? Section 6 in the department of commerce bill provides that these matters of information should be published without restraint. It reminds me of what is said down in my section when a man wants to make a thing absolutely secure and safe; he says it is equal to a "stake and rider fence." That is defined down in our country to be a fence, horse high, bull strong, and pig tight; you can not get over it, nor under it, nor around it, nor through it.

That last clause, "or so much thereof as the President may direct shall be made public," is a stake and rider legal barrier or fence. [Laughter.] Suppose a man goes there and wants to make a complaint before the President. It would simply be a physical impossibility for the President to hear all the complaints that would be made. Not only that, this Nelson substitute provides that the President shall suggest the data that the commissioner of the bureau of corporations is to collect, and for fear he might collect some data that ought not to go to the public, the measure, as a matter of precaution to prevent accidents, says that "so much thereof as the President sees proper shall be made public." I know that it is an ordinary provision to say that certain duties shall be under the control of the secretary of a department. For the Secretary of the Interior to supervise the Director of Census or the Secretary of Agriculture to supervise gathering of farm statistics is a harmless provision. That is right; but this authority put in the position it is here, making barriers, is a different proposition. What are the barriers to investigation? The secretary of the department of commerce and labor has first to have his say at it. Next, the President may tell him what data he must get. Next, when the President gets that data and information about these trusts in his hands, holding them in the hollow of his hand, it is for him to say whether he will publish them or not.

There never was, in my judgment, in the history of this great Government of ours such an autocratic power placed in the hands of one man, placed there on a subject that concerns the welfare and the interests of all the people of this country. It can be used as an engine of power. I do not mean to say that it would be used with reckless disregard of the rights of the people for and in behalf of the trusts. We all know that the President has repeatedly said that there are "good trusts and bad trusts." Who should be the judge on such a question? It should not be one man. It should be the law, under the rules and regulations prescribed for eliciting truth. This is a government of law. I have always believed that the least left to the discretion of a public official is the best law for the rights and interests of the people.

Why should the Littlefield bill be doomed to a languishing death in place of this Nelson substitute? That is the question that we have got to answer before the people. 'Tis said that it will surely die.

I will refrain, Mr. Speaker, from entering into a discussion of the tariff question. Gentlemen have heard enough of such discussion already. I want to read something that the distinguished Secretary of War, Mr. Root, said in a speech to the Union League at New York on the night of February 6. I read it, Mr. Speaker, with much concern. It bears its significance when it comes from such a source.

Secretary Root congratulated the veterans of the club upon having "woven a thread into fabric of the great life of this country." "There are," he added, "many problems coming up to-day on which the safety of this Government depends. There are to-day situations of possible evils for our country that call for devoted patriotism. First, division between the rich and the poor under which wealth controls legislation and poverty is trying to stir up a war of classes, but every good citizen should declare that never in this free land shall we have a war of classes."

Ought not the great Secretary to have supplemented that statement by saying that in order to prevent this deplorable war of classes we should undertake by law to curb the greed of the trust? That is what brought about this condition; it is what is leading us to this prophesied war of classes. What has made the division between the rich and the poor—made it so marked in our country in the past few years? Wealth controls legislation, and it behooves the Congress of the United States to recognize these conditions. It becomes us, as men who love the institutions of our country, to see to it that the great power of wealth shall not be used against the interests of the masses. No man has the right to denounce or impair the right of every man to acquire honest wealth. It is what we all strive for. Let every man have an equal and fair chance in the race of life for the goods of this world. Let us stand to, rechristen, and rededicate the great fundamental principles of our republican form of government, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

Mr. THAYER. I should like to ask the gentleman a question

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THAYER. I am not entirely conversant with the provisions of the act creating the Interstate Commerce Commission. I notice that this bill in section 6 confers upon the bureau of corporations, that is to be created, the same authority which is conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commission relative to common carriers. Now, my friend, in your opinion, if this bureau should be appointed, would it have authority to get the information which in our antitrust bill we have directed to be obtained? For instance, could it inquire of a corporation whether it had had any rebate, whether it had sold to one party at a lower price than to another, whether it had overcapitalized? Could the inquiries be made to reach any of those important matters?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. In answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts I will say that if he will read the Nelson substitute closely he will see that he says "subject to the provisions of this act," which, in my humble judgment, makes inapplicable the provisions for the investigation of these trusts as is provided by the act to regulate commerce, and is one of the chief barriers that will stand in the way to prevent such investigation. It was placed there, I think, just to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman does not really believe that.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Yes, I believe it; and if you will give me the time I can demonstrate it. What power can the Interstate Commerce Commission have to secure these returns if we make that Commission subject to the provisions of the Nelson substitute. This provision is, in my judgment, a carefully worded, well-considered, artistically framed device for preventing the accomplishment of the very thing that the people of this country are demanding to-day—the control and regulation of the trust.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the Nelson substitute apply to existing corporations?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. In regard to this Nelson substitute, let me say, as was said by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] the other day, that to leave out the Interstate Commerce Commission from the department of commerce would be like playing the great Shakespearean play without the character of Hamlet. Yet this Nelson substitute, though pretending to regulate these trusts and combinations and organizing a bureau of corporations, leaves out the railroad corporations; it does not embrace them at all; and I say that a law which in thus undertaking to regulate corporations leaves out the railroads does not only enact the great play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet omitted, but it puts upon the boards a roaring farce.

Mr. Speaker, I am not an extreme advocate of what is known as tariff revision. I would not of my own free will disturb, nor do I believe that my party would disturb, the interests or the business of our country in any improper way. The people of this country are conservative. They have felt the evils of the trust, and they expect and are entitled to relief. The law that we may make here ought to meet the demands to protect competition, which is the surest way and the strongest instrumentality for breaking down and preventing monopoly. It should not only do that, but it should reduce the tariff reasonably to a moderate revenue basis, and especially upon those products that are controlled by the trusts. It should protect the small industries and corporations of this country against unjust rivalry and competition. Those are plain principles. It should prevent unjust and unlawful capitalization. The law should provide for reasonable publicity—such publicity as would not stimulate or allow an inquisitorial investigation. We want reasonable, just laws that apply to all alike.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DALZELL). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Iowa to allow me five minutes more.

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield to my colleague on the committee five minutes more.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I am much obliged to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I say, too, Mr. Speaker, that the conservative sentiment which I have just enunciated comes from Republicans—leading Republicans of this country—as well as from Democrats. I read the language of one such:

We Republicans of Iowa are all protectionists, but we insist that the tariff must be removed on articles in which monopoly has been established. We call upon Congress to place legislative obstacles in the way of the tendency of modern combinations to destroy competition. Competition is the fundamental law of industrialism, and we are not willing to have the tariff used in throttling or perpetuating it.

That comes from the distinguished governor of Iowa—Governor Cummins. It is a sentiment that pervades all sections of our country. We must have genuine work—no dodging behind the bush now.

I read again from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]:

For years we have been telling the people that we would do something toward broadening trade by means of reciprocity treaties. We have had the power in all branches of the Government, but we have done nothing. The Republican party has got to stop a lot of its conversation or to take up these treaties and some of the tariff schedules and do something toward satisfying expectations. The Republican party on this question is like a ship with all sail set and anchor fast. It is time to take in sail or pull in the anchor.

In common parlance, that means "shoot, Luke, or give up the gun." You have been aiming at the trusts long enough; fire now or give the Democrats the gun. That is what it means for 1904, and if you adopt this homeopathic, diluted concoction for the Nelson substitute the sentiments of Senator DOLLIVER, uttered in his own State, will come back to annoy you and harass you. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the parliamentary situation of this matter, it is that the conference report will have to be voted down in order to reach this subdivision 6. I know there is great difficulty in that. I know there are gentlemen on both sides of this House who are interested in the establishment of the department of commerce and labor which this bill proposes to establish. I have frankly given my views upon the Nelson substitute.

I do not believe that anything good for the people against the trusts can come out of it. I was anxious to have and requested a separate vote on this substitute. This was declined or refused. I think that there is nothing whatever in it to alarm the trusts, and I do not think they are alarmed. The Republican party is responsible. No one should be allowed hereafter to say to us that we obstructed or hindered any legislation that promised or claimed to check the trusts. In that spirit I shall vote for the conference report. Surely no man who is honest and sincere in advocating the broad, conservative, legal, and just principles enunciated in the Littlefield bill can say for a moment that this Nelson substitute ought in justice to take the place of such a bill. If the Littlefield bill fails, then the people will answer in 1904.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BALL].

Mr. BALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker,

The four first acts already past,
A fifth shall close the drama with the day:
Time's rottenest offspring is the last.

First. In the closing hours of the Fifty-sixth Congress the Republican party presented, as a means to destroy the trusts, a constitutional amendment to confer added power upon Congress. The Democrats opposed that amendment, insisting that there was ample constitutional power in the Congress of the United States to destroy every trust in the Union. The Republicans have receded from the position which they took at that time, and the President and a Republican Attorney-General are now agreed that Congress has the necessary power.

Second. We had in the closing hours of that Congress what was known as the Littlefield bill, which was a measure calculated at least to seriously embarrass the trusts. That went through this House with a whoop and died, because there were but four days, as all the members of Congress knew, in which the Senate could consider it, and it had been held back for that purpose.

Third. We had heralded in the newspapers during the past summer the fact that the eminent gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] was preparing a "trust buster" under the auspices and direction of the President of the United States, who had promised "to shackle the cunning of the trusts." After consultation with the powers that be the gentleman from Maine brought in a bill, and it was submitted in this House, and in the language, forceful but true, of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], when the committee brought that bill back they had "cut the dog's tail off right behind the ears."

Fourth. We had the emasculated Littlefield bill, which was passed in this House a few days ago with apparent seriousness and good faith, voted for by every member upon both sides of the Chamber, although its authors knew and the members upon that side of the House knew that it was not the intention of the Republican party at this session or any future session of Congress that even as mild a bill as that should become law or to pass any effective trust legislation.

Fifth. Mr. Speaker, we have had trumpeted from the White House the fact that the Administration has changed its programme; that it is now anxious to get through what is known as the Nelson bill and the Elkins bill which passed the Senate of the United States without any discussion or consideration whatever; and the newspapers are pretending to say that the Standard Oil Company

is sending in telegrams and protests against the passage of these homeopathic doses to the trusts.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that John D. Rockefeller has sent any message to any Senator of the United States, or anybody else, in opposition to these measures, which are hardly equal to a dose of "soothing sirup," much less calculated to destroy the trusts. These bills are mere makeshifts, a hippodrome, to help get the Administration out of the hole into which its pretended trust-destroying efforts have placed it. If the President is sincere he is powerless, because he finds behind him a subservient Republican party which is not honest in its efforts to destroy the trusts. It is now the purpose of the Republican party to rush through the Nelson and Elkins bills to deceive the public and cover up the Administration's failure to get through legislation proposed by it and defeated by the trusts. Vote down this report, because if you adopt it, and then the Elkins bill, there will be a flourish of trumpets that, over the opposition of the Standard Oil and other trust concerns, the Administration has secured trust legislation.

There is nothing in this amendment of any value whatever. It creates a bureau of corporations at a considerable expense to gather information for the President, who makes public such as he sees proper. It is, in fact, no legislation whatever. When passed the suppression of trusts will be as far off as ever. Vote down the conference report and instruct the conferees to insist upon an amendment containing at least the publicity features of the House bill passed a few days ago, which is being smothered at the other end of the Capitol. In this way only will it be possible to have any legislation of value passed at this session of Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five or ten minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], if he desires the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. MANN. I shall not use all the time that is allotted to me, Mr. Speaker, principally because my physical condition is such that I am not able to speak without great effort. The purpose of the House in inserting in the bill the section for the bureau of corporations is most fully justified by the Nelson amendment, which we have before us in the conference report. I may say, in reply to the suggestions which have been made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BALL] in reference to the so-called Nelson substitute, that the statements made by them are not borne out by the wording of the substitute; and I say, Mr. Speaker, without question that the Nelson substitute confers a greater power upon the commissioner of corporations to make investigations of so-called trusts than has been proposed in any other bill or in any other proposition brought before Congress. The objection was made by one of the gentlemen interested in trust legislation that the Nelson amendment was too drastic, that it went too far.

Mr. Speaker, it confers upon the Executive an absolute power to make complete investigation in reference to all phases, all conditions, all control of any corporation engaged in interstate commerce which the Secretary may desire to have investigated. That information and that investigation are public. It is true that the Nelson amendment does not propose to punish violations of any law which we create. The Nelson amendment proposes investigation in order to obtain information. I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the other side of this House, which has always talked for trust legislation, now when it comes to the point where we can actually enact legislation, draws back afraid to put upon the statute books any legislation upon the subject. So long, Mr. Speaker, as the House is engaged in passing a bill, the gentlemen on the other side urge it. While the Senate is engaged in passing another bill, the gentlemen on the other side urge it; but when it comes to having the House and the Senate join in passing the same bill and the question is presented to the gentlemen, they hesitate and gag.

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. THAYER. I should like to ask the gentleman the question that I asked the gentleman from Alabama. Do you believe that if this bill passes you could, under the provisions of section 6, compel any officer of any corporation to reveal what is demanded of him in the antitrust bill, namely, whether they are overcapitalized; rebates, whether they have paid or received any, and the manner of the conduct of their business?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have hardly any belief on that. It is so plain that I think I may say I know if Congress has the constitutional authority under any circumstances to ask these questions of a corporation, that authority is conferred to the fullest extent by this bill upon the commissioner of corporations, and all the power Congress can confer upon anyone to make

investigations of corporations is conferred upon the commissioner of corporations by the Nelson amendment.

Mr. THAYER. One question further.

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. THAYER. The only authority conferred in this bill is the authority that is conferred in the Interstate Commerce Commission in dealing with railroads and common carriers. Is there any provision in the statute to which this refers to compel a corporation to reveal the conditions I have stated?

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, the gentleman knows that the authority conferred upon the commissioner of corporations, in reference to these corporations, is that conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commissioners now in reference to railway corporations. The authority is full and complete. The authority in the interstate-commerce act covers the question which the gentleman has asked about, and the authority conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commissioners is absolutely as full as can be conferred by language.

Mr. THAYER. Why did they not put it in, then, in the same language as the language in the antitrust bill, so that something definite and substantial could be discerned?

Mr. MANN. Well, if the gentleman will notice, the antitrust bill refers to certain provisions in the act to regulate commerce. It never has been the custom of anybody to copy all of these provisions over again. The gentleman laughs and shakes his head. Perhaps he has not read the bill.

Mr. THAYER. Oh, yes, I have.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps the gentleman has not read the law. If he has read the law, then I suspect that he knows that the question he asks is answered completely by the law. The authority conferred upon the commissioner by the Nelson amendment is definite and certain. He will possess all the power which Congress has as to making investigations of corporations. The manner and method of exercising that power are now indicated by the interstate-commerce act. The language we have used is plain and unambiguous.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, may I not ask the gentleman in the interest of fairness to withdraw the statement he made against the Democratic side of the House upon this subject of trust legislation in view of the record of hypocrisy made by the other side in the Fifty-sixth Congress?

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Speaker, whenever I withdraw any statement made in reference to my friends on the other side on the basis of the truth of their claim of hypocrisy on this side I hope I may land in a lower and not an upper world. [Laughter.] We all have become used to the argument that is made by gentlemen on the other side, which simply is abuse. I never heard one of you make a speech upon the floor of this House in reference to trust legislation that did not denounce the Republicans as a band of robbers and thieves.

Mr. FLEMING. You have not been in your seat all the time, then.

Mr. MANN. I am glad to except the gentleman from Georgia, who is always fair and courteous in his language; and there are other exceptions, I am glad to say.

