

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 12, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE, D. D.
The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. PENROSE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, there being no objection.

RENTAL OF BUILDINGS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 17th ultimo, an item in regard to buildings rented by them in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, 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 passed a bill (H. R. 7849) to authorize the county of Poinsett, in the State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near the town of Marked Tree, in said county and State; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented memorials of the Singing Society Frohsinn, of Mobile, Ala.; of Lodge No. 654, of Denver; of Lodge No. 667, of Colorado Springs; of the Denver Maennerchor, of Denver; of Lodge No. 435, of Denver, and of Bayern Verein of Denver, all in the State of Colorado; of the Schuetzen Verein of New Britain; of Lodge No. 266, of South Norwalk; of the Saengerbund of Hartford; of the Turn Verein of South Norwalk; of the Deutsche Gesellschaft of New Haven; of the Germania Bicycle Club, of New Haven; of Hermann's Sons' Maennerchor, of New Haven; of the German Ulk Club, of Ansonia; of the Teutonia Maennerchor, of New Haven; of the German Citizen Society, of Rockville, and of the Arion Singing Society, of South Norwalk, all in the State of Connecticut; of Lodge No. 349, of Wilmington; of the East End German Democratic Club, of Wilmington, and of the Turn Verein of Wilmington, all in the State of Delaware; of the Gesang Verein Teutonia, of Savannah, Ga.; of the Germania Verein of Shelby; of the Germania Club of Cedar Rapids; of Lodge No. 12, of Rock Rapids; of the Germania Benevolent Society, of Manilla; of the St. Joseph's Society of Muscatine; of the German Society Frohsinn, of Decatur; of the Military Brotherhood of Denison; of the German Aid Society of Iowa City, and of the Deutscher Krieger Verein, of Sioux City, all in the State of Iowa; of the Turn Verein of Mount Olive; of the Georgetown Turn Verein, of Smithton; of Germania Bund No. 2, of Shiloh; of the Mascoutah Central Turn Verein, of Mascoutah; of Lodge No. 73, of Freeport; of the Liederkrantz of Mount Olive; of the Turn Verein of East St. Louis; of Lodge No. 794, of Chicago; of Anker Encampment, No. 142, of Aurora; of Concordia Lodge, No. 303, of Aurora; of the Germania Maennerchor of Cairo; of the Turn Verein Eiche, of Chicago; of the Turn Verein of Chicago; of the Junger Maennerchor of Chicago; of the Sociale Turn Verein, of Chicago; of the German Military Society of Freeport; of the Turn Verein Garfield, of Chicago, and of the Deutsche Krieger Verein, of Aurora, all in the State of Illinois; of the German Singing Society Concordia, of Alexandria; of the German War Veterans of Fort Wayne; of the Schuetzen Verein of Hammond; of the St. Joseph Turn Verein, of Evansville; of the Saengerbund of Jeffersonville; of the Turn Verein of Hammond; of the Doppel Quartette Sakonia, of Fort Wayne, and of the Catholic Knights of America, Branch No. 77, of Evansville, all in the State of Indiana; of the Turn Verein of Leavenworth; of Lodge No. 1, of Leavenworth; of the Concordia Singing Society, of Kansas City; of the German-American Skat Club, of Topeka, and of the Gesang Turn Verein of Alma, all in the State of Kansas; of the Turn Verein of Kansas City, Mo.; of the Germania Club of Grand Island, and of Goldene Krone Lodge, No. 19, of Hartington, all in the State of Nebraska; of Kickapoo Tribe, No. 237, of Egg Harbor City; of the Good Will Hook and Ladder Company, of Egg Harbor City, and of Humboldt Grove, No. 20, of Passaic, all in the State of New Jersey; of Sigel Lodge, No. 93, of Webster; of the German School Association of Lawrence; of the Germania Club of Taunton; of the Germania Lodge, No. 380, of Springfield; of the German Cremation Society of Lawrence; of Herman Lodge, No. 467, of Adams; of Rollstone Lodge, No. 573, of Fitchburg; of the Glee Club Eintracht, of Lawrence, and of the Glee Club Mozart Maennerchor, of Lawrence, all in the State of Massachusetts; of Independence Lodge, No. 23, of New Orleans, La.; of Lodge No. 13, of Deer Lodge, and of Blucher Lodge, No. 10, of Kalispell, all in the State of Montana, and of Turn Verein

Vorwaerts, of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Springfield, Ohio; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Carlisle, N. Y.; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Bradford; the Young People's Missionary Society of Newberry; the Mothers and Teachers' Association of Newberry; the Ladies' Aid Society of Newberry; the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of Newberry, and of the congregation of the United Evangelical Church of Newberry, all in the State of Pennsylvania, and of the Woman's Club of Pekin, Ill., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, praying for the ratification of certain treaties between the United States and the other leading countries of the world providing proper restrictions for arbitration of international questions; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of 330 telegraph operators of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of telegraphers who served in the war of the rebellion; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of California, praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a petition of the History Club, of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington (for Mr. ANKENY) presented a petition of Alfred Sully Post, No. 3, Department of Washington and Alaska, Grand Army of the Republic, of Dayton, Wash., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (for Mr. ANKENY) presented a petition of sundry miners of Alaska, praying for a temporary suspension of assessment work on mining claims in the Territory of Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also (for Mr. ANKENY) presented a petition of the city council of Ballard, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made to deepen the harbor at that port; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made in aid of the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition; which was referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions.

He also presented memorials of Local Union No. 100, International Longshoremen's Association, of Aberdeen; of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific of Seattle, and of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific of Port Townsend, all in the State of Washington, and of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relative to the allotment of seamen's wages; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a petition of the ministers of the Presbyterian, Baptist, and Methodist Episcopal churches of Langdon, N. Dak., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; for the appointment of physical directors for the new army gymnasiums; to prohibit interstate telegraphing of gambling bets; for the enactment of a Sunday law for the national capital, and to amend the Lewis and Clark Exposition bill, requiring the exposition to be closed on the Sabbath day and to prohibit midway exhibits thereat; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARD presented a petition of the San Bernardino County Fruit Exchange, of San Bernardino, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of Ellison Post, No. 127, of North Branch; of Levi Sutton Post, No. 73; of George B. Adams Post, No. 151, of Eagle Bend; of C. Summers Post, No. 94, of Canby; of J. S. Cady Post, No. 2, of Anoka, and of Wallace Post, No. 142, of Princeton, all of the Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of the Bay and River Steamboatmen's Union of California, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relative to the payment of allotment in the coastwise trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MILLARD presented a petition of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of Nebraska, praying for the adoption of an amendment to section 1814 of the Revised Statutes, relative to the placing of statues in the United States Capitol; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Humboldt, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Gibbon, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Tecumseh, Nebr., and a petition of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Humboldt, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect prohibition States and districts against "original-package" tricks; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of York; of the Ladies' Missionary Society of Hansen; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of York; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Union; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Silver Creek; of the Fin de Siècle Club of Central City; of the Ladies' Missionary Society of Mira Creek; of sundry citizens of Geneva, and of the Nebraska Federation of Women's Clubs, of Lincoln, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a petition of Landan Post, No. 156, Department of Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, of Lake City, Iowa, and a petition of J. G. Safley Post, No. 125, Department of Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, of Traer, Iowa, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Odebolt, Iowa, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented memorials of George Thomas, of Wingate; of the Delaware County Merchants' Association and Credit Bureau, of Muncie; of the Retail Merchants' Association of Evansville, and of J. Cadden, of Evansville, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of the Bay and River Steamboatmen's Union of California and a memorial of Local Union No. 100, International Longshoremen's Union, of Aberdeen, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relative to the payment of allotment in the coastwise trade; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Plymouth, N. H., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the East Washington Citizens' Association, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to authorize the extension and operation of the Great Falls and Old Dominion Railroad upon and over certain streets in the city of Washington; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALGER presented a petition of Detroit Harbor, No. 47, American Association of Masters and Pilots of Steam Vessels, of Detroit, Mich., and of Lodge No. 7, Shipmasters' Association, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the establishment of a breakwater at Rogers City, in that State; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

HAMILTON D. SOUTH.

Mr. PENROSE. I am directed by the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2820) for the relief of Hamilton D. South, to report it favorably with an amendment, and I ask for its present consideration. It is a short measure.

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 Naval Affairs was, in line 6, after the words "one thousand," to strike out "two hundred

and fifty" and insert "one hundred and fifty-seven;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Lieut. Hamilton D. South, United States Marine Corps, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,157, to reimburse him for the loss of personal property destroyed by the burning of the officers' quarters at the United States navy-yard, Pensacola, Fla.

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.

CHARLES BLAKE.

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report the same kind of a bill as that which has just passed, and I ask for its present consideration. It is the bill (S. 1753) for the relief of Pay Clerk Charles Blake, United States Navy.