But your speakers usually say that the Republicans are a band of robbers and thieves. They say we act at the behest of the trusts. And yet I do not know a gentleman on that side of the aisle who believes it. There is no gentleman on that side who believes gentlemen on this side of the aisle are not actuated by purposes as honest, as noble, as truthful as theirs; and I would not claim that gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House are not earnest and sincere in their work against the trusts. They are now only seeking political capital. We are responsible for what we do; they are not held responsible for what they say. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. May I ask the gentleman a question before he sits down?

Mr. MANN. Well, if it is a question in reference to the bill, I will take time to answer it; if it is a mere political question—

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I would like to know if the gentleman has ever seen me ask any other question since my service in this House?

Mr. MANN. I think that is true. The gentleman is sincere. Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. What I want to know is if the gentleman does not think it would have been better to have required the commissioner of corporations to lay his report before Congress rather than before the President; because it is not so important, as I view the matter, that the President should be enabled to make recommendations as that Congress should be enabled to enact some intelligent effective legislation.

Mr. MANN. I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the commissioner of corporations is under the department of commerce and labor, which has a secretary, and the secretary is required to make an annual report, which of course means that

the statement that the commissioner of corporations makes in his report to the secretary would be included as a part of his report.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. In that same connection I apprehend that this provision of the amendment which says it shall lie in the discretion of the President as to what shall be made public of these reports would preclude the commissioner from laying before Congress what the official report developed in his investigation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I wish I had time; I think I could explain that to the gentleman's satisfaction.

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, a member of the committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to appear in antagonism to my distinguished friend on the committee, the gentleman from Alabama, who was one of the managers on the part of the House. However, I do not desire that any vote that I may cast shall be construed into an indication of lack of knowledge that the provision discussed by the gentleman from Alabama, known as the Nelson substitute, is a delusion and a snare, a hollow mockery, thinner than thin air, weaker than water, the meanest sham, the most contemptible fraud and false pretense, because it seeks to deceive constituents who send members here.

But we are put upon notice, at least by the newspapers, which everybody knows are always truthful, that this is the only anti-trust measure that the "trust busters" are going to permit to pass at all. I do not propose to go before the country in the attitude of opposing the only antitrust legislation that we are served with notice can be enacted. I shall not oppose the report of the managers on the part of the House on that account. I know the managers on the part of the House have been diligent and patient. I know something of the difficulties they encountered. I accept their report as the best that can be secured under the circumstances, and shall contribute with great pleasure to creating the department of commerce and labor by voting for the adoption of this report. [Applause.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report, and on that demand the previous question.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman one question before he demands the previous question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BARTLETT. I desire to ask the gentleman if this report—and I have read it very carefully—in reference to insurance companies does anything more than to authorize the Commissioner to gather statistics in reference to insurance companies?

Mr. HEPBURN. Nothing in the world, so far as I understand.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then there is nothing in this measure that contravenes the votes of the House on that subject.

Mr. HEPBURN. All I mean to say is this, that it simply authorizes information being secured. Now, Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? I do not want to debate.

Mr. HEPBURN. I prefer not to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Does the gentleman decline to yield for a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks for the previous question on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HEPBURN. On that question, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 252, nays 10, answered "present" 4, not voting 85; as follows:

Adams,	Bowersock,	Calderhead,	Currier,
Adamson,	Bowie,	Caldwell,	Curtis,
Alexander,	Brandegee,	Candler,	Cushman,
Allen, Ky.	Brantley,	Cannon,	Dalzell,
Allen, Me.	Breazale,	Capron,	Darragh,
Apin,	Brick,	Cassel,	Davey, La.
Bankhead,	Bromwell,	Cassingham,	Davidson,
Barney,	Brown,	Clark,	Davis, Fla.
Bartholdt,	Brownlow,	Clayton,	Deemer,
Bartlett,	Brundidge,	Conner,	Dick,
Bates,	Burgess,	Coombs,	Dismore,
Beidler,	Burke, S. Dak.	Cooper, Tex.	Dougherty,
Bell,	Burkett,	Cooper, Wis.	Douglas,
Bellamy,	Burleigh,	Corliss,	Dovener,
Billmeyer,	Burleson,	Cowherd,	Draper,
Blakeney,	Burton,	Creamer,	Eddy,
Boreing,	Butler, Mo.	Cromer,	Emerson,
Boutell,	Butler, Pa.	Crumpacker,	Esch,

Evans,	Howard,	Moody,	Sims,
Feely,	Hughes,	Moon,	Skiles,
Finley,	Hull,	Morgan,	Slayden,
Fitzgerald,	Irwin,	Morris,	Smith,
Flanagan,	Jackson, Md.	Morrisell,	Smith, Ill.
Fletcher,	Jenkins,	Mudd,	Smith, Iowa
Flood,	Johnson,	Mutchler,	Smith, Ky.
Foerderer,	Jones, Wash.	Needham,	Smith, H. C.
Fordney,	Joy,	Norton,	Snodgrass,
Foster, Vt.	Kahn,	Olsted,	Snook,
Fox,	Kehoe,	Overstreet,	Southard,
Gaines, Tenn.	Kern,	Padgett,	Sperry,
Gaines, W. Va.	Kleberg,	Palmer,	Spight,
Gardner, Mass.	Knapp,	Parker,	Stark,
Gardner, Mich.	Kyle,	Patterson, Pa.	Steele,
Gardner, N. J.	Lacey,	Patterson, Tenn.	Stevens, Tex.
Gibson,	Lamb,	Payne,	Stewart, N. J.
Gilbert,	Landis,	Parre,	Stewart, N. Y.
Gill,	Latimer,	Perkins,	Storm,
Gillet, Mass.	Lawrence,	Pou,	Sullivan,
Glass,	Lessler,	Powers, Me.	Sulzer,
Gooch,	Lever,	Powers, Mass.	Talbert,
Gordon,	Lewis, Ga.	Randell, Tex.	Tate,
Graf,	Littauer,	Reeder,	Tawney,
Graham,	Livingston,	Reeves,	Taylor, Ohio
Green, Pa.	Lloyd,	Rhea,	Taylor, Ala.
Greene, Mass.	Long,	Richardson, Ala.	Thayer,
Griffith,	Lovering,	Richardson, Tenn.	Thomas, Iowa
Griggs,	McAndrews,	Rixey,	Thompson,
Grosvenor,	McCleary,	Robb,	Underwood,
Grow,	McCulloch,	Roberts,	Van Voorhis,
Hamilton,	McDermott,	Robinson, Ind.	Wanger,
Hanbury,	McLachlan,	Rucker,	Warner,
Haugen,	McLain,	Russell,	Warnock,
Heatwole,	McRae,	Ryan,	Watson,
Hedge,	Maddox,	Schirm,	Weeks,
Hemenway,	Mahon,	Scott,	Wheeler,
Henry, Conn.	Mann,	Shallenberger,	White,
Henry, Miss.	Marshall,	Shattuck,	Wiley,
Henry, Tex.	Martin,	Shelden,	Williams, Ill.
Hepburn,	Metcalfe,	Sheppard,	Williams, Miss.
Hildebrandt,	Mickey,	Sherman,	Woods,
Hill,	Miller,	Shoemaker,	Wright,
Hitt,	Minor,	Sibley,	Young,
Hooker,	Mondell,		Zenor.

NAYS—10.
 Ball, Tex.
 De Armond,
 Fleming,
 Lester,
 Little,
 Littlefield,
 Reid,
 Robertson, La.
 Shackelford,
 Vandiver.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.
 Dayton,
 Haskins,
 Hopkins,
 McClellan.

NOT VOTING—85.
 Acheson,
 Babcock,
 Ball, Del.
 Belmont,
 Benton,
 Bingham,
 Bishop,
 Blackburn,
 Bristow,
 Broussard,
 Bull,
 Burk, Pa.
 Burnett,
 Cochran,
 Connell,
 Conry,
 Cooney,
 Cousins,
 Crowley,
 Dahle,
 Driscoll,
 Dwight,
 Edwards,
 Elliott,
 Foss,
 Foster, Ill.
 Fowler,
 Gillet, N. Y.
 Glenn,
 Goldfogle,
 Hay,
 Holliday,
 Howell,
 Jack,
 Jackson, Kans.
 Jett,
 Jones, Va.
 Ketcham,
 Kitchin, Claude
 Kitchin, Wm. W.
 Klutz,
 Knox,
 Lassiter,
 Lewis, Pa.
 Lindsay,
 Loud,
 Loudenslager,
 McCall,
 Mahoney,
 Maynard,
 Mercer,
 Meyer, La.
 Miers, Ind.
 Moss,
 Naphe,
 Neville,
 Nevin,
 Newlands,
 Pierce,
 Prince,
 Pugsley,
 Ransdell, La.
 Robinson, Nebr.
 Ruppert,
 Scarborough,
 Selby,
 Shafroth,
 Small,
 Smith, S. W.
 Smith, Wm. Alden
 Southwick,
 Sparkman,
 Sutherland,
 Swann,
 Swanson,
 Thomas, N. C.
 Tirrell,
 Tompkins, N. Y.
 Tompkins, Ohio
 Trimble,
 Vreeland,
 Wachter,
 Wadsworth,
 Wilson,
 Wooten.

So the conference report was agreed to.
 The following pairs were announced:
 For the session:
 Mr. DAYTON with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.
 Mr. MCCALL with Mr. MCCLELLAN.
 Until further notice:
 Mr. TIRRELL with Mr. CONRY.
 Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. SCARBOROUGH.
 Mr. BALL of Delaware with Mr. RANSDALL of Louisiana.
 Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. ELLIOTT.
 Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. SWANSON.
 Mr. JACK with Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska.
 Mr. HASKINS with Mr. FOX.
 Mr. VREELAND with Mr. WILSON.
 For one week:
 Mr. ACHESON with Mr. SPARKMAN.
 For the day:
 Mr. Samuel W. SMITH with Mr. KLUTZ,
 Mr. CONNELL with Mr. SHAFROTH.
 Mr. GILLET of New York with Mr. JETT.
 Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. BELMONT.
 Mr. MERCER with Mr. NEWLANDS.
 Mr. COUSINS with Mr. HAY.
 Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. RUPPERT.
 Mr. TOMPKINS of New York with Mr. LINDSAY.
 Mr. TOMPKINS of Ohio with Mr. EDWARDS.
 Mr. SUTHERLAND with Mr. PUGSLEY.
 Mr. MOSS with Mr. NEVILLE.

Mr. NEVIN with Mr. MAHONEY.
 Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. JACKSON of Kansas.
 Mr. PRINCE with Mr. JONES of Virginia.
 Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. NAPHEN.
 Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania with Mr. GLENN.
 Mr. KNOX with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.
 Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.
 Mr. HOWELL with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. FOSS with Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.
 Mr. DAHLE with Mr. COONEY.
 Mr. BULL with Mr. CROWLEY.
 Mr. WACHTER with Mr. WOOTEN.
 Mr. BISHOP with Mr. MAYNARD.
 Mr. BLACKBURN with Mr. COCHRAN.
 Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. PIERCE.
 Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania with Mr. BURNETT.
 Mr. MILLER with Mr. SMALL.

For the vote:

Mr. LOUD with Mr. TRIMBLE.
 Mr. HOLLIDAY with Mr. BROUSSARD.
 Mr. FOWLER with Mr. BENTON.
 Mr. BRISTOW with Mr. MIERS of Indiana.
 Mr. DWIGHT with Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina.
 The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.
 On motion of Mr. HEPBURN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

- S. 6848. An act to establish a life-saving station at Cape Nome, Alaska;
 S. 3638. An act for the extension of Eighth street northwest, or Wright's road, District of Columbia;
 S. 4922. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Smith;
 S. 5219. An act to grant an honorable discharge from the military service to Robert C. Gregg;
 S. 6048. An act granting a pension to Lillian G. Elkins; and
 S. 7186. An act granting a pension to Mary C. Smith.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3287) to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

- H. R. 16731. An act permitting the town of Montrose, Colo., to enter 160 acres of land for reservoir and water purposes;
 H. R. 10678. An act for the relief of the Florida Brewing Company;
 H. R. 10355. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Smithson;
 H. R. 12952. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the Rochford Cemetery Association to certain lands for cemetery purposes; and
 H. R. 12411. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Bart.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

House concurrent resolution 57.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 3,000 copies of a Congressional Directory which embraces the biographies of all members of Congress from the Continental Congress to the Fifty-seventh Congress, inclusive, compiled by O. M. Enyart, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

PORT OF NIAGARA FALLS, N. Y.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported back with a favorable recommendation, the bill (H. R. 16885) to extend to the port of Niagara Falls, N. Y., the privileges of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

TERMS OF UNITED STATES COURTS, KANSAS CITY, KANS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House, with amendments of the Senate, the bill (H. R. 7642) providing for the holding of terms of the circuit and district courts of the United States at Kansas City, Kans., and for other purposes.

The amendments of the Senate were read.

Mr. JENKINS. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

RECORD OF DEEDS, ETC., IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. LACEY. I call up the conference report on bill (S. 5678) providing for record of deeds and other conveyances and instruments of writing in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes. I ask that the reading of the conference report, which has been printed in the RECORD, be dispensed with, and that only the statement of the House conferees be read.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, I wish to ask whether all the conferees have signed this report.

Mr. LACEY. They have. It is a unanimous report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the statement only will be read.

The statement of the conferees was read, as follows:

The effect of this agreement is to accept the bill in the form in which it passed the Senate, defining the recording districts and places of record in Indian Territory.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5375) "providing for record of deeds and other conveyances and instruments of writing in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

J. S. SHERMAN,

JOHN F. LACEY,

JOHN S. LITTLE,

Managers on the part of the House.

WM. M. STEWART,

O. H. PLATT,

JAMES K. JONES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, the House bill on this subject authorized the judges of the courts to divide the Territory for the purpose of making registration districts. The Senate bill specified the divisions of the Territory. The House conferees yield and accept the Senate bill, thereby agreeing to the divisions as embraced in that bill.

The question being taken, the report of the committee of conference was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LACEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering House bill No. 17202, known as the sundry civil appropriation bill. Pending that motion, I will ask the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] whether we can not now make some arrangement as to the duration of the general debate.

Mr. McRAE. I think we on this side can agree to accept an hour, as I have applications for only a part of that time.

Mr. CANNON. Then I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill close in not exceeding two hours. I think I shall not want an hour for myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that general debate on the sundry civil appropriation bill in Committee of the Whole be closed in not exceeding two hours. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The motion of Mr. CANNON was then agreed to; and accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. TAWNEY in the chair) and proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17202) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

There was no objection; and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will detain the Committee of the Whole for only a few minutes touching this bill and some matters of especial interest to the committee and the House, to which I wish to call attention.

This bill is accompanied by Report No. 3427, which explains the bill, its new provisions, and its changes of existing law, where the same are recommended.

The bill by its recommendations carries in round numbers \$78,000,000 upon estimates of \$80,000,000, the recommendations being \$8,000,000 less than the regular and supplemental estimates, and \$17,000,000 in round numbers more than the appropriations for the current fiscal year.

The increases in the bill over current law are referred to in the report; and the merit of the same will no doubt be explained and debated, paragraph by paragraph, under the five-minute rule as we proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Your committee have put much labor upon the preparation of this bill and feel that, complying with legislation over which

they have no control—touching rivers and harbors, touching public buildings, touching light-houses and life-saving stations, and all along the line of public service—we could not recommend less than we have recommended from the standpoint of existing legislation and sound public policy. We have failed to recommend here and there appropriations that Congress has power to make under the rules of the House and the Senate upon general bills, because, in the judgment of the committee, appropriations here and there ought not to be made to the full limit proposed by the estimates.

Now, without further discussion of the bill, I crave the attention of the House to amendments that have been discussed by the Appropriations Committee, and which have been investigated at the last session and the present session of Congress; and while we have not reported in this bill items covering the matters to which I shall refer, I have it in mind—I think with the approval substantially of the committee, and certainly of my own judgment—to move at the appropriate places the items to which I now desire to call attention.

Mr. Chairman, the progress of the Republic is wonderful. If we stop to think about it, it overwhelms the individual and all of us. I am not an old man—I fancy I am not—but it is within my recollection as a boy, after I had begun to take some notice of public affairs as they were referred to in the few newspapers that we had away back in 1850, as a lad of 14, reading that Congress had authorized the extension of the Capitol building; then year after year progress was reported on the Dome, this wing, the other wing, and finally, as I recollect, there was substantial completion—not full completion—along in the early sixties, when my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] presided over the House.

Mr. GROW. We did not have any roof on.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says that no roof was on. He will recollect with more accuracy than myself as to when the two wings of the Capitol were occupied. But at the time the extension of this Capitol was determined upon we had 23,000,000 people in the United States, 30 States—a population of 23,191,876, to be exact. The membership of the House, including Delegates, was 173. Each Representative represented 134,000 people. There were 36 committees of the House. The minimum membership of any committee was 3 and the maximum 9. The number of States represented in Congress was 31. In 1900 the population of the country was 76,000,000 plus. The membership of the next House, the Fifty-eighth Congress, will be 389, as against 173 a half century ago. Each Representative will represent 190,000 people. There are now 45 committees of the present House, as against 31 of the House of half a century ago. The minimum membership of the committee is 5 and the maximum 17, as against 9 of a half century ago.

The number of States now represented in Congress is 45. I don't know that it is necessary for me to say more touching the increase of population and the growth of the country, a country that had within its boundary and its institutions the material for everlasting differences and contention ripening ten years later in civil war—the greatest war, the most expensive war in blood and treasure, the most heroic war that was ever waged in the history of the race, involving an expenditure of \$8,000,000,000 and a resulting expenditure in a pension roll of \$140,000,000 a year. And the end is not yet.

To-day we have a reunited country with material progress such as it has never experienced before, such as the world never before saw. Then we had the great unsettled West, what is now the Middle West and what is now the West, reaching out to the Pacific coast, an unknown country, presumed at that time to be of but little value, a land of desert, of wild beasts and wild men, abounding substantially in agriculture alone, not much of railroads, not much of river and harbor accommodations, not much of improvements of inland navigation—not necessary. Then we had Chicago, with 50,000 people, minus; now it is a city of nearly two million. New York had a comparatively small population; Cincinnati less than a hundred thousand. Nothing at San Francisco, while the thousands of prosperous villages that reach out along 200,000 miles of railway, trading places as they are, with elevators and factories, were not.

Mr. Chairman, no prophet could have foretold what has happened in that half century.

Now, to the gratification of all of us, however we may throw words and sentences back and forth for partisan advantage, which I do not deplore, because ours is a government through parties, after we have fought our partisan fight, there is no man in the House upon either side who is not glad and glories in the growth and greatness of his country, its material prosperity, its intellectual wealth. Without boasting, no population on earth can equal it. We are first in agriculture still, but in diversification of industry, through the enterprise and the industry and the cunning and the judicious use of capital, sometimes, perhaps, in-

judicious it appears as we try to solve some of the problems that present themselves, we leap forward in competition with all the world until this country of ours to-day, for capital, is many, many, many billions of dollars ahead of any nation on earth; and while we remain first in agriculture, as far as manufactures are concerned we have, by virtue of the skill of our people, an annual product more than equal to the combined product of Great Britain and France and Italy and Austria.

Now, I have thought proper, as an American citizen and as a member of the House of Representatives, to speak of this material condition, because in almost thirty years of public service I have seen the country grow. Here we have our Capitol, everybody proud of it, this great building of wonderful architecture, beauty, and excellence—we are proud to say, perhaps, the best capitol building on earth, everything considered. Yet, Congress by Congress and decade by decade, with the increase of members, it becomes more and more insufficient for the purposes of the Congress of the United States, enlarged as it has become in the legislation and the business of the whole country.

I never have been an advocate of extravagant expenditures. I have always believed that enough was as good as a feast. Yet, in common with every other member, from one Congress to another, I have had the feeling that something ought to be done to enable the people's representatives especially, because we are the large body, as well as the popular body, to be better equipped in the Capitol and about the Capitol for the transaction of our legislative duties. [Applause.] The salary of a member of Congress is the same now that it was some time ago, a little less by twenty-five hundred dollars a year than it was when I entered Congress thirty years ago. Five thousand dollars is a large sum; yes. I have always lived at a hotel. I have never been able to keep house, I felt, in justice to myself and my family, because that meant entertainment. It meant expenditures for rent, in the absence of money to buy a house. It meant living in the house, and if you did as others did who keep house, economical though you might be, without frills, it meant the taking of from three to five thousand dollars of the salary, and then living in a very plain way, quite as plain as we would in our respective homes where our citizenship is.

But I do not desire further to refer to the pay of members. I wish to say that, owing to the increase of the price of living and the increase in the duties of a member of Congress—which I think I can safely say, from personal experience for thirty years, have been multiplied at least by three—it becomes necessary to live somewhere, in a leased house or an old house, or at a hotel or a boarding house, and it becomes necessary for every member of Congress, in the performance of his business as he ought to, in justice to his constituents, to have, outside of the place where he sleeps and receives friends in a modest room or little parlor, an office—a place to put the help, a place to put his papers. Many members for many years have complained, "Why, I have to go here or there and lease an office. My constituents do not find me when they come, unless they find me at the House of Representatives or at my home. Why can not something be done," they say, "to enable Representatives in Congress, in the performance of their official duty, to be found by their constituents?"

Now, your committee have given that matter investigation, and in connection with the investigation they have been assisted by the Superintendent of the Capitol, a most praiseworthy, honorable, vigilant, competent official, with the knowledge that a first-class architect ought to have and the common sense and practicability that few architects do have. He serves this House; and the committee on Appropriations set him to work over a year ago, and he investigated touching the cost of an office building that would accommodate the House.

It will be seen at once that an office building ought to be in the vicinity of the Capitol. You can not put it on this reservation without doing injustice to the architecture of the Capitol, and what is it—the perspective? My friend from Missouri [Mr. BENTON], who is an authority on the subject, nods his head, and I know I am right always when he does that. [Laughter.] So that it has necessarily to go off of this reservation.

Now, the Architect of the Capitol, in making his investigations under the consultation of the committee, concludes, and I think rightly so, that if an office building is constructed for committee rooms and offices for Representatives for official purposes, it ought to be somewhere on one of four blocks, commencing on this one toward which I point, which I will describe as the Congressional Hotel block, or the next one or the one that runs down to the corner where the cars turn as we begin to ascend the hill. You could not have it at the other end very well, north of the Senate, because that would not be convenient for us. You could not properly go farther away, either east or west, because it ought to be convenient to the Hall of the House of Representatives, and, in my judgment, from any of the four locations of which I have spoken it ought to be connected with this Capitol by a subway.

Now, this report was made in the last Congress. The Superintendent of the Capitol proposes three plans. The committee that investigated this matter believe that neither the lowest nor the highest one should be taken, but the one between; and devoting myself to that plan I will say that it is believed that a site can be procured at the outside for \$750,000. It is believed that it can be procured for half a million dollars; but as the appropriation, in the event it is authorized, must be sufficient to cover the cost of condemnation, to enable the proceedings to be effective, we put in not exceeding \$750,000 for a site and to begin building.

That plan requires an area of 81,500 square feet. I believe there are 43,000 square feet in an acre, so that it is a little less than 2 acres. If constructed on either of the large squares which I have just referred to, this requirement could be met with proper distance surroundings. The building would have a floor space of more than 136,000 square feet. It would be three stories high, with a subbasement. It would contain 96 rooms on each floor, and allowing for storage and heating purposes in the subbasement, will afford from 374 to 410 available rooms. I do not mean including that, but allowing for that there would be that many rooms left, 374 to 410. The subbasement would be well lighted by courts and suitable for storage purposes. The size of the office rooms would average 17 by 20 feet. Assuming that all materials can be contracted for and delivered promptly, it is believed the building can be finished in about two and one-half years after acquisition of site. It can be connected with the Capitol by a tunnel. Let the question of outside finish, whether to be of marble or granite, be settled by the proposed commission. These are little memoranda that I made from the report. Now, a building in the locality referred to should be a building that would fairly correspond with the Capitol in appearance. You can not put a cheap-John building there. It is right here at the Capitol.

This building can be completed with architecture that fairly corresponds with the Capitol—such as it ought to be—and with granite or marble finish, with 400 rooms for committee rooms and offices for official purposes with room for heating, if thought wise, subsequently to furnish the electricity for lighting and the steam to heat this Capitol as well, with a subbasement that would be sufficient for the folding room and the document room of the House. If any gentleman wants to know whether the books in our present document room ought to be placed somewhere else, and whether the room that is now occupied is fit for that purpose, just let him wander down there with or without a candle. He will need a candle in some places and will not need it in other, if he wanders down through the rooms.

Here, with rooms well designed and ventilated, with 400 rooms for committee rooms and offices, room for the document room, and large enough, if the Senate wanted to be accommodated, for the Senate, and accommodate it as well as the House for a document room. Now, that building, all complete, heating and light, and of the kind that I have described, to correspond, as it ought to, with the Capitol, can be built for \$3,000,000. I am informed, covering the court and all, about 2 acres of land. In addition to that, the site would have to be bought, for, I believe, about a half a million dollars, although we will propose \$750,000, so as to cover it. Now, so much for the office building.

Mr. WATSON. That is \$3,000,000 for the office building alone?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. BOWIE. Is that in this bill?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman that the bill does not contain this provision. I believe the Committee on Appropriations are substantially in favor of it; and I will be entirely frank with the House, I think we would have reported it had it not been that it is perfectly evident to everybody that it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you allow us to move to suspend the rules? [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Well, I am going to say that, after thinking the matter over thoroughly, I believe the consensus of opinion on both sides of the House favors the construction of such a building [applause] and I will move at the proper place in the bill to insert the provision to authorize it. [Applause.] I should be very glad if we take it up by unanimous consent. If somebody else had made the motion, I would not have felt at liberty to make the point of order, although I do make them, have got to do so in justice to the House, and make them substantially all along the line. But this is a matter that runs to the comfort of all the members and affects their efficiency as Representatives. Therefore I would be glad to take the opinion of the Committee of the Whole upon it, and shall be glad if it passes upon the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I did not hear all the gentleman's remarks, but indorse the latter part of them. I ask him

if this building should be alone for the use of the House of Representatives?

Mr. CANNON. The office building? Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman give his assurance that the Senate will not claim an interest in it?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman that we will specify that this is for the House. The Senate is a small body of 90, holding near one-half of this Capitol, the Supreme Court having a little room and space, and the Maltby Building, which was bought for the use of the Senate and is fairly well cared for. Then, too, if the House asks that an appropriation be made for an office building for its use, under the practice that obtains between the House and Senate, that whatever goes to the comfort and efficiency of the two bodies, respectively, lies in the discretion of the respective bodies, I do not think there will be any trouble.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. What assurance can the gentleman give us that the building will be ready for use and occupation in the political lifetime of the present members?

Mr. CANNON. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I stated it while he was out. It is understood that the title can be obtained in five months. Now, the Architect of the Capitol states that from the time the title is obtained, with authority to contract, that the building can be completed in two years and a half.

Now, then, I want to drop that and go to one other matter that I have in mind to offer for the consideration of the House. The Capitol building, the extension was designed by Mr. Walters, who died many years ago. You know what it is. It was never completed. The eastern projection, the size of which I will give you, by the original plan, was never built.

I will just read it. For proposed extension of the Capitol as authorized it will make a total of 108 feet. That is on the east of the old building to the wall of the extension; giving an addition of 352 feet north and south, with not less than 66 rooms, 33 for each House. It will also add to the floor space of the building, 65,247 square feet. If accommodations for the Supreme Court room are provided in this proposed extension, the number of rooms available added will be reduced to 55, instead of 66. Further, the size of these rooms will be about that of the room of the Committee on Appropriations, about 25 by 28 feet, corresponding to the rooms now in the House wing of the building.

The central extension would have 55 feet beyond the wall line of the present wing. Now, gentlemen will notice that the western extension has lately been put into committee rooms for the House and Senate. That was completed according to the original design. The corresponding extension on the east was never built. If gentlemen want to verify—if it needs any verification—if you will go out and look at the Dome on the east side, looking at the main wall of the building, you will see that the Dome extends 9 or 10 feet beyond the main wall to the east.

The whole plans are in existence. There is a drawing, which I do not care to bring in here, that was made by Mr. Walters when the original design was made, with complete plans in every respect for the extension of the building.

Now, I submit that the time has come, not only for an office building for the House, but for the completion of this Capitol. [Applause.] It will cost two and one-half million dollars to complete it. It can be completed in about the same time that it will take to build and complete the office building. If larger and increased room is wanted for the Senate, with or without the Maltby Building, it will give the Senate all the rooms that it will ever need. Because while this body will increase as the population increases, we have pretty nearly reached the limit as to the number of States of the Union. It would add to the architectural effect. It would give us the much-needed room for the transaction of business. But, say some, it costs a good deal. Yes; but, gentlemen, these new wings cost \$8,000,000; and let me tell you something: The intelligent and patriotic and industrious service by every Congress for two years, well equipped from every standpoint and with every aid, would more than save the cost of the Capitol extension and the office building in appropriate legislation and appropriate legislation for the public service.

So it is really economy instead of extravagance. Now, in my judgment, a provision to finish the Capitol according to the original design would probably not be subject to a point of order. I have it in mind that this is the proper place in this bill to move an appropriation to commence with that work and authorize it by contract, because, as the gentleman from Tennessee asked, "How long will it take?" We want it in this life, and we can not build—build as fast as we can, we can not more than half keep up with the increase in population. A large expenditure? Yes; about three and one-half million, four million, six million dollars. Now, let us build the office building and put in the heating apparatus for the Capitol in the new office building, put in the mains that bring the heat and the steam and the electricity to this Capitol, clean out the old document room and get rid of the smells and

the foul ventilation that is offensive to everybody, our constituents as well as others, have the Capitol as it ought to be, a clean, healthy place with room enough in which to transact the public business, and do it as citizens do who transact much less business than we do on their motion, and be prepared for it.

Have we the money? Yes. I think this is the time for action. In my judgment, if action is not had at this session of Congress it is liable to go over a decade and possibly longer than that, and we go crippling along with our insufficient surroundings. We have got a very considerable surplus in the Treasury. You can prove by me that there are a great many people in the United States that want to relieve the Treasury of that surplus. [Laughter.] There is the river and harbor bill, the public buildings bill, in the main well done. But once in a while there is an unwise appropriation, but in the main pretty well held in hand. In the main the appropriations not justified are denied. But in my judgment, having the money and the wherewithal for these amendments, if they are adopted and enacted into law, no better expenditure of \$6,000,000 in the next two and a half years can be made than would be covered by these amendments. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has sixteen minutes remaining.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I have very little criticism of the pending bill. It is exceptionally free from new legislation. It does not abound with increases of salaries for new offices. I believe it has no increases of salaries nor any new offices at all—no new legislation that is not beneficial, and none except along the lines of proper limitation upon expenditures.

There is one paragraph in the bill to which I will call attention, not for the purpose of adverse criticism, but in order that the committee may understand that the paragraph is here, and why. I refer to the paragraph which seeks to give \$3,000,000 to relieve distress in the Philippines. I regret that it is necessary that we should make this appropriation, but it is a necessary result of the policy that we have adopted for these new possessions. Without regard to whether this country should have been annexed, these people are a part of our country and entitled to the protection of our flag, and it is as much our duty to relieve distress there as in any part of our country. We have many precedents for such appropriations.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct the gentleman's attention to the subject adverted to by him on page 111 of the bill. It is as follows:

Philippine Islands: For the relief of the distress in the Philippine Islands, to be expended under the direction and in the discretion of the Philippine government in such proportions as they deem wise, in the direct purchase and distribution or sale of farm implements, farm animals, supplies, and necessities of life, and through the employment of labor in the construction of government wagon roads, railroads, and other public works, to be immediately available, \$3,000,000.