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 to Charles Blake, pay clerk, United States Navy, the sum of \$700, to be a payment in full of all losses of personal property incurred by him by reason of the destruction by fire of the Windsor House, at Yokohama, Japan, on the morning of February 8, 1886.

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

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, if there is any general legislation which would authorize the Navy Department to adjust these claims?

Mr. HALE. There are certain features of general legislation, and these cases are only reported where the Department has certified that they do not come under the general head.

The bill was passed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom were referred the following joint resolution and bills, reported them severally without amendment:

A joint resolution (S. R. 6) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to donate to the Minnesota Historical Society the steering wheel of the former ship *Minnesota*;

A bill (S. 2437) to provide for the transportation of naval and other stores and supplies in American-built ships; and

A bill (S. 2641) to provide for the removal of floating dangers to navigation in certain steamship lanes off the Atlantic coast of the United States and for the construction of a suitable vessel to be used for such purpose by the Navy Department.

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

A bill (S. 3114) to authorize the use of depositions before naval courts in certain cases; and

A bill (S. 3110) to provide for the convening of general courts-martial at remote naval stations.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 921) granting to the State of Wyoming 50,000 acres of land to aid in the continuation, enlargement, and maintenance of the Wyoming State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 127) authorizing the joining of Kalorama avenue, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2540) authorizing the appointment of Allen V. Reed, now a captain on the retired list of the Navy, as a rear-admiral on the retired list of the Navy, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 351) for the relief of Joseph B. Sargent, reported it without amendment.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2845) to authorize the appointment of Ricardo Iglesias as a midshipman in the United States Navy, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

REPORT ON AFFAIRS IN ALASKA.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Territories I desire to present to the Senate the report of the subcommittee of that committee, which visited Alaska under a resolution adopted near the close of the last Congress, together with

testimony, statements, and other information gathered by the subcommittee.

I wish, Mr. President, in presenting this report to call the particular attention of the Senate to it. Within a day or two of the close of the last Congress I presented a resolution authorizing the appointment of this subcommittee. Accordingly a subcommittee was appointed, consisting of the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], as chairman, the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BURNHAM], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON]. These gentlemen, as a subcommittee, visited Alaska and spent in actual work two months' time of discriminating and intelligent investigation. That work is embodied in this admirable report, which is the report of the entire subcommittee, and drawn by its chairman, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. It embraces original information gathered on the ground; and I believe it is the first report of full and first-hand information ever presented by a committee from either House to Congress for its guidance in legislating on the affairs of the district of Alaska.

I direct the particular attention of the Senate to the feature of this report upon transportation, which is of immense value. Indeed every line of this valuable document is weighty with facts and sound judgment. This subcommittee has accomplished the maximum of results with the minimum of expense. The recommendations are the recommendations of the entire subcommittee, with the exception of one concerning the Delegate, from which the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] dissents.

I ask that 5,000 copies of the report itself and the map which accompanies it be printed, and that of the testimony and statements taken by the subcommittee fifteen hundred copies be printed. This is not an unusual number, I think, for a report so important, so timely, and so full, as is this notable presentation of the situation in the district of Alaska to the Senate and the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If no objection is made, the order will be entered for the printing, as requested by the Senator from Indiana, and for the printing of maps and of illustrations, if there may be any.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 3311) to amend section 2599 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

A bill (S. 3312) to provide an adjunct to the corps of consular clerks (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3313) to amend section 1706 of the Revised Statutes (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 3314) to regulate consular invoice fees (with accompanying papers).

Mr. BARD introduced a bill (S. 3315) for the relief of Carlos Manjarez; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 3316) to provide for a site and public building at South Bethlehem, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3317) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant right of way for pipe lines through Indian lands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3318) to correct the military record of Joseph Rankin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3319) to correct the military record of William H. Everson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3320) to correct the naval record of John Clark, alias Daniel Andrews; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 3321) granting a pension to Andrew Comrey;

A bill (S. 3322) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Nagle;

A bill (S. 3323) granting a pension to Eleanor M. Laize;

A bill (S. 3324) granting a pension to Adeline C. Roberts;

A bill (S. 3325) granting an increase of pension to James B. O. Horbach; and

A bill (S. 3326) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Geiger (with accompanying papers).

Mr. FOSTER of Washington (for Mr. ANKENY) introduced a bill (S. 3327) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Moore;

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

Mr. FOSTER of Washington introduced a bill (S. 3328) granting to the city of Port Angeles, Clallam County, State of Washington, for park purposes, certain portions of the Government reserve in said city; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3329) granting a pension to Mary E. Strong; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 3330) granting an increase of pension to William H. Williams; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3331) to authorize the Vulcan Coal Company, of Vulcan, W. Va., to bridge the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at Vulcan, Mingo County, W. Va., where the same forms the boundary line between the States of West Virginia and Kentucky; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3332) granting a pension to Thomas M. Harris; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KEARNS introduced a bill (S. 3333) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hendrickson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced a bill (S. 3334) granting an increase of pension to Frances G. Belknap; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3335) granting an increase of pension to John Waldo; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 3336) to provide an additional district judge for the district of Alaska, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 3337) to provide for the construction and maintenance of roads, the establishment and maintenance of schools, and the care and support of insane and destitute persons in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 3338) to amend and codify the laws relating to municipal corporations in the district of Alaska;

A bill (S. 3339) providing for the election of a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the district of Alaska; and

A bill (S. 3340) to amend an act entitled "An act to define and punish crimes in the district of Alaska, and to provide a code of criminal procedure for said district," approved March 3, 1899.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 3341) 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; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 3342) for the relief of the Nez Percé tribe of Indians in Idaho; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MCCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 3343) 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.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3344) for the extension of Shepherd street northwest from Connecticut avenue to Idaho avenue; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3345) granting an increase of pension to Edward Davidson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3346) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Hollenbaugh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 3347) for the establishment and organization of a nurse corps of trained women nurses in the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 3348) granting a pension to Helen G. Hibbard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3349) granting an increase of pension to Morgan Dwyer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 3350) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Harbert (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 3351) granting a pension to Randolph F. Williamson (with accompanying papers).

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 3352) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Nash; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 3353) to provide for the registration and protection of commercial marks, prints, and labels used in foreign or interstate commerce, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced a bill (S. 3354) to divide the third judicial division of the district of Alaska into two recording and judicial divisions; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3355) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the extermination of fur-bearing animals in Alaska, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

A bill (S. 3356) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Teter;

A bill (S. 3357) granting an increase of pension to Welcome B. French; and

A bill (S. 3358) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Bowsher.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 3359) for the relief of the attorney and representative of the Choctaw Nation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 3360) for the relief of the Muir Glacier Packing Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 3361) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, to authorize and provide for the maintenance and supply of fuel and illuminating gas and its by-products in Honolulu; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 3362) granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Wallace; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HALE (for Mr. SPOONER) introduced a bill (S. 3363) granting an increase of pension to William A. Murray; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 3364) granting an increase of pension to Moses Fletcher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 3365) for the relief of the heirs at law of Maj. Tarleton Woodson, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims.

STATUE OF BENJAMIN HARRISON.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I introduce a joint resolution which I ask may be read at length.

The joint resolution (S. R. 31) authorizing the erection and maintenance of a statue in memory of the late President Benjamin Harrison, upon land owned by the United States in the city of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Benjamin Harrison Memorial Association of Indiana be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct and maintain, on property owned by the United States in square numbered 36, in the city of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, a monument in honor of the life and services of the late President Benjamin Harrison. The said monument shall be constructed south of the post-office, court-house and custom-house building now in course of erection on said square, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. As will be seen, the joint resolution authorizes the construction and maintenance, on property of the Government at Indianapolis, of a monument in honor of the life and services of the late President Benjamin Harrison. I should like to have its present consideration.

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

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

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

REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 32) to fill vacancies in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; which was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancies in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, shall be filled by the reappointment of John B. Henderson and Alexander Graham Bell, residents of the city of Washington, whose terms of office expire on January 24, 1904.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I see no reason why the joint resolution should not be considered now. These vacancies have to be filled by Congress. Ex-Senator Henderson and Dr. Alexander Graham Bell are regents whose terms expire in a very few days. I suppose there will be no objection whatever to their reappointment.

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

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

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

COURT OF PATENT APPEALS.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I have introduced two bills for the creation of a court of patent appeals. There is very great interest taken in them by patent attorneys and inventors. Each bill provides for the creation and establishment of a new court with final jurisdiction in patent matters. The bills differ somewhat in plan and detail. One is supported by a memorandum explaining the bill and the reasons for it, and the other by a report of the American Bar Association. I ask that each of these papers may be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What reference does the Senator desire?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The papers have been referred to the Committee on Patents.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut asks for the printing of the papers which he has just sent to the desk. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

PORT OF SALT LAKE CITY.

Mr. KEARNS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 201) to establish a port of delivery at Salt Lake City, Utah.