I certainly join with the gentleman in the regret for the necessity that makes this appropriation in his judgment and in the judgment of the committee necessary. I would like to ask him what was the opinion of the committee as to the theory upon which this sum of three millions to be granted to the Philippine Islands. Was it upon the theory that the granting of this for relief of the distress was to prevent disorder and trouble there to the military of our Government, or is it upon the theory of a pure gratuity in the line of relieving distress?

Mr. McRAE. The hearing before the committee consists of course principally of the statement of the Secretary of War or those of his Department who are familiar with the facts, the Philippine Commission, and they are all agreed that the people are in distress. Thousands of them are dying from disease, many of them suffering for food and clothing, and the appropriation is here for the purpose of relieving the distress and caring for the sick.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. May I ask the gentleman how extensive the examinations of this committee were and how unanimous the evidence upon the proposition of the necessity for this large appropriation for the Philippine Islands?

Mr. McRAE. We have only one way of obtaining information from the Philippine Islands, which is through the Commission and the War Department. We have the statement of the Commission and the recommendation of the Secretary of War, and we accept those as true.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Is all the evidence in favor of it?

Mr. McRAE. Both concur in the statement that the distress exists and that the relief ought to be granted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I should like to ask the gentleman whether the hearings before the committee show the cause of this destitution?

Mr. McRAE. Sickness is the principal cause.

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend be willing to reserve the balance of his time and let me resume the floor and take the balance of my time? My colleague on the committee [Mr. GILLETT of

Massachusetts] has to leave the House. I should like to yield the remainder of my time to him and he would like to talk now.

Mr. McRAE. Yes; I will do that.

Mr. CANNON. Very well. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for sixteen minutes.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, that which entitles a member to a hearing in this House, on any subject, is long experience or long study of that subject, which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] so well exemplifies on this bill. I wish to impose a few remarks upon the committee from exactly the opposite ground, from the standpoint of a novice. I have just served my first term on the subcommittee framing one of these large appropriation bills, and I thought it would be pardonable to give to the House a few of the first impressions which the various hearings have produced on my mind. There were some of them quite startling.

I do not think I have any special disposition to be parsimonious in spending other people's money, and at the same time I think any member serving his first term on one of these subcommittees and listening to the hearings can not fail to be made conservative and to feel that the ordinary metaphor is seriously true which compares the public Treasury to a crib, to which innumerable applicants are constantly fighting for subsistence. And I am simply going to recount a few of the incidents in the hearings which especially surprised me, and which it seems to me would strike the House as extraordinary and instructive.

The first instance I will refer to is what seems to me an act of insubordination or disobedience, or perhaps it would be more fair to say indifference on the part of a great department to the command of Congress. In the last sundry civil bill Congress appropriated about \$1,000,000 for the construction of certain prescribed buildings. This year the gentlemen who had charge of that construction came before our committee and asked, I think, \$600,000 more for the completion of those very buildings for which the House last year appropriated over \$1,100,000. They were asked why it was that they had not observed the orders of Congress and built those buildings which we specified for \$1,100,000, and all they could say was that the money was not sufficient, that their plans were too large, and that they needed this \$600,000 more to complete what we ordered last year to be done for \$1,000,000. They had commenced on too grand a scale and had not been willing to reduce their expensive plans to the limitation imposed by Congress.

Now, what were we to do? We could not deny this appropriation, for here were the buildings, which were useless unless completed. We have no power over these officers, because we did not appoint them and we can not remove them, and if we should refuse to make this appropriation they would not be the sufferers, but the sufferers would be the innocent people for whom these buildings were planned. So we could simply do again what we did last year; that is, say that certain buildings should be erected for this money, and then wait and see whether in the next Congress they will again disobey our mandate and use up this \$600,000 and still ask for more.

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

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. MAHON. Why did you not put it in your bill that the money shall not be used for any other purpose?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. It was put in the bill last year. It was specified that they should build a certain number of buildings, and they did not do it, because they started with such expensive plans that the money would not hold out. They ought, of course, to have changed to simpler plans. What can we do? How can we punish them? Whether that exemplifies a whole series of smaller acts which are constantly going on under the different departments, evading the purpose of Congress, I do not know, but I confess when there is one such glaring offense of this kind, involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, I can but suspect that in small ways there may be many appropriations we make which are diverted from their intended purpose.

Another case similar to this came before us. An appropriation was asked for of, I think, \$20,000 or \$30,000 to put in elevators in a building which was just finished. We asked, "Was not that elevator provided for in your plans of the building?" "Certainly." "Why did you not put it in?" "There was not money enough." "Why did you not make your plans so that the money appropriated would complete them?" There could be no answer. Of course the purpose was to make the building a little better than they could for the sum Congress appropriated and then trust to the good nature of subsequent Congresses to supply the deficiencies they left.

I understand that in some States there are laws making it a crime for an officer to exceed the authorized expenditures. I

incline to think it would have a very beneficial effect here. I know of one case, not in this bill, where Congress appropriated \$20,000 to build a couple of houses, just alike. The Government official who had control of the building advertised for bids. He could not get anybody to build the two houses for less than \$21,000 or \$22,000. What did he do? Did he revise the architect's plans and make smaller buildings, to conform to the purpose of Congress? Oh, no; not at all. He wanted these particular buildings. So, inasmuch as no contractor would build them for \$20,000, he went on and said: "I will build them by the day," regardless, apparently, of the limitation.

He went on by day labor and built one building, and by the time it was finished had spent about \$15,000, and then he used up the rest of the \$20,000 on the other building, and diverted to it some appropriations which belonged to an entirely different department; and then, when he found he could not finish the other building, even with that assistance, he came back to Congress, and we gave him an amount sufficient to complete the two buildings at an expense of about \$25,000, I think. I do not know how common such systematic violations of our laws are, and I do not think this House is aware of them, and it is well that these extreme cases should come to your attention.

Now, these are cases of plain violation of our laws. There is another series of cases that is quite different, and that is the tendency of departments to come before Congress and get all the money they can, without any apparent thought of economy. One is a case before us in this bill. There is an appropriation for \$2,000,000 for Army barracks. There was a similar appropriation last year, I think. There is an appropriation of about the same size in the Army bill of this year, and I believe was last year. I find our Army to be provided with barracks consists of about 57,000; about 20,000 of these are in the Philippines, leaving about 37,000 men in this country. About 14,000 of these are in the coast artillery, which leaves about 23,000 men in this country outside of the coast artillery. Yet the officers in the War Department report to us that there are barracks to-day in this country, outside of the coast artillery, for 31,000 men; and yet they want \$4,000,000 more for barracks.

Now, undoubtedly many of these barracks are old and could be vastly improved. They have not the modern conveniences, and yet I question very much if, when we have existing barracks for 31,000, we ought to go on, when we have only an Army of 23,000 who need them, and spend millions of dollars every year providing new barracks. I found that one of these cases was right here at the Washington Barracks, and I thought I would go down and see what was being done. There is where they are going to build the new War College, which the present administration of the Army is so much interested in. I suppose each administration gets interested along different lines. I have no doubt that a War College is a most admirable institution; but perhaps a few years from now the administration of the Army will not care much about a War College and will be pursuing some new fad. But just now the War College is greatly in favor, and so I find they have gone down here to this point of land on the Potomac, where there are now barracks and officers' quarters for the engineers, and have decided to put this War College there.

There was apparently plenty of land for them at this end of the yard. The barracks and officers' quarters now occupy the extreme southern end of the point of land, and there is a large portion of land between there and the entrance, which is unoccupied; and naturally you would think that if they were going to put the War College there, they would put it at this end on the unoccupied ground. But no, they go down there and decide the War College must go where the ground is all covered with barracks and officers' quarters, and that they are going to raze to the ground all the present barracks and officers' quarters and make a new open field and put up their buildings for a War College. Then they are going to put up new barracks and new officers' quarters for the engineers at this end of the grounds now vacant.

I have no doubt the present officers' quarters and barracks are old and have not modern improvements. I suspect they are about as good as the men and officers would have in civil life, and I expect they would live fairly well as they are. And it looks to me like an instance where the Department, with undoubtedly the purest intentions and highest purpose, entirely disregards economy and only studies to get the very best results for themselves without regard to expense. They are going to tear down an army hospital only ten years old, apparently doing very good service, in order to carry out the wholesale plan of obliterating everything there and building up anew, and then they want several hundred thousand dollars from us for a new hospital to take its place.

There is another whole series of expenditures which attracted my attention, the appropriations for the Geological Survey and the Smithsonian Museum. I confess it does not seem to me that it is wise for this National Government to spend money simply for scientific researches which do not promise any direct material

advantage. I should think gentlemen on the other side of the House might think it was unconstitutional for the Government to spend money for scientific research. At any rate, I think it is not wise and not the part or purpose of this Government to be spending money purely for scientific and educational purposes. We have a great Museum there.

That Museum seems to be of great interest to all of the people of the United States who come to the capital, and ought to be continued and kept up, and I think it ought to have a new building and be handsomely housed, but I do not see why it should cost \$170,000 a year simply to take care of that Museum.

Then we appropriate \$40,000 a year for investigations in ethnology. I have no doubt very learned results have been produced, of great value in that field of research, but I ask myself, Why should this Government be paying for it? There is, I believe, a theory that this money is spent to instruct Congress, and particularly the Indian Affairs Committee, how we should treat the Indians, but I doubt if members get their inspirations for that legislation from this department, and certainly the success of our legislation does not testify to its value. But however valuable it may be to the scholar, I do not think it is a proper object for Government support.

Then we appropriate \$10,000 each year for studies in paleontology. Why should we study that? How does paleontology interest the Government of the United States? It means, I believe, a study of fossils. Now, if they would study the numerous fossils connected with the Government, and find out some way to eradicate them, I would make no criticism. [Laughter and applause.] But to spend \$10,000 supporting some learned and excellent men in the study of fossils out in our West seems to me wrong. But it has gone on year after year and has become a regular practice.

There is another appropriation of \$15,000 for astrophysical researches, or the effect of the sun on the earth. I have no doubt that it, too, is a most desirable result to have accomplished somewhere, but I do not see why the United States Government should appropriate money to carry it on. A most learned, and accomplished, and genial, and delightful gentleman is in charge of it, one whom we are all proud to see connected with the Government, and yet it seems to me the purpose of this Government is not to make these discoveries. We had a request for \$25,000 for a collection of butterflies, which I have no doubt would still more adorn the collections of the Museum. I do not think we ought to spend much money to make these collections scientifically complete. They interest the public; let us keep it interesting and not try to make it scientifically perfect.

Now, the last Smithsonian report attracted my attention. I have no doubt it attracted the attention of every member, if you had as many letters from constituents asking for it as I have. I understand the reason was that soon after it was issued there appeared in the press all over the country a uniform and highly complimentary notice of that report, suggesting that we could furnish it on request, which brought to us all many more applications than we could comply with. I looked at the report, and I find that the report proper of the Director occupies 52 pages. Next come 100 pages of appendices, which relate to the business of the office. Then follow 600 pages of miscellaneous articles, reprinted from magazines and newspapers, profusely illustrated. This document is published by the Smithsonian Museum as a Government document. I do not think the publication of such books is a proper use of the privilege of the Institution. I do not think that this is any proper part of their report. I do not think it ought to be printed and distributed at public expense. It is undoubtedly interesting to our constituents. I notice, for instance, one article—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate may be extended for twenty minutes on each side. There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], reserving one minute.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I only want a few minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. Take all the time you want. I have no other applications for time.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. This one article that attracted my attention was an article by Fournier, automobilist, giving an interesting account of the automobile races from Paris to Berlin. This is profusely illustrated by pictures of automobiles with the crowds along the way. What has that to do with our Smithsonian Institution or with the advancement of science? It seems to me all this ought to be struck out. It is interesting, of course, because it has all been printed in magazines, etc., before and has been tested. But it is not a proper part of a Smithsonian report, and I think such publications are an abuse.

In this way my attention has been attracted to various reports

which exemplify another abuse, the profuse indulgence in illustration, which ought to be stopped. For instance, here are the annual reports of the various Territories, and the one feature of them which I think is growing to be an abuse consists in the illustrations which they contain. I can not stop to describe the numerous pictures, but here are one or two. Here is the report of the Territory of Alaska, in which I find one illustration entitled "The Eskimo haymakers at Unalaska." It is a picture of 15 or 20 men with scythes, rakes, etc.—not particularly different from any other haymakers, but the picture tends, perhaps, to make up an interesting report. Sprinkled all through the report are illustrations—photographs, expensive, of course—absolutely useless, except to attract the eye and make the report, if possible, entertaining. Whether they succeed in that respect or not, they certainly make it expensive.

Here in the report from the Territory of Oklahoma is a group entitled "Picking cherries on an Oklahoma fruit ranch." It is a picture of some good-looking young women on ladders—such a group as you might see not only in Oklahoma, but in any other Territory or in any State of the United States.

In the report from the Territory of Hawaii I find a large-sized picture of a beautiful girl, and it is entitled "Hawaiian woman." This is gotten up at Government expense, with the object, doubtless, of attracting attention to Hawaii, and if this were a fair specimen of Hawaiian women I have no doubt it would stimulate a large immigration of young men.

Then, here in the report from the governor of New Mexico I find one picture entitled "Normal school basket-ball team, Silver City, 1901." It is a picture of a group of about a dozen plump and comely young women in bloomers; it is the great basket-ball team! I suppose the object is to show us that the West is rivaling the effete East in modern civilization, and that those people are well entitled to admission into the Union. Next year I presume we shall have pictured in this way the football team of the normal school, and then there can be no question of her title to statehood.

Now, here is a document which possibly some of you gentlemen have seen—the report of the Boundary Commission upon the boundary between the United States and Mexico. It is a beautiful album, containing nothing but a series of photographs—large photographs on handsome paper—making an elegant book. When you come to look at it you find that the first picture is of Boundary Stone Marked No. 1, and the next is Boundary Stone Marked No. 2, and so it goes on till the last, where we find Boundary Stone Marked No. 258. There is a separate photograph of each one of these boundary stones between the United States and Mexico. They have tried to make this interesting by putting in the mountains in the background, sometimes in one direction, sometimes in another; here they have the picture of a cactus tree, and here is a group of farmers; here [is] a horse; there is a cow. They tried to make variety, but the whole collection is simply a series of pictures of boundary stones. They might just as well have gotten up a series of pictures of the milestones along the Pennsylvania Railroad or the gravestones at Arlington Cemetery, decorated by an artist with a few accompanying objects. It must have cost thousands of dollars to make simply the photographic plates for this publication.

This publication you will be surprised to learn, emanates from that seat of economy and frugality and unselfishness—the United States Senate; it is printed as a Senate document. That particular abuse of course we can not check, but I think there ought to be some committee with the power to act as censors over the public printing and to cut out these useless, if ornamental, photographs, to restrict our printing to what it naturally should be. I must admit that the departments have large excuse for extravagant printing when they look at the printing of Congress. I presume the Smithsonian director would say, and say very truly, "My report is infinitely more interesting and useful than most of the reports of Congress which you are constantly publishing."

I will admit the truth of that retort. We are just as much to blame as they are. There ought to be in Congress some committee which should see to it that our reports are not printed as they are now—everything, either valuable or useless, of the same amount and of the same variety and same number—but that they ought to be in some way checked and prevented.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will my friend permit a question?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman not think that the grossest abuse in the matter of printing is permitting an extension of remarks in the RECORD and permitting members of Congress to print long speeches that were never delivered on the floor of the House, and to which every gentleman gives his consent?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I do not. I differ from the gentleman there. I think that probably nine-tenths of the speeches delivered here—and I suppose the gentleman from Illinois will say that mine should be included among the rest—were better printed than delivered.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; I would never make that remark about any of the gentleman's speeches.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. But I really think that the rule of allowing speeches to be printed is a great refuge, that it saves the time of this House and accomplishes just as much as if they were orally delivered. It seems to me that where the great abuses creep in are in these enormous numbers of documents which are filling up the whole Capitol and which I am sure are encumbering us very much to know what constituent would ever look at them, and which are, most of them, absolutely wasted. That is an enormous expense to the Government.

It seems to me that the whole subject of printing is one that requires investigation. I was particularly struck, when the Public Printer was before us, to find that here is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, one of the largest newspapers in the country, published daily, and yet there is not a typesetting machine in the whole Government Printing Office, with its splendid new building and modern equipment. It is all done by hand as it was years ago, whereas, I suppose, every other enterprising paper in the United States has these time-saving machines. Whether the public printing is as expensive or economical as we generally hear, I do not know. It is a subject much discussed and which, I think, ought to be investigated. It was called to my attention within a few days by another incident. A gentleman who was a member of one of the departments of the Government showed me two blank books and asked me if I could tell which was the better. I could not see much difference between the two. He replied that if he ordered one of them he could get it in the public market for 30 cents, and the other one would cost at the Government Printing Office \$1.40.

Now, I have an impression that almost all Government business is transacted at about double the expense that it would be outside, but I did not suppose that any department of the Government was compelled to pay from four to five times as much as outside. That may be a mistake. There may be a vital difference in the two books which I did not see, but it corroborated to some extent much of the gossip which we hear about the expense of that department of the Government. Now, I wish to say, before sitting down, that most of these expenses of the departments, the scientific departments in particular, are not due to any malfeasance on their part or to any ill intentions on their part; are not due, perhaps, to extravagance. It is simply due to the fact that they are enthusiastic in their departments; that they see great possibilities which they can accomplish; that they see great advances to science and culture and civilization, and doubtless think we are sordid in demanding material returns for our money.

That enthusiasm is most commendable. It is only by such enthusiasm for this work that any department can be successfully carried on, and we can not expect that they will stint themselves when their imaginations see such possibilities, but it is for us, when they come to the question of appropriation, to look at it in the cold light of taxation and not to allow the enthusiasm of any department to run away with us. It is for us, looking at all the different departments of the Government, to say how much shall be given to each one and to try to make each appropriation commensurate with the results which are the best for the Government, and that is what the different departments do not do and probably can not be expected to do. That is probably what, owing to the constitution of humanity, we would not even want them to do. Therefore what this House ought to do, it seems to me, is to carefully scrutinize and suspect the estimates that come in, and ruthlessly cut them if we think they ought to be cut.

I suppose I ought not to reveal anything that goes on in a committee, but I think it is no betrayal of confidence to say that not once in all the framing of this bill was it suggested in the committee that there was any danger that any one item which we passed would be cut down by the House. The only danger in considering any item was whether the House might not make it larger. I think each member is too apt to look at his own particular district and wishes and not to weigh what the country as a whole requires.

Now, I thought before I had become petrified on the committee by service, before I had gotten quite accustomed to distributing \$80,000,000 in a few days and throwing a hundred thousand dollars here and there, I would express the effect which is produced on me by hearing this testimony. I wish that the House could give more minute attention to it and observe how the different departments are each enthusiastically grasping for what money they can get, and then consider whether it is not the duty of this House to carefully retrench these annual expenditures. [Applause.]

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to a matter which affects the western boundary of the State of Arkansas—a question recently brought to the attention of the public by the passage of a concurrent resolution through the general assembly

of the State of Arkansas. The claim is that Arkansas is entitled to a strip off of the east side of the Indian Territory 40 miles wide. In order that all of the facts as to why this strip of territory was attached to Arkansas Territory and how it was given to the Indians may be fully understood by Congress, by the people of Arkansas, by the people of the Indian Territory, and by others who may be interested, I desire to call attention to certain statutes and treaties relating to the organization of the Territories of Louisiana, Orleans, Missouri, and Arkansas, and affecting the boundaries of Arkansas, both as a Territory and State.

The act of March 20, 1804, provided for the organization of two Territories in Louisiana Territory, acquired from France, one to be called Orleans and the other the Territory of Louisiana.

SECTION 1. That all that portion of country ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies south of the Mississippi Territory, and of an east and west line to commence on the Mississippi River, at the thirty-third degree of north latitude, and to extend west to the western boundary of the said cession, shall constitute a Territory of the United States under the name of the Territory of Orleans.

SEC. 12. The residue of the province of Louisiana, ceded to the United States, shall be called the district of Louisiana. (2 Stat., 283.)

The act of June 4, 1814, provides:

That the Territory heretofore called Louisiana shall hereafter be called Missouri. (2 Stat., 743.)

The first section of the act of March 2, 1819, provided for the establishment of a separate Territorial government for the southern part of the Territory of Missouri, to be known as Arkansas Territory, and I call attention to the fact that in this act the name is "Arkansaw," not "Arkansas."

That from and after the 4th day of July next all that part of the Territory of Missouri which lies south of a line beginning on the Mississippi River, at 36° north latitude, running thence west to the river St. Francis, thence up the same to 36° 30' north latitude, and thence west to the western Territorial boundary line, shall, for the purposes of a Territorial government, constitute a separate Territory and be called the Arkansaw Territory. (3 Stat., 493.)

By the act of March 6, 1820, the State of Missouri was admitted into the Union with the following boundary:

That the said State shall consist of all the territory included within the following boundaries, to wit: Beginning at the middle of the Mississippi River on the parallel of 36° north latitude; thence west along that parallel of latitude to the St. Francois River; thence up and following the course of that river, in the middle of the main channel thereof, to the parallel of latitude of 36° 30'; thence west along the same to a point where the said parallel is intersected by a meridian line passing through the middle of the mouth of the Kansas River where the same empties into the Missouri River; thence from the point aforesaid north along the said meridian line to the intersection of the parallel of latitude which passes through the rapids of the river Des Moines, making the said line correspond with the Indian boundary line; thence east from the point of intersection last aforesaid along the said parallel of latitude to the middle of the channel of the main fork of the said river Des Moines; thence down and along the middle of the main channel of the said river Des Moines to the mouth of the same where it empties into the Mississippi River; thence due east to the middle of the main channel of the Mississippi River; thence down and following the course of the Mississippi River, in the middle of the main channel thereof, to the place of beginning. (3 Stat., 545.)

The act of May 26, 1824, is the one to which I especially wish to call attention, because that is the one which extended the western boundary of the territory of the State of Arkansas 40 miles west:

That the western boundary line of the Territory of Arkansas shall begin at a point 40 miles west of the southwest corner of the State of Missouri, and run south to the right bank of the Red River, and thence down the river and with the Mexican boundary to the line of the State of Louisiana, any law heretofore made to the contrary notwithstanding. (4 Stat., 40.)

This extension was supported in the United States Senate by the distinguished Senator from the State of Missouri, Mr. Benton, and passed that body with very little opposition. Mr. Benton argued that the proper national policy was to make Arkansas strong—make her a first-class State, both for her own sake and that of the Union, and equal to all the exigencies of her advanced and frontier position. In the House the bill was advocated by Mr. Clay, who represented the hardships of the circumstances of the settlers. He said the new Territories were younger daughters of the common federative family and, as such, were entitled to an indulgent policy, and urged the policy of making Arkansas a strong State.

Mr. Conway, the Arkansas Delegate, remonstrated against 40,000 Indians turned in among the settlements of Arkansas to turn out those who had subdued the wilderness and were surrounded with improvements, the fruit of their own labor. He contended that the limits of the Territory should be removed farther to the west, to allow room for these Indians having a separate home from the whites and to give strength to Arkansas as a future frontier State.

This was a wise policy deliberately adopted, and it was a great misfortune to Arkansas when it was abandoned without the consent of her people or Congress.

I now refer to the treaty of Washington, made May 6, 1828, and found on page 311 of the seventh volume of Indian Treaties, which recklessly and unconstitutionally amputated the Territory in question:

ART. 1. The western boundary of Arkansas shall be, and the same is hereby, defined, viz: A line shall be run, commencing on Red River, at the

point where the Eastern Choctaw line strikes said river, and run due north with said line to the river Arkansas, thence in a direct line to the southwest corner of Missouri. (7 Treaties, 311.)

In discussing the binding effect of this treaty, Mr. Benton said:

The proper objects of treaties were international interests, which neither party could regulate by municipal law, and which required a joint consent and a double execution to give it effect. Tried by this test—

Said he—

and this Indian Territory lost its supremacy. The subject was one of ordinary legislation, and especially and exclusively confined to Congress. It was to repeal a law which Congress had made in relation to Territories, and to reverse the disposition which Congress had made of a part of its territory. To Congress it belonged to dispose of territory, and to her it belonged to repeal her own laws.

The law of May 26, 1824, has never been repealed by Congress, unless the treaty of 1828 had that effect. On the question of the expediency of the treaty, Mr. Benton said:

The in expediency of the treaty was in the question of crippling and mutilating Arkansas, reducing her to the class of weak States, and against all the reasons which had induced Congress for years before to add on 12,000 square miles to her domain, and to almost double the productive and inhabitable capacity of the Territory and future State by the character of the country added. I felt this wrong to Arkansas doubly, both as a neighbor to my own State and because, having a friendship for the Delegate as well as for his Territory, I had exerted myself to obtain the addition which had been thus cut off.

Thus crippled, mutilated, and shorn of a substantial part of her strength in the beginning of her Territorial life, it is not surprising that she has not at all times been "equal to all the exigencies of her advanced and frontier position." When we consider the fact that for eighty years she has had on her entire western border an unorganized Indian Territory, without government or law, and for most of the time the hiding place for criminals from all the States, it is no wonder that she has not increased in wealth and population as fast as other States with less natural resources.

With this unjust and illegal treatment on the part of the treaty-making power of the General Government, the people of Arkansas Territory naturally sought relief from Territorial servitude by securing statehood on any terms she could get it. Under the enabling act of June 15, 1836, she was admitted, but required to accept as her western boundary "the line described in the first article of the treaty between the United States and the Cherokee Nation." The following is the boundary, as described in that act, and which she was compelled to accept or remain a Territory and subject to still further reduction by treaty:

That the State of Arkansas shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever; and the said State shall consist of all the territory included within the following boundaries, to wit: Beginning in the middle of the main channel of the Mississippi River, on the parallel of 36° north latitude; running from thence west with the said parallel of latitude to the St. Francis River; thence up the middle of the main channel of said river to the parallel of 36° 30' north; from thence west to the southwest corner of the State of Missouri; and from thence to be bounded on the west, to the north bank of Red River, by the lines described in the first article of the treaty between the United States and the Cherokee Nation of Indians west of the Mississippi, made and concluded at the city of Washington on the 26th day of May, A. D. 1828, and to be bounded on the south side of Red River by the Mexican boundary line to the northwest corner of the State of Louisiana; thence east with the Louisiana State line to the middle of the main channel of the Mississippi River; thence up the middle of the main channel of the said river to the thirty-sixth degree of north latitude, the point of beginning. (5 Stat., 50.)

Having, however, accepted statehood, with the boundary fixed by the treaty of 1828, the State is estopped from asserting a legal claim to the territory in question. Yet, in view of the unjust and illegal method of wresting it from her, and considering the great injury inflicted upon the State by it, our people feel that they have a stronger and more equitable claim to it than any other State or Territory. They feel that Congress now has the opportunity and that it should right the wrong of 1828. The question of what shall be done with the Indian Territory is now being seriously considered by both branches of Congress. The political status of that country must soon be fixed by Congress. Treaties have been made, which provide for the abrogation of all Indian tribal governments in 1906. Various suggestions have been made for disposing of it. A Territorial government, single statehood for it and Oklahoma, and separate statehood for each, all have advocates, but none appear to satisfy both Congress and the people of the Territory.

I have lived all of my life in a district adjoining the Choctaw Nation, and from some acquaintance with them I am satisfied that a majority of the people of that country would be willing to be attached to Arkansas. The people of Arkansas would be glad to add to their State the whole of the Indian Territory, if in the wisdom of Congress it is thought best not to divide it. But whether the whole or a part is annexed, Arkansas promises the people who may come just and fair treatment under a system of laws not surpassed by any of her sister States.

We invite them to a State free from debt and one that is now entering upon an era of prosperity in agriculture, horticulture, manufacturing, mining, and railroad building unknown in the history of the State. The people of Arkansas are looking to the

future with hope and a resolution that insures success, but I earnestly desire to see her obtain at least the lands that once belonged to her so that she may become what Benton, Clay, and the other great men who aided in bringing her into the Union intended her to be—one of the greatest of the States of this great Union.

Mr. CANNON. How much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman used fourteen minutes of the twenty.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. There is a bill pending in the House, reported favorably and unanimously by the Committee on Indian Affairs, for the ratification of a treaty with the Rosebud Indians in South Dakota, ceding something over 400,000 acres of land in Gregory County and opening the same to entry and settlement under the provisions of the homestead law. It is a bill of great importance to the people of my State as well as to the Indians, and I hope that it may receive consideration and be passed during the session of this Congress.

The legislature of South Dakota unanimously passed a memorial to Congress urging the passage of this bill, and a copy of the same was transmitted to me by the secretary of state and duly certified, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Secretary's Office.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of South Dakota:

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 house joint resolution No. 7, passed by the legislature of 1903, 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 29th day of January, 1903.

[SEAL.] O. C. BERG, Secretary of State.

A joint resolution by the House and Senate of the eighth legislative assembly of the State of South Dakota memorializing the Congress of the United States to ratify the existing treaty with the Rosebud (Sioux) Indians for a cession of all that portion of their reservation lying in the county of Gregory, S. Dak., and praying that provisions be made for opening said tract to homestead settlement.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That whereas one James McLaughlin, a United States Indian inspector, did, on the 14th day of September, anno Domini 1901, make and conclude an agreement with the male adult Indians of the Rosebud Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, for a cession of certain described lands lying and being in Gregory County, S. Dak.; and

Whereas said body of land, comprising approximately 416,000 acres, is reputed to be fertile in soil and rich in all natural resources, needing only settlement and development to transform it into one of the choicest spots of our great State; and

Whereas in its present state the coveted land brings no revenue to the Indians, and they desire to cede it, as evidenced by their treaty; and

Whereas the acquisition of this territory to the taxable area of the State would mean the addition of thousands to our population and the enlargement of Gregory County, which is now so small it can not maintain a county government without an annual deficit, even with an excessive tax levy: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, in justice to both the Indians and our State, implore the Congress of the United States to hasten a ratification of the existing treaty and to provide ways and means for the early opening of this splendid body of land to homestead settlement, under such restrictions and conditions as they may deem wise.

The Commercial Club of Bonesteel, in Gregory County, where the land proposed to be opened to settlement is located, adopted resolutions favoring and praying for the passage of the Rosebud bill, which resolutions are herewith submitted.

RESOLUTION AND PETITION.

At a regular meeting of the Bonesteel Commercial Club, held on Friday evening, January 23, 1903, the following resolution was introduced and adopted by a unanimous vote:

RESOLUTION.