Mr. LODGE. The regular order has not been finished yet?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has not.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection in the world to the bill, and I hope we shall go to the Calendar and take up all unobjected bills; but I shall be glad if the regular order may be finished first.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made to the request of the Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment providing that the immigration laws of the United States in force in the Philippine Islands shall continue to be administered by the officers of the Philippine Government, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$55,000 to enable the Secretary of State to provide at a number of the principal consulates 50 clerks, who shall be American citizens and shall not receive more than \$1,200 a year in any one case, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

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

Resolved, That there be printed, for the use of the Senate, 2,000 extra copies of the message of the President of the United States in regard to Panama.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH COLOMBIA.

Mr. DANIEL. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested, if in his opinion consistent with the public interest, to transmit to the Senate all correspondence between the Secretary of State

and the representatives of the Government of Colombia which has taken place concerning our relations with that country since the revolution of November 4 in Panama and which has not been heretofore transmitted.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope that the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator wants it to go over until to-morrow, I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the resolution will go over.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 7849) to authorize the county of Poinsett, in the State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near the town of Marked Tree, in said county and State, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

BRITISH CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of December 19, 1903, requesting the President, "if not incompatible with the public interests, to transmit to the Senate a list of any claims now pending in the Department of State by British subjects against the United States, or of citizens of the United States against Great Britain," I transmit herewith a report from the Acting Secretary of State covering the list called for.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, January 12, 1904.

GORDON, IRONSIDES & FARES COMPANY (LIMITED).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit a report by the Acting Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in regard to the application of the British Embassy in behalf of Messrs. Gordon, Ironsides & Fares Company (Limited), of Canada, for reimbursement of \$7,626.08, which they allege the United States customs authorities improperly exacted of them in November, 1902, as duties on certain sheep and cattle.

In view of the facts as recited by the Acting Secretary of State and shown in the correspondence, I recommend that provision be made for the company's reimbursement.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, January 12, 1904.

D'ANGERS BUST OF WASHINGTON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Acting Secretary of State, with inclosure from the ambassador of the French Republic, relative to the desire of certain French citizens to present to this Government a reproduction of the bust of Washington by David d'Angers, which the donors wish to be placed in the Capitol.

I recommend that Congress accept this gift by joint resolution and that suitable provisions be made for its ceremonial installation.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, January 12, 1904.

RELATIONS WITH COLOMBIA.

Mr. BACON. I offer a Senate resolution, which I ask may be read, and before the order of reference is made I will say a word, with the permission of the Senate.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, That the President be respectfully informed that the Senate favor and advise the negotiation, with a view to its ratification, of a treaty with the Republic of Colombia, to the end that there may be peacefully and satisfactorily determined and adjusted all differences between the United States and the Republic of Colombia growing out of the recent revolution in Panama and the consequent secession of Panama from Colombia and the alleged aid and assistance by the land and naval power of the United States in the successful accomplishment of said revolution and secession through the alleged forcible prevention by said land or naval forces of the assertion and maintenance by Colombia of her sovereignty and authority in Panama, and that full and complete compensation may be made by the United States to the Republic of Colombia for the loss of her sovereignty and property rights in Panama so far as the same may be shown to be due to any act of the United States through the land or naval forces of the same;

Resolved further, That the President be respectfully informed that if it should prove to be impracticable for the United States and the Republic of Colombia to agree through a convention upon the question of the said alleged responsibility on the part of the United States, or upon the question of the amount of compensation to be made when such responsibility shall be established, the Senate in that case favor and advise the negotiation, with a view to its ratification, of a treaty with the Republic of Colombia submitting to the permanent court of arbitration at The Hague, or to some other tribunal to be agreed upon, for impartial arbitrament and peaceful determination all questions between the United States and the Republic of Colombia growing out of the matters herein recited.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I shall move the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Before doing so I wish simply to say, with the permission of the Senate, that I think, from my standpoint, from my understanding of the facts as they have now been related to us both in the public prints and in official communications, this action on the part of the United States Government is required in justice to Colombia. As, however, there are doubtless some who will not agree with me on that point, I desire to suggest that, considered from another standpoint, the standpoint of good policy and expediency, this action should be taken by the Government of the United States.

We are, sir, committed by our agreeing to the international convention to the principle of arbitration when there is danger of war. We are committed to the principle of submission to some tribunal of a dispute which may lead to war in order that there may be a peaceful solution and determination of the same.

I desire to suggest to the Senate that we delude ourselves if we think there is no danger of war or of bloodshed growing out of the recent events in Panama and those which are now in progress. Of course at this distance it is difficult for us to fully realize the situation; but I hold in my hand, and ask that it may be read from the desk, a dispatch to the Washington Post, not from an anonymous correspondent, but from one who has held the official position of consul at Cartagena, Mr. Clifford Smythe, under date of January 8, from Bogota, setting forth the condition of affairs there and the imminent probability of hostilities. I ask that it may be read from the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR OR RUIN OF NATION.

[Special cable to the Washington Post, by Clifford Smythe, former consul at Cartagena.]

BOGOTA, January 8, via Galveston, January 9.

It is impossible for one not here to understand the deep feeling of Colombians on the Panama question. The situation is now critical. The national life is at stake. War or the disruption of the Colombian Republic will follow the refusal of the United States to give some satisfaction for the conditions she is permitting on the Isthmus.

Troops are now in readiness in the Cauca and Bolivar Departments to rush upon Panama when the word is given. In all my experience in Colombia I have never seen the people of this country so fully aroused. That they want war is beyond argument; and if war does not follow an unsatisfactory reply from the United States, internal dissensions will absolutely send Colombia to the verge of ruin.

STATEMENT BY MARROQUIN.

As high an authority as President Marroquin permits me to quote him. In answer to a message from me he sent me the following, and gave permission for the cabling of these latest and authentic facts concerning the situation here:

"The people of Colombia still hope that actual conflict may be averted through Democratic intervention in the Senate. Personally, I count on the assistance of the Democratic party and the great American people to save the sacred rights of Colombia, which have been so scandalously wounded."

It is not only my belief, but men high in authority have admitted, almost with tears in their eyes, that the "unfriendly acts" of President Roosevelt are threatening the unity and the continuance of the Colombian Republic.

Despite the bitterness against the Administration, I have been given the most courteous treatment, and Americans throughout Colombia are being protected, which is not difficult, as there are scarcely a handful here. That American interests are sure to suffer is undeniable. War or an internal crisis will follow the report of General Reyes to Colombia.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I have had that read in full, although there are some things in it which might not be directly pertinent, because I did not desire to present what might be charged to be a garbled statement of a dispatch. I desire to say that in so doing I have no wish in any manner to reflect upon the President of the United States or upon any political party, and if I could have done so with propriety I would not have had that part of it read. I thought it was better for the reason stated that it all should be read.

I consider the question we are now on not one of party. It is simply a question, viewed from the present standpoint of policy, whether or not we shall endeavor to avert imminent war. It is impossible to conceive that a people who have been so humiliated as have been the people of Colombia, however weak they may be, however absolutely hopeless the cause may be, will submit without any resistance or without any attempt to maintain what they consider to be their honor.

My only purpose in having the dispatch read was to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that matters are in a condition where, if we do not hold out to those people some prospect that the great United States Government, all-powerful and able to do as it pleases, will in a proper, magnanimous spirit endeavor peacefully to adjust these differences, there must be war and bloodshed.

No man can doubt for a moment what the result of such a war would be. Of course this pigmy can not stand against the great giant, the United States. But, Mr. President, certain as it is that

we will prevail, what would it profit us if in the contest thousands of those people were slain? What would it profit us if thousands of our officers and soldiers had to yield up their lives unnecessarily?

I believe if the Congress of the United States and if the President of the United States will hold out to those people any possible assurance that there will be an adjustment which will be compatible with their honor, that this bloodshed can be avoided.

I am anxious that in the accomplishment of this great work, which was to be the great crowning work of peace, we shall not have to shed human blood. Mr. President, we have had enough of it. What are a few paltry dollars or a few paltry million dollars to the Government of the United States, in the settlement of such a question, compared to the blood of our citizens? What are these paltry millions of dollars compared with what may be considered honorable and right dealing on the part of the United States, all-powerful as it is, with a weak and almost powerless people?

If we have not been in the wrong, it ought to be peacefully ascertained; it ought to be ascertained, not by the arbitrament of the sword. If we have been in the right, that question ought not to be determined by the rule of might, but by the impartial judgment of those whose judgment will be accepted by the civilized world, so that if we are in the right we have nothing to lose. But if, on the contrary, Mr. President, we have done wrong—this resolution does not say that we have, and I do not say so in this place—if we have done wrong, I may say, there is not power enough in all the world to make us do right unless we wish to do right. But if we have done wrong, there ought not to be power enough in all the world to keep us from doing right even to the weakest and least powerful of people.

Therefore I hope, sir, that this resolution, if no other Senator desires to speak upon it, may go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where it may have due and proper consideration, and that it may come back.

I sincerely trust, Mr. President, that even the introduction of this resolution may have a tendency to stay the outbreak which is threatened.

I will say that in the introduction of this resolution I had no disposition to invade the province of the President of the United States, and I do not think that the Senate, in the adoption of the resolution, will invade the province of the President of the United States. The Constitution distinctly makes the Senate an advisory body for the President of the United States in the negotiation of treaties. In the early history of the Government the President of the United States communicated with the Senate and asked its advice prior to the negotiation of treaties.

There have been instances, even during the limited period when I have had the honor to sit in this body, when similar resolutions have been introduced, though I am not sure that they were adopted.

I desire, sir, having said very much more than I intended in the beginning, to assure the Senate that I introduce this resolution in no partisan spirit; that I introduce it in the utmost good faith, in the hope that the action of the Senate may redound to the good of our people; may prevent bloodshed; may vindicate us before the world that we have done no wrong, and show us where the right is if we have departed from it in any particular.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] has moved that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I rightly apprehend that resolution, it is, in the first place, in the nature of advice to the President to enter upon a negotiation with Colombia. As to the right of the Senate to give such advice to the President I have no doubt; but this resolution, as I understand it, goes further, and instructs the President as to the course of that negotiation. But, Mr. President, my objection to this resolution is much deeper than that. Negotiations, as is well known, are pending between General Reyes and the Secretary of State. They are in communication. What the conditions of their negotiations are we do not know.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not true that those negotiations are ended?

Mr. LODGE. Not to my knowledge. I do not speak here on the basis of newspaper reports.

Mr. DANIEL. May I ask the Senator whether he is informed as to whether or not those negotiations are ended?

Mr. LODGE. Not to my knowledge. All I can say is that I am not aware that they are ended.

I think for us to come into the Senate with a resolution distinctly in the interest of Colombia would be a most harmful thing. I do not want even to discuss such a resolution. I do not think it ought to be discussed.

I am as anxious as the Senator from Georgia or anyone else can be to avert war and bloodshed, but I believe nothing could be more calculated to bring on fighting on the Isthmus between the people of Colombia and the people of Panama than the passage of such a resolution as that introduced by the Senator from Georgia.

I want to bring this matter to a direct vote without a reference to the committee, and therefore, Mr. President, I shall move to lay the resolution upon the table.

Mr. TELLER. That is not fair.

Mr. BACON. I trust the Senator from Massachusetts will not do that.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let us have a vote on it, then.

Mr. LODGE. What I want is to get a vote on it, and I know of no other way than that.

Mr. MORGAN. You will get a vote on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] moves to lay the resolution of the Senator from Georgia on the table. That motion takes precedence of the motion to refer.

Mr. TELLER. I will venture to say, even if it be out of order, that this is an unusual proceeding in this body. I will take occasion after the resolution is laid on the table to express my opinion about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is obliged to rule that the motion is in order.

Mr. LODGE. I have no desire to prevent discussion. I simply want to bring the resolution to a vote—that is all—without its reference to the committee.

Mr. BACON. I trust the Senator will withdraw that motion.

Mr. LODGE. I have no other alternative. If the Senate will agree to take the vote before the hour of 2 o'clock, I am perfectly willing to withhold the motion.

Mr. DANIEL. It seems to me very unreasonable—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending motion is not debatable.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand that it is not, but it has been debated, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. I will withhold the motion, as the Senator from Virginia wishes to be heard.

Mr. DANIEL. As the question has already been debated by two Senators, I suppose that a third one will have the same right as the other two had.

It would be very extraordinary to vote upon that resolution either to-day or to-morrow. It is a new proposition, one which as yet not even the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who has listened so attentively to it, could fully digest and comprehend without additional reflection.

The due and proper course is that the resolution should go to the committee, like other resolutions of that kind that it should not be treated with a drumhead court-martial—as other matters have been attempted to be treated in this body, which have heretofore been of a class which commanded the utmost respect of all parties and of all interested in the honest and just administration of public affairs.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who has taken charge of the business of the Senate, should at least allow that we may say a word or two on this subject.

This resolution is an important one. I am not myself prepared to vote on it now. I do not know, in the haste with which it was read, whether it does go beyond the power of this Senate or not.

It seems to me when the Senator from Georgia moved to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations that that ought to have been satisfactory to everybody in this Chamber. If the resolution goes further than it should, it will be the privilege of that committee to so amend it and change it as to bring it within the proper rule.

I should like very much to vote for a resolution in favor of arbitration upon any controversy that may arise between us and Colombia on this subject or any other.

I think, Mr. President, that this resolution ought to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not know that I want to vote on it as it stands just now for fear the criticism made by the Senator from Massachusetts might be correct. I am not sufficiently keen in my judgment and perception, Mr. President, to always know on two minutes' notice whether a matter of this character is an infraction of law or not, but I know some things that every man here knows, and one is that it has not been the custom of this body to dispose of matters of this kind in this summary way. I should certainly vote against laying the resolution on the table. But, suppose it should turn out when I come to examine it, that I have made up my mind that it goes further than it ought to go, I would then stand committed to a proposition that I certainly would not have voted for if I had thought it had

gone further than it should have gone, because I had no opportunity to examine the resolution.

The motion to lay the resolution on the table is contrary to the custom of this Senate. While it has been recognized, Mr. President, that there should be the power of disposing of debate on a question when a majority wanted to do so by a motion to lay it on the table, this is the first time in my experience in this body that I have ever known a motion of this kind to be made under such circumstances.

I think the resolution ought to go to the committee of which the Senator from Massachusetts is a member. The committee is organized for the purpose of seeing that just such resolutions are kept within the rules, and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], recognizing the usual custom of the Senate upon a resolution of this kind, has himself suggested that it go, or he moved that it go, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from Massachusetts desires to make the motion which he has indicated, I will withdraw the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and under the rule it will lie over until to-morrow.

Mr. LODGE. I submit that it is too late, Mr. President. Two motions have been made.

Mr. BACON. There is no motion pending, and, therefore, how could it be too late?

Mr. LODGE. There are two motions pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senator from Massachusetts to withdraw his motion.

Mr. LODGE. I withheld it.

Mr. BACON. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] could not have proceeded if the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] had not done so.

Mr. LODGE. Very well. If the Senator wants it to go over until to-morrow, I have no objection, but I shall renew the motion then.

Mr. BACON. I am perfectly willing to let it go over for to-day; but if the Senator is going to move that it lie on the table I will withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia withdraws his motion to refer the resolution.

Mr. BACON. And I ask that the resolution be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. CULBERSON. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made to its present consideration, the resolution will, under the rule, go over and be printed.

Mr. BACON. The Chair did not understand me to have withdrawn the motion to refer to ask for the present consideration of the resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would be considered presently unless objection were made.

Mr. BACON. I understand the rule to be the other way—that, as a matter of course, a resolution goes over unless there be unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does.

Mr. BACON. My only object in calling attention to it was that it might not appear in the RECORD that I was inconsistent when I had made no request for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, before we pass from this subject I want to see if I understood what the Senator from Georgia stated about the author of the newspaper dispatch that he had read from the Secretary's desk. What was the statement the Senator made in regard to the author of that dispatch?

Mr. BACON. I made no statement except that which is found on the face of the paper, that he was formerly consul at a place, the name of which was read. That is the only statement I made.

Mr. FORAKER. I heard that much, but I did not know but that something else had been said, and I wanted to be sure about it.

Mr. BACON. There was nothing more than that.

Mr. FORAKER. I have taken the trouble to telephone the State Department—

Mr. BACON. The only additional statement I made as to it was that this was not from an anonymous correspondent, and I gave the name.

Mr. FORAKER. I have taken the trouble to telephone to the State Department to find out who Mr. Clifford Smythe is. I find that he was appointed consul at Cartagena, Colombia, in March, 1894, by President Cleveland, and that he was at that time residing at Cartagena. How long he had been residing there no one seems to know. He was credited, however, to the State of New York; so that he was possibly originally a citizen of New York, but he seems to have for some reason located and become interested in that country. I mention that in order that it may have

such weight as Senators may see fit to give to it as affecting the character of the dispatch which he has sent.

Mr. SPOONER. Was that paper read?

Mr. FORAKER. The paper was read from the Secretary's desk as a part of the remarks made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], and the reason why the Senator from Georgia thinks that there ought to be adopted such a resolution as that which he has offered, a resolution which proceeds upon the theory that some great wrong has been done by the United States.

Mr. President, we have had a detailed history from the President of the United States as to all that has been done by the United States with respect to this controversy, with respect to Panama, and with respect to the recognition of the Republic of Panama. Does any member of this body pretend to say that that account so given by the President is not full, is not complete, that it does not embody everything that has been done? I have not heard of anybody making any such charge.