Whereas a treaty entered into by and between the United States and the Rosebud Indians for a cession of all their reservation land lying within the defined limits of Gregory County, S. Dak., is now pending in Congress awaiting a ratification by that body; and

Whereas we know said body of land to be fertile in soil, abundant in water supply, and rich in every natural resource, awaiting only settlement and development to make it one of the choicest portions of our great State; and

Whereas the present area of Gregory County is less than 150,000 acres, making a taxable territory altogether too small to sustain a county government without an excessive tax rate and an annual deficit in revenue; and

Whereas the opening of the land proposed to be ceded to the Government by the Rosebud Indians would enlarge Gregory County to a size contemplated by our State constitution and add thousands to its inhabitants besides materially increasing its assessment valuation; and

Whereas in its present state said tract of land is unused by the Indians and returns to them no profit or revenue, but on the contrary has proven a fruitful field for large stockmen who trespass upon its broad acres with thousands of head of cattle, much to the annoyance of the Indians and detriment to the nutritious grasses growing there; and

Whereas in its unsettled and undeveloped state it is a constant menace to the industrious and ambitious citizens of the settlement adjoining on the south and east by reason of the vast prairie fires that annually sweep across it and because of the rendezvous it affords for thieves and criminals; and

Whereas the existing treaty is fair in all its provisions and offers the Government an opportunity to add a magnificent body of land to its public domain at a minimum price; and

Whereas thousands of people are anxiously awaiting the opening of this tract, and justice to them and the settlement adjoining demands speedy action to that end; and

Whereas it is the judgment of this Commercial Club that opponents to the passage of the pending bill are not fully advised in the premises and are unconscious of the importance of the matter to the Indians and the State of South Dakota, as well as a waiting multitude of people: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congressmen BURKE and MARTIN and Senators KITTREDGE and GAMBLE to relax no effort to secure a ratification of said treaty and the passage of a bill opening the land for settlement during the present session of Congress; that they be appealed to to labor, individually and collectively, as well as unceasingly, making any reasonable concessions as to conditions under which the same shall be opened for homestead settlement, in order to secure favorable consideration of the matter during the present Congress; and

Be it further resolved, That in view of the exigency of the situation and the incalculable benefits that will accrue to Gregory County and the entire State by the opening of these lands, that we respectfully request our honored governor, Charles N. Herreid, to go to Washington and lend his best energy and influence toward furthering the passage of the pending bill; and

Be it further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Senators KITTREDGE and GAMBLE and Representatives BURKE and MARTIN, and a copy transmitted to the Hon. J. H. Welch, member of the legislature from this district, with a request that he present the same to Governor Herreid and appeal to him to heed its prayer.

We hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted by the Bonesteel Commercial Club at their regular meeting held on Friday evening, January 23, 1903.

Attest:
J. D. KELLER,
Secretary.

ED. HAAKINSON,
Acting President.

Those resolutions were indorsed by about 200 citizens of Gregory County, who signed the following:

"We, the undersigned petitioners, hereby certify that we have read the above resolutions and heartily indorse its sentiment and prayer."

Mr. McRAE. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to present to the consideration of this House a matter of importance. It is the proposition as to whether it is not advisable at this time to purchase the Hermann Strecker collection of butterflies and moths, and the library belonging thereto. In introducing this subject I wish to have read by the Clerk, as a part of my remarks, the following communications:

First. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury.

Second. A communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, under whose jurisdiction the National Museum is.

Third. The Report of the Custodian of Lepidoptera of the National Museum.

I think careful attention to the reading of these reports will convince members that this is a matter of importance at the present time, because its acquisition will give to the National Museum a collection of butterflies and moths or lepidoptera greater than any in the Western Hemisphere and equal, perhaps, to any in the world. To-day the collection that the United States owns of this branch of science is small and incomplete, and the scientists of the National Museum testify to the fact that this collection of butterflies, which in itself is the largest in America, will unite with the present collection of that institution and will not only make a first-class collection, but one of the grandest in the world. That is the reason I say to you that it is important.

If the United States does not purchase this collection it will not in a century be able to have another opportunity to purchase a collection of this kind and make the museum collection one of the first in the world. This chance rarely, if ever, occurs. For fifty years this man has gathered his collection together, and if gentlemen of this House will read what the scientists say, I am satisfied they will be convinced that there is great propriety in incorporating into the present sundry civil bill the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the people connected with this branch of science in the National Museum.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Where is this collection now?

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. In the city of Reading, Pa. That is the reason, perhaps, why I have been asked by the scientists to present this matter to the consideration of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

COLLECTION OF BUTTERFLIES AND MOTHS OF THE LATE HERMANN STRECKER.

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution submitting an estimate of appropriation for purchase of the butterflies and moths of the late Hermann Strecker.

June 18, 1902.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 17, 1902.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith, for the consideration of Congress, copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, of the 16th instant, submitting an estimate of appropriation, \$25,000, for the purchase for the National Museum of the collection of butterflies and moths of the late Hermann Strecker, of Reading, Pa., together with his library relating to the same.

Respectfully,
L. M. SHAW,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.
Washington, June 16, 1902.

SIR: My attention has been called to the importance of securing for the National Museum the collection of Lepidoptera (butterflies and moths) of the late Hermann Strecker, of Reading, Pa., together with his library relating specially to these families of insects; and in view of the fact that it is impossible to acquire these from the regular appropriation of \$10,000, provided for the purchase of specimens for the Museum, I respectfully request that the accompanying item be transmitted to Congress for insertion in the bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902.

Although the offer of this collection presents an opportunity which should not be lost to the Government, since its acquisition would place the National Museum in the very first rank in this branch of entomological science, it is not my wish that any provision for it shall prejudice what is hoped may be the favorable action of Congress in respect to the items for the Smithsonian bureaus in the sundry civil bill now in conference.

Very respectfully, yours,

S. P. LANGLEY, Secretary.

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

ITEM.

For the purchase of the collection of Lepidoptera (butterflies and moths) of the late Hermann Strecker, of Reading, Pa., comprising about 100,000 specimens, together with his library relating to the Lepidoptera..... \$25,000

NOTE.—Since the estimates for appropriations for the bureaus under the Smithsonian Institution were transmitted to Congress, the attention of the Institution has been called to the opportunity of securing, for addition to the National Museum, the collection of butterflies and moths brought together by the late Hermann Strecker, of Reading, Pa. The collection, which is now offered for sale for the sum of \$25,000, embodies the results of a lifetime of labor and the expenditure of very considerable sums of money by this eminent specialist. It comprises about 100,000 specimens, all in an excellent state of preservation, and is one of the largest and finest private collections of butterflies and moths in the world. If purchased by the Government it would add materially to the value of this branch of the national collections, since it contains many specimens needed to supply deficiencies in the series, as well as about 400 types of mostly North American species, in many cases rare or obscure. The sum stated in the estimate covers also the purchase of an extensive library relating especially to this department of entomological science and containing many rare volumes, some of them unrepresented in any library at the nation's capital.

This collection of world-wide fame will probably go into private hands or into the custody of some foreign institution unless immediate provision is made by Congress for its purchase. The price asked is a very moderate one, and the acquisition of this valuable material would place the National Museum in the first rank in this branch of science in America.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, U. S. A., January 13, 1903.

SIR: In my communication to you of the 6th instant I omitted to refer to a special item submitted to Congress, through the Secretary of the Treasury, on June 17, 1902, and printed as House Document No. 667, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, but on which no action was taken during that session. It relates to the purchase for the National Museum of a collection of Lepidoptera brought together by the late Hermann Strecker, of Reading, Pa., a distinguished entomologist. While the acquisition of this collection is still regarded as of importance, I beg to repeat what was said in my former letter, that it is not my wish that any provision for it shall prejudice what is hoped may be the favorable action of Congress in respect to the items for the Smithsonian bureaus contained in the regular estimates for the sundry civil appropriation bill for 1904.

Very respectfully, yours,

S. P. LANGLEY,
Secretary.

HON. JOSEPH G. CANNON,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Report of custodian of Lepidoptera, United States National Museum, on "The Hermann Strecker collection of butterflies and moths, and library accompanying it."

For the purpose of furnishing accurate information of the subject, I examined the collection in Reading, Pa., December 27, 1902.

The specimens constituting it are particularly adapted for a union with the present collection in the National Museum.

So united the Smithsonian collection would be a credit to the institution, and not only the largest and best in America but one of the greatest in the world.

The United States has an opportunity of purchase which rarely, if ever, presents itself, and for this reason prompt and favorable action is urgent and desirable.

Description of collection.—The collection is remarkable for the perfection of the specimens composing it. The number in any way injured is insignificant, which, from the nature of its insects, is most unusual and shows great care in selection of specimens.

A careful estimate, without counting, places the number of specimens at 100,000. They are contained in eleven cabinets having about 1,000 dust-proof glass-covered drawers or boxes. They are handsomely and substantially mounted, and each specimen is neatly labeled with its name and locality, often with remarks. In many instances, where the under and upper sides differ widely, they are mounted to show both.

The collection could be removed to the National Museum without repacking and without danger of being injured in transportation.

The collection is remarkably full of rare and expensive specimens, especially from the oriental and occidental Tropics, which furnish the most beautiful specimens of Lepidoptera.

The South American States and the West Indies, Mexico, and Central America, as well as Africa with Madagascar, the East Indies and Asia with India, Siam, and the Malacca Peninsula; the Philippine Islands and Australia have contributed many specimens of their brilliant and curious moths and butterflies.

Types.—The collection contains upward of 400 typespecimens—through the description of which by Mr. Strecker the scientific world received its first information of the existence of the species of insects. The British Museum values these type specimens at \$5 apiece more than other specimens of the same kind.

Freaks and aberrations.—It is particularly rich in hermaphrodites, in which

the male and female are combined in a single specimen, and in aberrations differing in color and form from the normal insect. Such specimens are very valuable and rarely ever to be duplicated.

Special specimens.—Quite a number of the specimens came from the noted exploring expeditions, those of Livingstone, Ross, and Peary, and such specimens could not be duplicated.

The *Colias boothii* is from the Ross expedition in search of Sir John Franklin in 1828—only nine specimens are known to exist. But five or six specimens of the *Parnassus acco* are known. Two superb specimens are in the collection; they come from the summit of the Himalaya Mountains, and \$1,000 are said to have been offered for them.

Looking over the catalogues of the largest dealers you will find in this collection many specimens which are not on sale and can not be obtained at all, and you will also find specimens of about all the rare and expensive flies and moths listed, showing this is no common or average, but an exceptional collection.

Largest and best in United States.—Taken by itself the collection, in both quantity and quality, considered the best in the United States.

Edwards collection.—The Edwards collection in the American Museum of Natural History in New York may be compared with it, but many specimens are mutilated and in an inferior condition.

Neumoegen collection.—Another large American collection is the Neumoegen collection in the Brooklyn Institute, which has about 40,000 specimens and was purchased for \$15,000. There are but few other large collections in this country.

Foreign collections.—The European collections are the largest and best in the world. Among them may be mentioned that of the British Museum, the Staudinger at Dresden, the Oberthur at Rennes, France, and the Tring at Tring, England.

A short list taken at random from recollection gives some idea of the character of the more valuable specimens:

	Unobtainable.	Cash value.
Ornithoptera rubidus.....	1
Ornithoptera dohertyi, 1 male, \$11.25; 1 female, \$18.25.....	\$29.50
Ornithoptera magellanus.....	1
Ornithoptera miranda, 1 male, \$18.50; 1 female, \$12.50.....	31.00
Ornithoptera lydia, male, \$50; female, \$40.....	90.00
Ornithoptera cressus, 3 pairs, at \$23.....	69.00
Ornithoptera priamus, 3 pairs, at \$16.25.....	48.75
Ornithoptera posidon.....	1
Ornithoptera victore, 1 male, \$100; 2 females, \$40.....	140.00
Ornithoptera regis, 1 male.....	150.00
Ornithoptera titonus, 1 pair.....	175.00
Ornithoptera trojana.....	2
Ornithoptera paradisa, 2 males.....	75.00
..... 1 female, \$15.....	15.00
Papilio neumoegeni.....	25.00
Papilio androcles, at \$10.....	20.00
Papilio dorcas.....	1
1 pair Papilio zagraens, 1 male.....	8.00
..... 1 female.....
2 Papilio bachus.....	20.00
1 Papilio homerus, almost extinct.....	1
3 Papilio antimicus, at \$30.....	90.00
1 Prepona buckelgiana.....	30.00
1 Agrias claudius.....	1
1 Agrias sardaniopolis, at \$20.....	40.00
2 Agrias amadon, at \$15.....	30.00
2 Agrias amadon, female.....	1
1 Agrias phalcedon.....	20.00
1 Agrias stuarthe.....	1
3 Agrias ugens, lat \$16.25.....	48.75
1 drawer of zeuxidia, at \$10, 14 flies.....	140.00
3 Morpho lecaba. (Mr. S. paid \$125 for poorest one in 1901).....	375.00
1 Morpho helena.....	1
1 Morpho retinor.....	15.00
1 Cocinera hercules.....	1
4 pairs Dynaster napoleon, at \$40.....	160.00
3 drawers of Papilio turnus. All these flies are rare aberrations or freaks, some being half male and half female; others are half dark and half light. There is also a 5-winged fly.....
2 pairs Armandia litterdali, 2 females.....	2
..... 2 males, at \$8.25.....	16.50
1 pair Papilio blumei.....	25.00
1 pair Papilio admantius, 1 male.....	1
..... 1 female.....	7.00
2 pairs Armandi thardinea, 2 females.....	2
..... 2 males, at \$7.50.....	15.00
2 pairs Parnassus actins.....	4
1 pair Parnassus charltonius.....	2
4 pairs Parnassus romanovi.....	8
1 pair Parnassus evermannii, male.....	15.00
..... 3 males, at \$15.....	45.00
1 pair Parnassus tibitanus.....	15.00
1 pair Parnassus poeta.....	2
1 pair Acco. (Only 2 in America).....	1,000.00
1 Colias boothii. (Only 9 known and has 1).....	1
1 Colias ladikensis.....	1
Total.....	36	2,969.00

Price.—In my opinion the price asked—\$25,000—is reasonable, as it is an average of from 20 to 25 cents a specimen, according to the value put upon the accompanying library and correspondence. Estimating the value of such collections is very difficult, but in a general way I find from an examination of the leading catalogues the average price of specimens which are on sale is from 70 cents to a dollar. Such prices would make this collection worth much more than the price asked. Seventy-five of the specimens are listed at \$2,969. Thirty-six on the small list above can not be bought, and there are no doubt more that can neither be bought nor duplicated.

Library and correspondence.—Accompanying the collection is a library containing nearly 300 volumes treating of the subject, several of which are not found in any of the libraries at Washington, also manuscript letters from noted collectors and others said to number from four to five thousand. The principal works in this library are named below, and when given in the recent catalogues of dealers I have added prices.

List of books.

Names.	Number of volumes.	Date.	Price.
Canadian Entomologist	32		\$32.00
Walker's British Museum Catalogue of Lepidoptera	35		
Westwood's Arcana Entomologica	2		17.00
Packard's Labrador Coast (author's copy)			
European Butterflies. (Berlin.)		1895	
Papilio	4		8.00
Boisduval's Madagascar Butterflies. (Paris.)		1830	5.00
Natural History of Known Insects (hand painted). (Berlin.)	11	1783	26.00
Boisduval's History of Insects. (Paris.)		1879	
Hagen's List of Entomological Works. (Leipzig.)		1862	3.50
Jardine's Entomological Library	5	1837	
Iris	11	1884	30.00
		1889	
Goeze Treatise on Entomology. (Leipzig.)	5	1777	
Amoenitates Academica. (London.)	8	1749	
Fabricius Entomology	6	1794	
Cuvier's Animal Kingdom	4		
American Naturalist			
Lepidoptera of Asia Minor. (St. Petersburg.)	2		
Davenport Academy Proceedings			
Lintner Reports of Entomology. (New York.)	12		
Entomological News	1-10		10.00
Entomological Society of Philadelphia. (Proceedings.)	10		
Buffalo Natural Sciences	3		
Genera Insectorum. (Fabricius.)	12	1779	
Morris Synopsis			
Packard's Guide		1867	
Harris's Injurious Insects. (Flint.)			
Esper's Foreign Butterflies. (Leipzig.)		1780	15.00
Newman Entomological Monthly	7	1857	}
		1884	
		1872	
Butterflies of South Africa. (Trimen, Cape Town.)		1865	
History of Insects. (Philadelphia.)			
Encyclopedie Methodique, Articles on Lepid. (Paris.)		1819	
Edwards's Butterflies of North America			80.00
Descriptive Catalogue of Lepidoptera of India. (East Ind. Co.)		1850	
Lederer Noctuidæ of Europe. (Vienna.)		1857	
Cotton Insects		1878	
Glover's North American Entomology	6		
Standinger's Exotic Butterflies. (Bayern.)		1892	35.00
Seba's Natural History. (Amsterdam.)	4	1834	
		1862	
		1866	
Hewitson's Exotic Butterflies. (London.)	5	1804	90.00
		1868	
Felder's Lepidoptera. (Frigate Novaisa.)	2		
Romanoff Memoirs of Lepidoptera. (St. Petersburg.)	9	1897	98.00
A. C. Wilhelm	2	1797	

Respectfully submitted.