Mr. President, if it be true that the President of the United States has laid before this body, in his message to Congress, all the facts connected with that transaction—the recognition of the Republic of Panama—all the facts pertaining to our action there, let some Senator put his hand upon a single step or a single fact connected with this Government, or for which this Government is responsible, of which he can say that there was anything wrong about it.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This debate is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator from Ohio allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. I have not heard discussed on the floor of the Senate by any Senator the right of the President to order an act of war upon a Government at that time friendly with this nation. Does he consider that that would be right?

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, the President of the United States has not ordered war to be made upon a friendly government. There has been no act of war that I know anything about.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator allow me to ask him another question?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator consider a direction to the naval officers of the United States to prevent the troops of Colombia from attacking an insurrectionary force not an act of war?

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, he has not done any such thing. The President of the United States, as set forth in his message, has simply done that which has been done over and over again.

Mr. DANIEL. When?

Mr. FORAKER. By Republican and Democratic Administrations alike—

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, no.

Mr. FORAKER. In the effort to discharge our duty under our treaty of 1846 with New Granada to maintain free from interruption the transit across the Isthmus. Over and over again marines have been landed. What for? Not to make war upon anybody, but to prevent war.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. To prevent war between whom?

Mr. FORAKER. To prevent war by anybody who might want to fight.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator consider that the United States has a right to send its naval forces to prevent war between other nations by fighting one of them?

Mr. FORAKER. No; we have not fought anybody nor do we propose to fight anybody.

Mr. DANIEL. Were they not directed to fight if the other forces had appeared?

Mr. FORAKER. Our marines were directed to prevent war or bloodshed along the transit that would interfere with its use.

Mr. DANIEL. By force?

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Virginia a question. Does the Senator from Virginia think that the President of the United States should have sat idly by and permitted belligerent forces to come into conflict along that transit?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. FORAKER. And there fight it out and interrupt the use of the transit?

Mr. DANIEL. I think he had no right to prevent it, I say to the Senator very promptly; and that is the issue between us.

Mr. FORAKER. Then, Mr. President—

Mr. DANIEL. While I am up, if the Senator will allow me to

ask him a question, will he kindly inform the Senate whether or not other Secretaries of State have not so expounded the law—Republican Secretaries of State—that we did not have a right to interfere with forces under similar circumstances? Have not Mr. Blaine, Mr. Fish, Mr. Seward, and others so held; and has not that been the settled policy of this country with respect to Colombia?

Mr. FORAKER. I think just the reverse has been the settled policy of this country with respect to Colombia ever since the treaty of 1846. I think it has been the settled policy of this country, whenever war or bloodshed was threatened in the neighborhood of or along that transit, to land our forces to prevent it.

Mr. DANIEL. And to attack one of the other forces?

Mr. FORAKER. We did not attack anybody there.

Mr. DANIEL. We did not attack them because they did not come. We had prevented them from coming.

Mr. FORAKER. If they had come, we would have protected the transit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators must observe the rules of the Senate and address the Chair when desiring to interrupt each other. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] has the floor.

Mr. FORAKER. If they had come and had attacked our forces, or had attacked anybody else who was in the use of the transit, and had by force and violence prevented the use of it, or had obstructed or embarrassed its use, it would have been the duty of the United States to relieve that situation, and for such a purpose they had the right, and that right has been exercised over and over again, to land the marines and make such use of them as might be necessary. We have never undertaken to attack anybody.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator from Ohio permit me to ask him another question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. FORAKER. I will yield to the Senator from Virginia as much as he thinks I should yield to him.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. My only object is to get at the truth of this matter. My understanding of the dispatches which have been communicated to us by the President is that the naval forces of the United States were directed to land and to intervene to prevent the troops of the friendly Republic of Colombia from getting to the insurrectionary troops of Panama. Is not that the understanding of the Senator?

Mr. FORAKER. I do not so understand the dispatches, Mr. President. I have not seen anything in the dispatches that goes to that extent. The dispatches show that it was the order of the President, properly communicated to our representatives, that our marines there should land, and that they should protect that transit from interruption; and in that behalf they should not allow any conflict between any military forces along that transit.

That is our duty, Mr. President, under the treaty of 1846; and if in the discharge of that duty, which we are under a solemn obligation to perform, Colombia was deterred from coming there to attack the insurgents, that is a mere incident of the discharge of our duty, for which we have no responsibility whatever.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes.

Mr. CARMACK. When the Senator says that the orders of the President were intended to prevent war, does he not mean that they were intended to prevent war between the Republic of Colombia and the insurgents in Panama?

Mr. FORAKER. Not at all, Mr. President. They were intended to prevent war between those forces or any other forces along the line of that transit. They could do all the fighting they wanted to do, removed from that transit. We were seeking to protect the transit; nothing more. That was our obligation in Panama.

Mr. CARMACK. I want to ask the Senator one more question. We have had to protect that transit frequently; but did it ever before occur that this Government assumed the right to prevent Colombia from landing her own troops upon her own soil to suppress an insurrection against her own Government?

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from Ohio let me ask him a question?

Mr. FORAKER. As soon as I answer the question of the Senator from Tennessee.

We never had this precise case before, but we have in other instances prevented Colombia from transporting troops over this transit. That has been done repeatedly.

Mr. CARMACK. I know, but if I understand it, we never went to the point of saying that Colombia should not land her troops in Panama. This was done, I will suggest to the Senator,

before there was any movement of insurrection in Panama. An order was given that the troops should not be allowed to land before there was any movement of insurrection in Panama.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator from Ohio permit me a moment?

Mr. FORAKER. As soon as I have answered the Senator from Tennessee.

We did not prevent Colombia from landing her troops in Panama. She could land them at any place in Panama she saw fit to land them, except only in the neighborhood of this transit.

Mr. CARMACK. No.

Mr. HALE. What I want to ask the Senator—

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

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I want to ask the Senator is not this whole thing a question, under the treaty of 1846, of protecting and keeping free the transit? The President, in whatever he did, restrained Panama equally with Colombia. Had Panama's position been one of hostility to and interference with the transit across the Isthmus, would not the President's action have been precisely the same, and was he in any way restraining one more than another in protecting the transit?

Mr. FORAKER. Not at all. I am much obliged to the Senator from Maine for that statement. I have been trying to get an opportunity to make that identical statement.

We were not intervening in hostility to Colombia; we were not intervening in hostility to anybody; but we were intervening in behalf of peace, to discharge our treaty obligations, and to preserve that transit from interruption.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. FORAKER. And to stop bloodshed. Now, Mr. President, the result of what was done by the President is his best vindication. The revolution has been a bloodless revolution. If it ceases to be bloodless, and war and loss of life are to ensue, it will be because of a responsibility that does not rest on the President, but upon those who make such speeches as indicate that here in the Senate of the United States an opinion prevails, for which there is absolutely no warrant, that the President of the United States committed wrong against the Government of Colombia.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator permit me to ask another question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. FORAKER. I do.

Mr. CULBERSON. I understood the statement of the Senator from Ohio to be that the President's directions were that no troops of Colombia should be permitted to land in the vicinity of the transit. I call the Senator's attention to the instructions themselves, if he will permit me to read the sentence. This is dated November 2, before the revolution even:

Prevent landing of any armed force with hostile intent, either Government or insurgent, at any point within 50 miles of Panama. Government force reported approaching the Isthmus in vessels. Prevent their landing if, in your judgment, the landing would precipitate a conflict.

I will ask the Senator if that does not prevent the landing of any Colombian troops at any point within 50 miles of Panama, the beginning of the transit?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly it does. That is exactly what I have stated. It prevents the landing of Colombian troops at either terminus, at Colon or at Panama, or in the neighborhood of the transit; that they should not be allowed to land in such proximity as that by a day's march they might come upon the transit and precipitate war and bloodshed.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator consider 50 miles within the neighborhood of the transit?

Mr. FORAKER. The distinguished Senator from Virginia knows that 50 miles is not very far away for light marching troops; that if they are allowed to concentrate an army within 50 miles of the transit, it is only a day's time to precipitate a conflict, war, and bloodshed. I think it was a wise order the President gave in that respect. How far away would the Senator require troops to be landed in order that they might not interfere with the transit?

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Was it not the duty of Colombia herself to protect that transit?

Mr. FORAKER. It may have been.

Mr. DANIEL. Was it not her primary duty?

Mr. FORAKER. Colombia was not protecting the transit.

Mr. DANIEL. Were not her troops going there to protect it?

Mr. FORAKER. I have not the dispatches before me; but if my information is not incorrect and if my recollection is not at fault, Colombia made a request of the United States that we send our troops there at this very time for the purpose of preserving order, as we were required without any request from her to do by the obligations of the treaty.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FORAKER. I yield.

Mr. CARMACK. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that Secretary Hay, in a telegram to our consul after this revolution had occurred, told him to express to the authorities of Panama that they would be expected to defend the transit under the treaty of 1846; that is the substance of it. In other words, that the new State of Panama, inheriting the obligation that had belonged to Colombia under the treaty of 1846, was itself under obligation to protect and defend the transit. If Panama had that right under the treaty of 1846, Colombia had the right under the treaty of 1846.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I am not going to answer that argument in the way in which it is advanced by the Senator from Tennessee, for I have already answered it. The complete answer to it is in the fact that we have always interpreted our treaty obligation to require of us that whenever the transit is threatened from any source whatever it is our duty to protect it.

Mr. CARMACK. Without being asked to do so by Colombia?

Mr. FORAKER. Without being asked to do so by Colombia or anybody else. It is our solemn treaty obligation. If Colombia does not do it, it is for us to do it, and we can not ignore it.

Mr. CARMACK. But Colombia must have a right to try to do it, must she not?

Mr. FORAKER. But Colombia was not coming there to preserve order. Colombia was coming there to wage war—

Mr. CARMACK. Upon whom?

Mr. FORAKER. Now, Mr. President, a motion was made to lay this resolution on the table. I am sorry that under the proceedings which were had it is impossible for that motion to be voted upon at this time. It ought to be voted upon at this time that this resolution might be disposed of immediately, because it is just such resolutions as this and just such speeches as we have been listening to here that are calculated to make war and bloodshed.

The Senator from Georgia sent up to the desk and had read a letter from the former consul, Mr. Smythe. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to one paragraph in it. It was all read, I think.

Mr. GALLINGER. It was all read.

Mr. FORAKER. I think it was all read. It has been suggested by some one near me that a part of it was not read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was all read.

Mr. FORAKER. I think it was read; but what I want to call attention to is this statement of President Marroquin, of Colombia.

As high an authority as President Marroquin permits me to quote him. In answer to a message from me he sent me the following and gave permission for the cabling of these latest and authentic facts concerning the situation here:

"The people of Colombia still hope that actual conflict may be averted through Democratic intervention in the Senate."

Mr. CARMACK. I hope so, too.

Mr. FORAKER. Now we have the open avowal from one of the most distinguished Democrats in this body that he does hope that through Democratic intervention that result may be accomplished.

Mr. CARMACK. Bloodshed prevented.

Mr. FORAKER. Well, I am not done yet:

"Personally I count on the assistance of the Democratic party and the great American people to save the sacred rights of Colombia, which have been so scandalously wounded."

Now, Mr. President, we have avowed here in the Senate sentiments precisely the same as those that are being avowed by the officials of Colombia and the same as those that are being entertained by the people of Colombia, according to this cablegram from Mr. Smythe.

Mr. DANIEL. If the Senator will permit a question, has not the Senator the same sentiments as those of the insurrectionists in Panama?

Mr. FORAKER. I understand that we had nothing to do with one side or the other in that conflict.

Mr. MORGAN. It is armed neutrality.

Mr. FORAKER. But if we should ratify the treaty which has been proposed, we would have another and a different kind of an obligation, of which I am not here at liberty to speak, but with

which all Senators are familiar. But for the time pending the ratification of the treaty with Panama, our obligation remains as it has remained there without interruption since 1846.

It is an obligation to preserve that transit from any kind of interruption. If men want to fight there we have a right to order them away and to require them to go away. Acting in that behalf there is nothing unreasonable in the fact that the President should not allow any troops to be landed, for the purpose of making war, within 50 miles of the transit.

Now comes this resolution of which I wish to speak. In the first place, it proceeds throughout upon the theory that our Government has committed some wrong. I challenge Senators on the other side to point out what step has been taken by this Government that was wrong. Let them indicate what point in the President's narration of events they take exception to.

Mr. MORGAN. You will give us time to do that, will you not?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes, certainly; we will give you time.

Mr. MORGAN. All right. All we want is a little time to do it.

Mr. FORAKER. Let us go on and understand what it is in behalf of Colombia that these Senators want to point out as their objection to the President's action. We have this resolution, I say, proceeding upon the theory that there is some great wrong. There is no wrong except only the assertion that in doing what was done, as an incident to it, Colombia was prevented from making war upon Panama along the line of that transit. This resolution, proceeding upon that false idea, declares, first, that the President shall enter into negotiations for a new treaty with Colombia, a treaty by the provisions of which we shall make such reparation to Colombia as she may be entitled to in the judgment of the negotiators and in the judgment of Senators who may vote to ratify such a treaty.

We deny in the outset that there has been any wrong; we deny that Colombia has any claim against us of any kind whatsoever.

Then, in the next place, failing to make such a treaty with her, the President is directed to take the necessary steps to submit this to The Hague tribunal of arbitration.

Mr. President, it seems to me there is no occasion for such resolutions; and it seems to me also that this is a most serious matter, for if this is to have any effect at all it is, as I said a moment ago, to turn a bloodless revolution into one that is to be attended with bloodshed, war, and pillage. We do not want to be responsible for that.

Is it true, as President Marroquin has stated, that the dependence of the Colombians is upon the Democratic party in the United States, or rather the Democratic party as represented in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. MORGAN. May I ask the Senator a question?

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

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. MORGAN. Are not the Senator and the Republican party and the President all dependent on the Democratic vote for a ratification of the Hay-Varilla treaty, the one that is pending in the Senate?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes; certainly.

Mr. MORGAN. You are dependent on us?

Mr. FORAKER. We certainly hope that there are Democrats who will vote for that treaty, and we certainly hope there are Democrats who will rise above party requirements, if it has been sought to make it a party question, and vote with their country and for its interests.

Mr. MORGAN. Then why does the Senator from Ohio undertake to make this a party question and to devolve the responsibility of the President's action on the Democratic party?

Mr. FORAKER. We do not undertake to make it a party question.

Mr. MORGAN. That is what you are doing.

Mr. FORAKER. We undertake simply to answer those who are trying to make it a party question. Let me inquire of the mover of this resolution whether it was considered in the Democratic caucus?

Mr. BACON. What was the inquiry of the Senator?

Mr. FORAKER. What is the origin of the resolution? Has it been considered in the Democratic caucus, may I ask?

Mr. BACON. Well, Mr. President, I do not think the Senator would have a right to make that inquiry, but I have no objection—

Mr. FORAKER. Then—

Mr. BACON. The Senator ought to permit me, I think, to complete my sentence.

Mr. FORAKER. What is it?

Mr. BACON. Am I not entitled to complete my sentence?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. The Senator did not seem to recognize that right.

Mr. FORAKER. I beg pardon.

Mr. BACON. I was proceeding to say that the Senator had no right to propound the inquiry, especially in the dictatorial and domineering manner in which it was made, but that I had no objection to saying to the Senator that the resolution originated solely with myself, and that it was never seen by any other human being except the stenographer until after the Senate met this morning, when I showed it to two or three Senators around me.

Mr. FORAKER. I hope the Senator will not think that I asked the question in a domineering or dictatorial tone, or in such a manner. I asked it only because it was suggested on the other side that this was being made a party question. That was said after I had made the statement that we hoped Democrats would vote with us upon these propositions. I asked it in order that I might bring out the fact that I was justified in the belief I had expressed that this was not a Democratic measure; that it had not been introduced or considered in the Democratic caucus, but that it had originated with the very distinguished Senator from Georgia, and that he alone was responsible for it.

Mr. BACON. Absolutely and exclusively.

Mr. FORAKER. I imagined so. I never thought for one moment that it had originated otherwise, and I only wanted to bring out the fact that it was not one of the Democratic caucus measures that had been introduced here by direction of the caucus for the purpose of making this a party question.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me for a moment in this connection—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that he must obtain permission to interrupt the Senator holding the floor. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. FORAKER. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. I desire simply to say to the Senator from Ohio that as the authorship was definitely ascertained he ought to give to the author credit for sincerity in the statement made when the resolutions were presented, to the effect that it was not designed as a party question, but one in which I hoped all Senators, regardless of party, would sympathize because of the object to avert threatened hostilities.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I did give the Senator credit for that—at least, in my own mind—and when it seemed that some question had been made about it on the Senator's side of the Chamber I sought to make it perfectly clear, and put it in the RECORD, that the resolution had originated with the Senator alone, and that he did not have a party purpose in view, but that he was proceeding according to what his best judgment directed him to do in order that he might properly discharge his duty.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. FORAKER. Now, I have said all I am going to say, and I quit, as I began, with an expression of regret that it is not possible for us to at once take a vote upon the resolution and put it out of consideration in the Senate, and thus show to Colombia that she is being misled, as I fear, by the expressions made by some Democrats, at least, in the Senate, to her very great prejudice.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator from Ohio give me his views of the construction of the thirty-fifth article of the treaty of 1846 before he takes his seat? It says:

The Government of New Granada guarantees to the Government of the United States that the right of way or transit across the Isthmus of Panama upon any modes of communication that now exist, or that may be hereafter constructed, shall be open and free to the Government and citizens of the United States, and for the transportation of any articles of produce, manufactures, or merchandise of lawful commerce belonging to the citizens of the United States.