HARRISON G. DYAR,
Custodian of Lepidoptera, U. S. National Museum.

JANUARY 19, 1903.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen who have listened to the report of the custodian of lepidoptera will see that he has gone into the matter of the examination of this collection with a great deal of care, and presents his views, which I suppose we must all defer to, as this is his specialty, not only as to the price of the collection, its character and compass, but as well that of the library connected with it.

I wish to emphasize his statement in two matters. One is that this is an opportunity that perhaps will never occur again to the United States to purchase a collection of this character.

Second, that if this collection is purchased it will make the department of lepidoptera in the National Museum better than any in the United States, and one of the finest in the world.

A few words on the history of this celebrated collection. Hermann Strecker, one of the most distinguished entomologists of the world, lived, and about two years ago died, in the city of Reading, Pa. For fifty years all his leisure time was spent in studying, collecting, and mounting butterflies and moths. Every dollar earned during these years, except so much as was required for the support of himself and small family in the most modest way, was invested in this collection. Before he died two of his desires with regard to the great collection representing the labor of his lifetime were:

First. That it should be preserved as a whole and not dismembered.

Second. That it should be disposed of to some great scientific institution, preferably the United States National Museum.

In deference to these two wishes of the distinguished scientist, this collection has been offered to the United States.

The price asked for it is admitted to be exceedingly small compared with its real value. From the statements made in the report above set forth it is worth twice or three times the amount asked.

It could be parceled out among collectors and a far greater amount of money realized than that asked for the collection entire.

Upward of 400 types or specimens from which the original descriptions known to the scientific world were taken are in this collection. For these the British Museum has a standing offer of a guinea apiece beyond the actual value of the specimens. This alone would amount to nearly \$2,000. They could not be labeled for a like amount. Mr. Strecker bought the rarest specimens of each group, and comparing the specimens of his collection with the catalogues you find he has secured the rarest and most expensive flies. Many can never be duplicated.

This collection belongs in the National Museum, and Congress should not leave the opportunity slip by of purchasing it. It would be a great ornament as well as of great utility there, as well as in direct line with the recommendations of President Roosevelt.

THE NATIONAL MUSEUM.

The President, judging from the recommendations contained in both his messages, seems to have an entirely different idea of the utility of the functions of this great institution than that entertained by the Appropriation Committee of this body.

In the message of December 3, 1901, we find the following:

The advancement of the highest interests of national science and learning and the custody of objects of art and of the valuable results of scientific expeditions conducted by the United States have been committed to the Smithsonian Institution. In furtherance of its declared purpose—for the "increase and diffusion of knowledge among men"—the Congress has from time to time given it other important functions. Such trusts have been executed by the institution with notable fidelity. There should be no halt in the work of the institution, in accordance with the plans which its Secretary has presented, for the preservation of the vanishing races of great North American animals in the National Zoological Park. The urgent needs of the National Museum are recommended to the favorable consideration of the Congress.

Again, in his second message, of December 2, 1902, we find the following:

I again recommend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the plans of the Smithsonian Institution for making the museum under its charge worthy of the nation, and for preserving at the National Capital not only records of the vanishing races of men but of the animals of this continent, which, like the buffalo, will soon become extinct unless specimens from which their representatives may be renewed are sought in their native regions and maintained there in safety.

The speech made this afternoon by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], a member of the House Appropriations Committee, voices the views of the controlling spirits of that committee, which I was, to my astonishment, first made aware of when I presented the report of the custodian of entomology, above referred to, and made a few remarks on the desirability of the purchase of this collection.

The first interrogation put to me by the chairman was as follows: Of what use is a collection of this kind to the Museum; they can not be eaten or worn; of what earthly use are they?

Following such a strictly utilitarian measure of any collection which would be desirable to be placed in this great institution, it will be many years before the hopes of the President and the people, that of making the Museum worthy of the nation, will be realized, if ever.

The British Museum was never founded and built up upon any such narrow ideas, nor that of any other great national scientific institution.

The great nations of the world are expected to furnish to the scientific world through their great collections of specimens in every department of science—collections great and expensive beyond the means of the scientist and the private scientific institution—knowledge which could not have been procured in any other way.

Every great nation has its great collections and collectors, and the United States has not in the past and must not in the future be an exception to this rule.

As in everything else, it must be in the very front rank of scientific investigation, and no opportunity should be lost to place it there.

Mr. McRAE. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I would like to have an extension of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

[Mr. SMITH of Arizona addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND].

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the eloquent and instructive remarks of the chairman of the committee reporting this bill [Mr. CANNON], and followed him in happy reverry as he went over his review of the history of the country,

marking its growth and progress, I thought how, notwithstanding the country has grown rapidly, marvelously, the growth of appropriations has outstripped the growth of the country; that extravagance, as marked by legislative action, has been even more rapid in its progress, more phenomenal in its achievements, than the growth of the country itself. And, Mr. Chairman, I could not help thinking while contemplating the picture painted by the eloquent gentleman from Illinois—and a very interesting picture it was, too, and is—how we may in the near future have to deal with other things calling upon the Treasury of the country and swelling tremendously the appropriations made by Congress.

This suggestion comes in part from a somewhat remarkable bill introduced at the other end of the Capitol, one having something remarkable objects in view. I refer to the bill for pensioning the slaves, the black men and the black women of the South. This bill provides that every person, man or woman, who was a slave and has attained the age of 70 years shall be given upon its passage \$500 and a pension of \$15 a month so long as he or she shall live after that time; that those over 60 and not having attained the age of 70 shall be given \$300 and pensioned at \$12 a month; that those over 50 and under 60 shall have \$100 and a pension of \$8 a month, and that those who, perhaps, were infants in arms during the time of the war, those under 50, shall have a pension of \$4 a month.

I do not know whether this bill is going to pass; I do not know whether it was designed or expected that it should pass. It is a curious piece, however, in the study of the passing drama of statesmanship and politics. It is rather a seductive picture held out for the black brother, North or South. It has attachments, too, that will reach not only the colored brother, but ought, if it were made a law, to be beneficial to some of those who hurried and scurried South shortly after the war and associated themselves, for purposes of their own, very greatly to their own profit and very greatly to the injury of the communities in which they dwelt, with the colored brother. There are vague passages in the bill under which and by which those who have "supported" the colored brother might get the pension in place of the colored brother. [Laughter.] I think they will not only take in the child who may have properly supported an aged father or an aged mother, but I believe the bill can be so expanded and so applied that it will take in these gentlemen—the carpetbaggers—who, in political association in the South, have, perhaps, not strictly supported the colored brother, but who claim they have supported him, and who certainly were supported by him. [Laughter.]

Possibly this bill is of more value as a piece of political maneuvering than as a piece of prospective legislation. It carries with it, it seems to me, to the broad nostrils in black the pleasant aroma of the barbecue, borne upon the swift breezes of anticipation. It carries with it the suggestion that our Uncle Samuel is not merely going to kill the fatted calf in order to afford a feast for his black children, but that he is going to slaughter the choicest of his flocks and herds. In this anticipation, in this pleasant looking forward, in this delightful sniffing of the breeze which bears in anticipation and in imagination the odor and flavor of this barbecued meat there appears to be something political. It seems to me that in comparison the "glad hand" is not in it. [Laughter.]

And then, what, in the estimation of the colored brother, is the pleasant smile in the drawing-room as against baked 'possum and taters in the kitchen? [Laughter.]

Of course the gentleman who introduced this bill, as we understand upon his own authority, is not and will not be a candidate for the Presidency. We understand upon the same authority, however, that there are no trusts; and so, putting the one statement with the other statement and drawing our own conclusions, we may wonder whether or not a certain play for the favor of the colored brother has not been met, and more than met, by another play for the favor of the same colored gentlemen. We know that when it comes to the nomination of a Presidential candidate by at least one of the great parties of this country the colored delegate is a very important factor—a factor to be played for, a factor to be dealt with, a factor to be bargained for; and there is nothing like making preparation in good time, so that the yearning of the colored brother may be directed in the proper channel, so that the colored brother may look to the proper source for relief and benefit when, in good time, his friends come into control. Of course, his friends have been in control for a great many years, but so far he has been living very largely upon promises.

Now, the old promise, the old suggestion of 40 acres and a mule, is entirely discounted, is out of sight and belittled, in view of the present promise of \$500 and a pension of \$15 a month.

I do not know how this is going to come out. I do not know what it is going to result in, but it does appear to me that upon the political checkerboard, where there seem to be rather more of

the colored spots than is usual in the forming of checkerboards, a very interesting play is going on. Those of us who are not in the game, those of us who are not particularly interested in the result of the game, can watch it; and meantime, as we hear disclaimers from this source and that, we can put those disclaimers side by side with others and form our own conclusions as to what they are worth.

From one point of view, not of course from the political point, where, I judge, it appears very practical, but from certain points of view all this would seem to be almost farcical. But even these farces sometimes have a solemn side, and I can imagine how the old negroes of the South, male and female, will now be the prey of the sharks who, in order to "promote" legislation, in order to bring in the millennium, in order to hasten the coming of the good time promised in this bill—promised also otherwise and in other ways—will give up their small earnings from their scanty hoards, and then in their time of want will do as they have been doing these many years, as they long since learned to do, and as they long will do—turn to their natural and best friends, the white people of the South, for substantial relief, entirely free from the politician's frills and furbelows, which are designed simply to catch the colored voter and not to help him. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McRAE. The gentleman may proceed with the reading of his bill.

Mr. CANNON. I wish to say a word and then we can proceed with the reading of the bill. I always listen to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] with great pleasure. He can construct better sentences in colder blood than any man of my acquaintance, and I have listened this time with great pleasure to him while he talked about a bill that the newspapers state was introduced by request. I have never seen the bill. There is lots of that kind of thing done. It is substantially equivalent to a petition. The right of petition, the right of hearing, runs to all the citizens, great and small, wise and unwise, sane people and cranks. They have the right of hearing and petition, and the right to ask bills to be presented; but it is not necessary for me to refer to that.

While the gentleman was talking, it did seem to me that if he would listen to an exhortation that the gentleman and myself have heard the like of many times, of the importance of repentance and of individual forgiveness before one could be saved, and before one was entitled to be an evangelist, that possibly he would first have addressed himself to the beautiful condition that is to be found in the opposition party. I was going to say the Democratic party, but I would have to apologize to Cleveland and Olney and Hill and Bryan, and all the hosts, you know; not so many but what they are in a very decided minority. So I will not say Democratic party, because I would have them all bowing, you know, looking different ways. [Laughter.] I think the gentleman might first set his own house in order, before he goes off to chasing a will-o'-the-wisp and saying it belongs to other folks.

I am now ready to have the bill read.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. To be serious about the matter.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman may not know that at this very moment companies are being formed and circulars are being sent out through the South, inviting the poor, ignorant colored people there to send their contributions to designing men who are seeking to build up fortunes out of this proposition; and I think the gentleman ought to join with us in saying, in order that the colored people of the South may not be misled and robbed, that there is no reason now why they should be sending their quarters and 50-cent pieces and dollars to any company or any combination of men anywhere with the expectation of advancing their chances to get pensions. I will say to the gentleman that that is being done now.

Mr. CANNON. My friend talks seriously about the matter. I was answering the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], who never lets an opportunity pass or an assault upon an opportunity to say what he has to say. But now, seriously, in reply to the gentleman, to every citizen of the Republic, rich or poor, black or white, ignorant or cultured, there is but one great guaranty that runs to each and all, and that is equality before the law, equality of opportunity, protection in person and property, and then each unit to work out his own salvation. [Applause.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CANNON. I always do.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I wish to repeat the suggestion made by the gentleman from Tennessee and the question which he asked—that is, whether the gentleman from Illinois is willing to join in the assurance suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee that these poor colored people in the South had better keep their money instead of frittering it away upon this pension bill—that as a matter of fact it is not intended seriously to pass the bill which has been introduced. If the gentleman can give that assurance, it may be worth a good deal to these poor colored people. If, upon the other hand, this legislation is likely to be enacted, it will perhaps be a source of great comfort to have that assurance from one so high in authority as he is. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Tennessee was in earnest. Mr. DE ARMOND. I am in earnest, too. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to be assured that the gentleman from Missouri is in earnest, for he himself hath said it. [Laughter.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. This matter raised by the gentleman from Tennessee, suggesting that the colored people of the South are now being fleeced out of their hard earnings and scanty hoard in order that some adventurers may be enriched, has nothing of levity about it. I do not think of anything more serious, and I do not see how the gentleman from Illinois can consider it as anything else than a decidedly serious matter. I think that the gentleman from Illinois might say something which might preserve maybe hundreds, maybe thousands, or tens of thousands of dollars for these poor people of what they can not afford to give away for nothing, and prevent a large number of adventurers from getting that for which they do nothing. If the gentleman has anything to say, I hope he will say it.

Mr. CANNON. Now, then, the gentleman, I understand, speaks of the matter seriously, and if necessary I will further seriously answer. As an individual Representative, and that is merely my best judgment, and as standing for my own action, along with other private Representatives who agree with me, I supposed that in reply to the gentleman from Tennessee, I had been entirely frank and had covered the ground. But it seems that I have given an answer even my very good friend from Missouri can not understand, and perchance some poor ignorant citizen with a black skin may be as unable to understand as my good friend from Missouri. [Laughter.] I say to him, courteously and in all candor, that in my judgment no such bill will pass; and if there be adventurers that would swindle the colored citizen, all things ought to be done by their brethren that surround them and citizens elsewhere that would instruct them to the contrary. It is known that swindling goes on in all our cities, North and South; the sharper and even the swindler is there, and once in a while even people that belong to the Anglo-Saxon race are swindled. I do not know that I can say anything in addition to what I have said. [Applause.]

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Greensboro, N. C., court-house, post-office, etc.: For completion of extension under present limit, \$41,650.

Mr. CANNON. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 9, after line 21, insert the following:
"Rental of temporary quarters for the accommodation of certain Government officials at Greensboro, N. C., and for expenses incidental thereto, \$3,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Holyoke, Mass., post-office: For continuation of building under present limit, \$33,750.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 10, after line 16, insert:
"For the complete establishment of an immigrant station, and the erection of the necessary buildings at Honolulu, Hawaii, on land owned by the Government, adjoining the wharf known as Channel Wharf, and for each and every purpose connected therewith and necessary to complete said station in all of its details within the sum hereby appropriated, \$30,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Los Angeles, Cal., rent of buildings: For rental of temporary quarters for the accommodation of certain Government officials and all expenses incidental thereto, and for electric current for power purposes, \$9,700.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had further disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4825) to provide for a union railroad station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, numbered 39 and 41, and so much of amendment numbered 57 as relates to the striking out of section 13 of the bill and the substitution of matter in lieu thereof, had agreed to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. DILLINGHAM, and Mr. MARTIN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 149) to provide for holding terms of court in the district of Utah.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4825) to provide for a union railroad station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7659) to amend sections 5191 and 5192 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ALLISON, Mr. ALDRICH, and Mr. JONES of Arkansas as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 15659) granting a pension to Elise Sigel, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. FOSTER of Washington, and Mr. TURNER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 15, page 13, after the word "dollars," the following:
"For the erection and completion of an addition to the public building at Tyler, Tex., the sum of \$25,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will have to make the point of order that it is not authorized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will not the gentleman reserve the point of order and let me make this statement?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, a very great public necessity at Tyler, Tex., has suggested the amendment which I have just sent to the Clerk's desk. The public building at Tyler, Tex., was erected some twelve or fifteen years ago. Since that time there has been a very great increase in the public business there. The building was originally constructed to accommodate the post-office and Federal court at Tyler. It was sufficient at that time to meet the purposes for which it was then erected. Since that time the necessity for this amendment has been made manifest by the increase of public business, which has resulted not only from the development of the country, but from new legislation from Congress. A very large amount of the court business of eastern Texas is returnable to Tyler. The establishment of rural-delivery routes has very greatly increased the postal service to be performed there.