Then again:

And, in order to secure to themselves the tranquil and constant enjoyment of these advantages, and as an especial compensation for the said advantages and for the favors they have acquired by the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles of this treaty, the United States guarantee positively and efficaciously to New Granada, by the present stipulation, the perfect neutrality of the before-mentioned Isthmus, with the view that the free transit from the one to the other sea may not be interrupted or embarrassed in any future time while this treaty exists; and in consequence the United States also guarantee, in the same manner, the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over the said territory.

Now, I ask the Senator this question, and I simply ask the Senator for the purpose of getting his views. When we guaranteed the neutrality of the Isthmus—it says “of the before-mentioned Isthmus”—does that mean that we guaranteed that the Isthmus shall not become the theater of war in the future, so far as foreign powers are concerned, and also so far as Colombia is concerned in factions and dissensions? When we simply guaranteed the neutrality of the entire Isthmus to prevent foreign countries from going there and entering into war, have we also the right to prevent the people of Colombia from going there and preventing their own people from entering into a war?

Mr. FORAKER. What we undertook to guarantee was that

the transit should be preserved free from interruption, and we undertook to do whatever might be necessary in that behalf, no matter whether its interruption might be threatened by citizens of Colombia, or officials of Colombia, or soldiers of Colombia. Whoever might come there and interrupt it we were bound to suppress, we were bound to preserve the peace, and we were bound to do whatever might be necessary to that end.

Article 35 of the treaty of 1846 has been construed over and again by all the Administrations that have followed since then. There is no question about its construction; neither, in my judgment, is there any question but that every act done by President Roosevelt and every message sent by our Government to Panama in connection with this transaction were strictly within that construction.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Ohio is always extremely courteous and considerate of all his colleagues in debate. While his manner is animated and forcible, and not thereby less attractive, he has always heard their queries with great courtesy and patience. I thank him for the consideration and courtesy he has shown me this morning in my interruptions of his discourse. He is the first speaker upon this floor who has touched acutely the points in dispute between gentlemen who favor the policy which he does and gentlemen who feel constrained by their sense of what is due to the Constitution of the United States, to our solemn treaties, and to international law to dissent.

Mr. FORAKER. May I interrupt the Senator just a moment?

Mr. DANIEL. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. Was the Senator taking the floor on the question? I had yielded it.

Mr. DANIEL. I took the floor to accept the Senator's challenge.

Mr. FORAKER. I thought the Senator wanted to ask me a question is the reason why I was remaining standing. I wish to say to the Senator that I appreciate his appreciation of my courtesy, and I am glad I did not show any domineering attitude toward the Senator from Virginia—

Mr. DANIEL. I am sure the Senator did not.

Mr. FORAKER. As the Senator from Georgia thought I did toward him.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator from Virginia will permit me to say that in a moment of possibly too much feeling I used hasty language to the Senator from Ohio, than whom there is no man in the Senate I hold in higher esteem.

Mr. SPOONER. I am glad that the controversy need not be referred to the tribunal at The Hague. [Laughter.]

Mr. BACON. The Senator will mark the fact that the resolution proposes that the United States and Colombia shall settle their differences between themselves, and only go to The Hague in case they can not. That is the same solution I now tender to the Senator from Ohio, which I hope he will receive in proper spirit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. DANIEL. While this state of excellent good feeling is existing, and while I am in somewhat good humor myself now, I may at some time in the future be a little impatient, and I beg to bespeak the charity of my friends beforehand.

The Senate can not have been unobservant of the fact, nor do I think the country will be unobservant of the fact when it has awakened to the reality of the differences in this Chamber, that the distinguished Senators who have heretofore addressed themselves to this subject have avoided or touched gingerly the real issues.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] made an elaborate argument, in which he poured an encyclopedia on recognition in the forefront of his speech and then glided tenderly over the points in dispute.

The Senator from Ohio challenges this side to put their fingers upon the points in this policy which they object to. I accept that challenge, and I accept also the statement of his own side, which the Senator to-day has made more clearly and more manfully and openly than any of his predecessors. He declares it to be his judgment and puts this question upon the ground that it was the duty of the United States, under the treaty of 1846, to see to it that an open transit was preserved across the Isthmus.

That is one proposition. A second proposition was that it was the duty of the United States, in consequence of its right to protect an open transit, to send the armed forces of the United States to keep the State of Colombia, which was the owner and sovereign of that country, from landing troops in the vicinage of the transit line, or within 50 miles thereof; and, thirdly, that this was in accordance with the historical precedents of the United States.

I will reverse the order in which I join issue with the honorable Senator. First, I deny that it is within the historical precedents

of the United States, either as to Colombia or as to any other nation.

It is singular enough that Mr. Loomis, the Assistant Secretary of State, who on behalf of the Administration took the American people into his confidence, has cited none; that the President of the United States has cited none; that the distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS] have cited none, and that the Senator himself has as yet cited none. I ask the production from those Senators and challenge the production of precedents to the effect that the United States of America may send her armed forces, naval or military, to interfere with the armed troops of a friendly nation in defending her sovereignty, her property, or her territory. That is the point I make.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. DANIEL. One minute, if the Senator pleases.

Mr. LODGE. I thought the Senator asked for precedents.

Mr. DANIEL. A little later I will be very glad to yield to the Senator.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator has assailed by his main proposition the career of his own party in this country. If M. Varilla, who seems to have been imported into this country from France by way of Panama to instruct its people in their international duties upon the hustings, is to be followed in attacking the State Department of the United States in its administration for a generation, the people of the country ought to understand it. I will read to the Senator from a great Secretary of State, a man of as high intelligence as ever occupied that seat near the President. Here is what Mr. Seward said about this treaty:

Neither the text nor the spirit of the stipulation in that article by which the United States engages to preserve the neutrality of the Isthmus of Panama imposes an obligation on this Government to comply with a requisition like that referred to. The purpose of the stipulation—

Says Mr. Seward—

was to guarantee the Isthmus against seizure or invasion by a foreign power only. It could not have been contemplated that we were to become a party to any civil war in that country by defending the Isthmus against another party.

That has been the position which the Republican party of this country has honorably and worthily occupied for over thirty years respecting this identical matter. In 1873 this same matter came before Hon. Hamilton Fish, of New York, as Secretary of State. He announced from the State Department the following doctrine:

This Government, by the treaty with New Granada of 1846, has engaged a guaranty of neutrality of the Isthmus of Panama. This engagement, however, has never been acknowledged to embrace the duty of protecting the road across it from the violence of local factions.

Does the Senator from Ohio consider that the troops of Colombia and Panama were local factions?

Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. DANIEL. As soon as I finish this quotation I will yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, who wants to ask me a question:

Although such protection was of late efficiently given by the force under the command of Admiral Almy, it appears to have been granted with the consent and at the instance of the local authorities. It is, however, regarded as the undoubted duty of the Colombian Government to protect the road against attacks from local insurgents. The discharge of this duty will be insisted upon.

Now I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for a question if he wishes to ask me one.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator made the statement that nobody had referred to any precedent on this matter.

Mr. DANIEL. I said that no one had cited a precedent to that point.

Mr. LODGE. To that point.

Mr. DANIEL. I stated the point, and the point is this: The United States to send its armed naval or military forces to interfere with armed forces of a friendly government in defending itself against local attacks from insurgents.

Mr. LODGE. The precedents were cited by the President in his message—the precedents of 1900, 1901, and 1902, in which precisely the same instructions were given that were given in the year 1903. Colombia invited us to come there. We have taken the ground—

Mr. DANIEL. Colombia invited us to come?

Mr. LODGE. I only want to point out precedents. I will not read them. We have taken the ground—

You are directed to protest against any act of hostility which may involve or imperil the safe and peaceful transit.

That was in 1900. We follow that universally.

Mr. DANIEL. Did not that apply only to the transit?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; and so has the President's order applied only to the transit.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator mean to say that it was not the obvious purpose of the United States to prevent the Colombian Government from suppressing the insurrection?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think there is anything of the kind. I

think the object was to preserve the transit and stop the fighting; and both parties were protected.

Mr. DANIEL. How? By taking the side of one party?

Mr. LODGE. We did not take the side of one party.

Mr. DANIEL. We did not, because the other party did not appear.

Mr. LODGE. We prevented the insurgents from attacking Colombia. They tried to move their men and we prevented that. It is all stated in Captain Hubbard's letters. He prevented the insurgents; they said it themselves. That is not taking sides. We held the balance absolutely even. The result was that the people of Panama got their independence. There is no doubt of the result.

Mr. DANIEL. If the Senator is done asking his question, I would like to continue.

Mr. LODGE. I beg the Senator's pardon; I rarely interrupt the Senator. He interrupted the Senator from Ohio so frequently I did not suppose he would mind my asking the question.

Mr. DANIEL. As I understand it, then, the United States troops were sent there to prevent the insurrectionists from attacking Colombia.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; to prevent Colombia from attacking the insurrectionists.

Mr. DANIEL. That is what the Senator states.

Mr. LODGE. The order was distinct.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand the orders.