The rapid settlement of eastern Texas gives promise of a phenomenal development, at least, in the postal service, which will justify the adoption of the present amendment. I have received letters from the custodian of the public building at Tyler, from the district attorney of the district in which that town is situated, from the deputy marshal of the Federal court there, and from other Federal officials conversant with the facts, which justify me in making the statement that the present building needs an addition to make it sufficient for the public uses. If the point of order suggested by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee shall prevail, I shall feel myself justified in offering this amendment at every opportunity presented during the life of this Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not controvert the statement of the gentleman from Texas at all. It may be a very apt and appropriate measure, and I presume it is, but we have so many public buildings here to be provided for that I am compelled to insist on the point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the matter may be passed over until I can present more data.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has been ruled out of order and there is nothing more to pass upon.

The Clerk read as follows:

Waco, Tex., court-house and post-office: For completion of extension under present limit, \$75,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 20, after line 9, insert the following: "For rental of temporary quarters for the accommodation of certain Government officials at Waco, Tex., and for expenses incidental thereto, \$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yerba Buena Island, California: For construction of an oil house at Yerba Buena Island, \$8,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

Insert after line 2, page 25, the following:

"Fog bell and lens-lantern light on the southeastern end of Southampton Shoal, San Francisco Bay, California: For establishing on the southeastern end of Southampton Shoal, San Francisco Bay, California, a fog bell and lens-lantern light, \$30,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the point of order, I think that legislation has been provided for.

Mr. KAHN. The bill has been signed by the President. This is in compliance with that bill.

Mr. CANNON. As I understand, this is in compliance with the law.

Mr. MADDOX rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. MADDOX. I want to inquire if the gentleman from Illinois has withdrawn his point of order?

Mr. CANNON. No; I reserved the point of order for the purpose of ascertaining whether this was subject to a point of order. I asked the gentleman from California whether the legislation has been enacted. He says it has passed both Houses and has been signed by the President at this session of Congress. So, if that be true, no point of order would lie. I have some familiarity with the merit of this matter and I know that it is meritorious and appropriate, and if it has been authorized I have nothing further to say.

The amendment was considered, and agreed to.

Mr. PEARRE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 22, line 16, for the purpose of submitting an amendment to which I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Well, it is 5 o'clock.

Mr. PEARRE. I want to say to the gentleman that this is a very important matter, to which I called his attention a day or two ago, and since then I have received additional information.

Mr. CANNON. What does the item relate to?

Mr. PEARRE. The condition of the subtreasury in Baltimore city, where they have not room to transact their business.

Mr. CANNON. Well, we can take that up to-morrow. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. TAWNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 17202, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 11596. An act granting an increase of pension to Inez L. Clift;

H. R. 12410. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Nichols;

H. R. 14251. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh J. Reynolds;

H. R. 14897. An act granting an increase of pension to Phillip Mooney;

H. R. 13088. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram D. Deming;

H. R. 14391. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Walsh;

H. R. 6889. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Rader;

H. R. 16053. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Reynolds;

H. R. 16358. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin W. Walker;

H. R. 714. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Hart;

H. R. 11417. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia Anglada;

H. R. 16217. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Jones;

H. R. 1482. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Smith;

H. R. 16591. An act granting an increase of pension to James Mattingly;

H. R. 1377. An act granting an increase of pension to Bridget Agnes Tridel;

H. R. 10953. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. M. Seitz;

H. R. 16272. An act granting an increase of pension to Enoch Dodd;

H. R. 2473. An act granting an increase of pension to James Billingsley;

H. R. 14604. An act granting an increase of pension to Asa C. Hill;

H. R. 15473. An act granting an increase of pension to Winthrop W. Walcott;

H. R. 3516. An act granting an increase of pension to Ozra F. Cheney;

H. R. 3569. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Buckholz;

H. R. 16153. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Choate;

H. R. 15437. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Gerry;

H. R. 15438. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Peabody;

H. R. 1639. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Thompson;

H. R. 7012. An act granting an increase of pension to Abel Fleming;

H. R. 15300. An act granting a pension to Delania Preston;

H. R. 15206. An act granting a pension to Mary P. Everton;

H. R. 15870. An act granting an increase of pension to John Smith;

H. R. 15673. An act granting a pension to Annie E. Doss;

H. R. 14605. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Knoop;

H. R. 4807. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Parfitt;

H. R. 13826. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis N. Bonneau;

H. R. 16465. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Knepple;

H. R. 11790. An act granting an increase of pension to Abel Woods;

H. R. 15572. An act granting a pension to Charles W. Bracken;

H. R. 5167. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Nowman;

H. R. 7334. An act granting an increase of pension to Ira L. Evans;

H. R. 16269. An act granting an increase of pension to Annie W. Coit;

H. R. 15571. An act granting an increase of pension to John Macfarlane;

H. R. 13297. An act granting a pension to Martin Greeley;

H. R. 4059. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Cook;

H. R. 14789. An act granting an increase of pension to David Brobst;

H. R. 9950. An act granting an increase of pension to Moses Whitcomb;

H. R. 15064. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Shovar;

H. R. 15421. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Palmer;

H. R. 15439. An act granting an increase of pension to John P. Chisler;

H. R. 14388. An act granting an increase of pension to Graham McClosson;

H. R. 5460. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Sherry;

H. R. 1929. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter Tuper;

H. R. 14120. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Leopard;

H. R. 16602. An act to extend the time granted to the Muscle Shoals Power Company by an act approved March 3, 1899, within

which to commence and complete the work authorized in the said act to be done by said company, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11127. An act for the relief of the Propeller Tow Boat Company, of Savannah; and

H. R. 16334. An act fixing terms of United States courts in Colorado, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3287. An act to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On February 9, 1903:

H. R. 288. An act for the relief of the Christian Church, of Henderson, Ky.;

H. R. 647. An act for the relief of William P. Marshall;

H. R. 16330. An act to detach the county of Dimmit from the southern judicial district of Texas and to attach it to the western judicial district of Texas;

H. R. 16651. An act to fix the time for holding the United States district and circuit courts in the northern and middle districts of Alabama; and

H. R. 16604. An act making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904.

On February 10, 1903:

H. R. 9503. An act to authorize the Oklahoma City and Western Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Fort Sill Military Reservation, and for other purposes.

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. 6048. An act granting a pension to Lillian G. Elkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4922. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5219. An act to grant an honorable discharge from the military service to Robert C. Gregg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3638. An act for the extension of Eighth street NW., or Wrights road, District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 6848. An act to establish a life-saving station at Cape Nome, Alaska—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 7186. An act granting a pension to Mary C. Couch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

MEMORIAL SERVICES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE MOODY.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That when the House meets on Sunday, February 22, 1903, it shall consider resolutions memorial of the life and public services of Hon. JAMES M. MOODY, late a Representative from the Ninth Congressional district of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the following change of reference was made:

S. 4908. An act to incorporate the American Academy in Rome—from the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the Committee on the Library.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HILDEBRANT, for one week, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

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

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, with a favorable recommendation, a letter from the chief of division, Revenue-Cutter Service, relating to new revenue cutters—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a communication from Mr. Samuel J. Barrows submitting a report on the International Prison Congress of 1900—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a communication from Mr. S. J. Barrows submitting a report relating to the prison systems of Europe—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report on the determination of the intersection of the true one-hundredth meridian with Red River—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed law relating to transcripts of land records—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. JOY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16139) to authorize the Norfolk and Western Railway Company to bridge the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at certain points where the same forms the boundary line between the States of West Virginia and Kentucky, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3697); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16885) to extend to the port of Niagara Falls, N. Y., the privileges of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3698); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17155) to authorize the Pittsburg, Carnegie and Western Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3699); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LOVERING, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 7043) to establish a light-house depot for the Second light-house district, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3700); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17149) to authorize the board of commissioners of the Connecticut River bridge and highway district to construct a bridge across the Connecticut River at Hartford, in the State of Connecticut, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3701); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6973) authorizing the city of Nome, a municipal corporation organized and existing under chapter 21, title 3, of an act of Congress, approved June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," to construct a free bridge across the Snake River at Nome City, in the Territory of Alaska, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3702); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16280) to open for settlement 505,000 acres of land in the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian reservations in Oklahoma Territory, submitted the views of the minority, to accompany report (No. 3661, part 2); which said views were referred to the Committee of the whole House on the state of the the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

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

which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3020) granting an increase of pension to Eliza E. Littlefield, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3684); 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. 6143) granting an increase of pension to Elvira C. Compton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3685); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4443) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bassett, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3686); 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. 5929) granting a pension to Margaret J. McCranie, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3687); 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. 6394) granting a pension to Everts Ewing Munn, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3688); 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. 7145) granting an increase of pension to Rosetta E. Rafferty, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3689); 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. 7207) granting an increase of pension to May Mosher Chase, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3690); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14032) granting a pension to Gustav Jansen, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3691); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11546) granting a pension to Edward Bryan, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3692); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16212) granting an increase of pension to Sanders W. Johnston, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3693); 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. 12090) granting a pension to Arvilla N. Stocker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3694); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15573) granting a pension to Cynthia Thomas, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3695); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11851) granting a life-saving medal to Hugh F. Doherty, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3696); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. PUGSLEY: A bill (H. R. 17355) providing for the issue and circulation of a supplementary currency and for the deposit of public moneys with national banking associations—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 17356) for the erection of an equestrian statue to the memory of Maj. Gen. Robert Howe at Wilmington, N. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MOON (by request): A bill (H. R. 17357) recognizing the military service of and giving pensionable status, under all pension laws of the United States, to persons serving under United States officers as home guards, militia, or other provisional troops during the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 17358) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between the city of Chamberlain, in Brule County, and Lyman County, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 267) to provide for the publication of the military laws of the United States—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FLYNN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) for the appointment of a public lands commission—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOODY: A resolution (H. Res. 438) calling on the Secretary of War for certain reports—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BULL: A resolution (H. Res. 439) for the relief of Elizabeth Norris, widow of Eppa Norris, late an employee of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BLAKENEY: A resolution (H. Res. 440) providing for payment to Louis Trischmann for extra services rendered during the Fifty-seventh Congress—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CANNON: A resolution (H. Res. 441) relating to an amendment to H. R. 17202—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 442) relating to an amendment to H. R. 17202—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 443) relating to an amendment to H. R. 17202—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A joint resolution of the legislature of Montana, relative to an agreement with the Indians of the Crow Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: A concurrent resolution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Castle Island—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A resolution of the legislature of North Dakota, relative to the shipment of live stock—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 17359) granting a pension to Carrie Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BILLMEYER: A bill (H. R. 17360) granting a pension to Carrie Keefer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 17361) granting a pension to Patrick E. Dancy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17362) granting a pension to L. L. Coffey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 17363) granting a pension to Joel Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17364) granting an increase of pension to Larkin Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 17365) granting a pension to Edwin Babcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 17366) granting an increase of pension to Dr. Fleetwood H. Sale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17367) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Melton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17368) granting a pension to Dr. James H. Sale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17369) granting a pension to Sarah F. Dittlinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17370) granting a pension to Wilkerson E. Grubbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICKKEY: A bill (H. R. 17371) granting a pension to John A. Bussert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17372) granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 17373) for the relief of the heirs at law of Sarah M. Rittenhouse, deceased, and others—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PUGSLEY: A bill (H. R. 17374) granting a pension to Sara A. Wardell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 17375) for the relief of C. E. Booty—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17376) for the relief of H. Pierce—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 17377) for the relief of the estate of William H. Edrington, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD (by request): A bill (H. R. 17378) for the relief of A. C. Barton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 17379) granting an increase of pension to Wesley B. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ACHESON: Resolutions of Will F. Stewart Post, No. 80, Grand Army of the Republic, of Uniontown, Pa., protesting against the erection of a statue of Gen. Robert E. Lee in the national grounds of the battle of Gettysburg—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of the chief burgess and councilmen of Clifton Heights Borough, Pennsylvania, favoring Senate bill 909, for the extension of the free-delivery service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Alexander D. Patton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 419, of Salina, Kans., favoring House bill 16457, relating to gifts in connection with the sale of tobacco and cigars—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution of Local Union No. 95, International Union of Steam Engineers, Pittsburg, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 3076, for an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution of Keystone Division, No. 293, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Allegheny, Pa., favoring Senate bill 3560, known as the Foraker safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Resolutions of New England District Lodge No. 7, Boilermakers and Iron-ship Builders' Union, of Boston, Mass., in favor of the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Wilkerson E. Grubbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACKSON of Maryland: Petition of citizens of Cambridge, Md., asking for the passage of Senate bill 909, for the extension of the free-delivery system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolution of the Sioux City Humane Society, protesting against the passage of the bill amending the law in relation to the shipment of live stock—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Resolution of Thomas Dickson Division, No. 171, Order of Railway Conductors, Mechanicsville, N. Y., in favor of House bill 15990, known as the safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN: Resolution of the Bonesteel Commercial Club, of Gregory County, S. Dak., for the opening of the reservation land in Gregory County for homestead settlement—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of Amos L. Griffith, of Marion County, Tenn., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Union Springs, N. Y., to prohibit liquor selling in Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. REEDER: Petitions of Methodist Episcopal Church conferences of Smith Center and Kensington, Smith County, Kans., to prohibit liquor selling in Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolutions of the Medical Association of Central New York, favoring the establishment of a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNOOK: Paper to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Wesley B. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolution of the Medical Association of Central New York, favoring the establishment of a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Spirit Lake, Iowa, in favor of Senate bill 909, providing for the extension of the free mail delivery service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of Ellicott Fisher, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the establishment of a department of commerce and industries—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 11, 1903.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington. The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. QUAY, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved.

TRANSCRIPTS OF LAND RECORDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize registers and receivers of local land offices to furnish transcripts of their records to individuals, etc., and recommending that it be enacted into a law; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

INTERNATIONAL PRISON SYSTEMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting a letter from Mr. S. J. Barrows, commissioner for the United States on the International Prison Commission, forwarding a report prepared by Charles Richmond Henderson, D. D., professor of sociology in the University of Chicago, relating to the organization and regulation of modern prison systems of various countries of Europe and America; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 7226) to authorize the Pittsburg, Carnegie and Western Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River; and

A bill (S. 7159) authorizing the Memphis, Helena and Louisiana Railway Company to construct and maintain a bridge across St. Francis River, in the State of Arkansas.

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

A bill (H. R. 6332) granting a pension to Michael Conlon;

A bill (H. R. 7642) providing for the holding of terms of the circuit and district courts of the United States at Kansas City, Kans., and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 14845) granting a pension to Margaret Snyder;

A bill (H. R. 15400) granting an increase of pension to Enos Turner; and

A bill (H. R. 15757) granting a pension to Frances C. Broggan.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16161) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Treadwell, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, Mr. BROMWELL, and Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (S. 3287) to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States;

A bill (H. R. 714) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Hart;

A bill (H. R. 1377) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Agnes Tridel;

A bill (H. R. 1482) granting an increase of pension to John A. Smith;

A bill (H. R. 1689) granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Thompson;

A bill (H. R. 1929) granting an increase of pension to Peter Tuper;

A bill (H. R. 2473) granting an increase of pension to James Billingsley;

A bill (H. R. 3516) granting an increase of pension to Ozra F. Cheney;

A bill (H. R. 3569) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Buckholz;

A bill (H. R. 4059) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Cook;

A bill (H. R. 4807) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Parfitt;

A bill (H. R. 5167) granting an increase of pension to John J. Nowman;