Mr. LODGE. It was:

Prevent landing of any armed force with hostile intent, either Government, or insurgent.

That is exactly what was done, and that it was our duty to do.

Mr. DANIEL. It could hardly be supposed, Mr. President, that Colombian troops moving could have hostile intent to any but those who were hostile to her. As I now understand the Senator from Massachusetts, the armed forces of the United States were sent within the territory of a friendly nation to prevent the troops of that friendly nation from interfering with a hostile intent, with an insurrection in that friendly nation. That is the declaration, as I understand it, of the Senator from Massachusetts, and that is this matter as I apprehend it.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator does not quite state me. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator, but he does not quite—

Mr. DANIEL. I shall be very glad to hear the Senator's statement.

Mr. LODGE. My statement is that they were landed to protect American property and citizens and the transit, and maintain the peaceful transit over the Isthmus. In so doing they operated equally against the Government and insurgent troops. I think that is the whole case.

Mr. DANIEL. In so doing they stepped between two lines of battle and commanded the peace between a friendly government that then had her minister at the capital of the United States and a little insurrection which was noticed by this country in official dispatches a day before it took place.

Now, then, to that I address myself, and I will cite again the Secretaries of State, who were placed by the Republican party of this country in that high station, to illuminate this very matter, and who have declared the law to be that which I now confirm it to be, in my own opinion, and who, in my humble opinion, no constitutional or international lawyer of repute in his profession can dissent from as to its integrity, its justice, its clearness, or its properly meeting the issue.

I read again, in answer to the Senator from Ohio, from Mr. Fish. He says:

This Department deems it important, in the interest of general commerce, and especially of the carrying trade of that route, that these disturbances should be guarded against. By the treaty with New Granada of 1846 this Government has engaged to guarantee the neutrality of the Isthmus of Panama. This engagement, however, has never been acknowledged to embrace the duty of protecting the road across it from the violence of local factions; but it is regarded as the undoubted duty of the Colombian Government to protect it against attacks from local insurgents.

When the Government of Colombia was marching its troops to suppress a local insurrection, and, as we have the right to assume, as there is no suggestion to the contrary, to protect its interests in and to defend that transit, the United States held before them a line of battle and warned them off.

I will read, Mr. President, from William M. Evarts, of New York, Secretary of State. He is addressing himself to the very point upon which the Senator from Ohio has challenged this side of the Chamber. I will permit him to give his answer:

But it can not be overlooked that by the thirty-fifth article of the treaty of 1846 the United States has not only, "in order to secure to themselves the tranquil and constant enjoyment" of the advantages of that treaty, undertaken to "guarantee positively and efficaciously to New Granada the perfect neutrality of the before-mentioned Isthmus," but they have further obliged themselves to "also guarantee in the same manner the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over the said territory."

How is it, Mr. President, that from Loomis, from Varilla, and

from all the diplomatic and Senatorial expounders of this treaty we hear nothing but one side of the question, and that nothing is said about another guaranty that is in this treaty, given in consideration of the very right of transit to American troops and persons passing across that Isthmus? Mr. Evarts calls attention to it and makes the reminder that we have guaranteed in the same manner the rights of sovereignty and property which New Grenada has and possesses over the said territory, and it is not debated that Colombia is in that respect her successor. Now, his conclusion:

While, therefore, the United States have perfect confidence in these representations, as well as in the strong friendship of the French Government, it can scarcely be denied that such a concession to foreign subjects would introduce new questions of relative rights and interest, affecting both the sovereign and proprietary rights of the Government of Colombia and such as would seriously enlarge the responsibilities of our treaty guaranty; and this Government feels that it is not unreasonable in expecting that any concession involving such consequences should be a subject of joint consideration by, and that its details can scarcely be settled without a preliminary agreement between, the Governments of Colombia and the United States as to their effect upon existing treaty stipulations.

In answer to the query which the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] made to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], I beg to read a few lines from a distinguished publicist from his own State. It was no less than the brilliant and able James G. Blaine. He wrote in 1881 as follows:

The United States recognizes a proper guaranty of neutrality as essential to the construction and successful operation of any highway across the Isthmus of Panama, and in the last generation every step was taken by this Government that is deemed requisite in the premises. The necessity was foreseen and abundantly provided for, long in advance of any possible call for the actual exercise of power.

In 1846—

He adds—

In 1846 a memorable and important treaty was negotiated and signed between the United States of America and the Republic of New Granada, now the United States of Colombia. By the thirty-fifth article of that treaty in exchange for certain concessions made to the United States we guaranteed "positively and efficaciously" the perfect neutrality of the Isthmus and of any interoceanic communications that might be constructed upon or over it for the maintenance of free transit from sea to sea—

Then he says—

and we also guaranteed the rights of sovereignty and property of the United States of Colombia over the territory of the Isthmus as included within the borders of the State of Panama.

Mr. President, on the 2d day of November, 1903, we were in complete peace with the friendly Government of Colombia. If she had committed any unfriendly act toward this Government, Congress had not been apprised thereof by any Executive message. At that time, while this treaty was extant under which we stood before the world and guaranteed to that Republic the sovereignty of her territory, we sent armed troops into that territory, not to suppress an insurrection, but to prevent that friendly Government from exercising the highest necessary right of sovereignty—to defend itself.

Now, Mr. President, this is a painful subject to me. Allusions to Democratic party and to Republican party have been made on both sides of this Chamber. I wish to say for myself that there never has been a Democratic President of the United States or a Democratic party in this country that was strong enough to make me support this procedure. It has been my fortune, or misfortune, in politics some time to disagree with the Administration of my own party. It has also been my misfortune, or fortune, as you may look at it, to disagree with the leaders of my party. If the party of Mr. Bryan and Mr. Cleveland and of Mr. Cleveland's predecessors in office, from George Washington to this time, were to propose such things as are now proposed to a body of which I was a member, I would not sustain them; and while we are seeking to make the noblest example of a free, just, and honorable nation before the world, they ought not, in my judgment, to be sustained by any man, to whatsoever party he belongs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate, under the rule, the General Order, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Order of Business No. 12, Senate resolution 27, by Mr. PENROSE, instructing the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads to direct the Postmaster-General to send to the committee all papers connected with the recent investigation of his Department, etc.

Mr. HALE. I had intended to submit some remarks, not much extended, on the Post-Office resolutions this morning, but they evidently will not be reached to-day, and I ask that they all go over until to-morrow morning, to be called up after the routine morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the resolutions known as the Post-Office resolutions may go over until to-morrow morning, to be called up immediately after the routine morning business. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SPOONER. This matter is still under consideration, I suppose, only by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It can only be under consider-

ation by unanimous consent, for there is nothing pending before the Senate except the first bill on the Calendar of General Orders.

Mr. HALE. I do not suppose, as debate has gone on by unanimous consent so far, that any Senator will now object to other Senators discussing it.

Mr. DANIEL. Certainly not.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss at this time the general subject or the rights and duties of the United States under the treaty of 1846. Later I intend to ask the Senate to permit me to discuss with some fullness the various propositions which are really involved, as I conceive it, in the subject.

I do not any more doubt the sincerity of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and his patriotism than I do my own or that of any other man in the world. I have, and I did it from my heart and without reservation, hitherto had occasion to pay tribute to that Senator for his silence—dignified, manly, and patriotic—in the midst of utterances on that side of the Chamber which could be nothing less than an encouragement to the prolongation of war being waged against the United States. But I can not divest myself of the belief that this resolution in the circumstances is a mischievous one, not possible to be productive of any good to this country or to Colombia, and pregnant with possibilities of danger to both.

The spectacle which we have afforded to the world, Mr. President, must have caused astonishment. We have been debating here for weeks a proposition which the Senate was asked to endorse, declaring that an act of war has been committed by the United States against the Republic of Colombia.

Mr. BACON. This resolution?

Mr. SPOONER. No, sir.

Mr. BACON. Oh, I beg pardon.

Mr. SPOONER. No, sir.

Mr. BACON. Well, I beg pardon.

Mr. SPOONER. A proposition that the United States has committed an act of war against the Republic of Colombia while that Republic has not yet said so, but has been in full diplomatic relations with the United States, and is to-day.

Some things have happened. They are accomplished. The President recognized the Republic of Panama. He received a minister from the Republic of Panama. The great nations of the earth have recognized the Republic of Panama. Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Peru, and Cuba have recognized the Republic of Panama. The Senate has concurred in the action of the President accrediting a minister from the United States, with full diplomatic capacity, to the Republic of Panama. The President has entered into and sent to the Senate—and that has been made public, and I have a right to refer to it—a treaty with the Republic of Panama.

Those things have occurred. They mean something and they have some effect in international law. Some of the steps by which these results have been reached will be criticised. That is the right of Senators; that is the right of the press; that is the right of the people. But those criticisms will be for influence upon our own constituencies, not for effect upon the transaction or the status as it actually exists. The injustice of such criticism will be easily shown.

This resolution can not help, can not overturn. On the contrary, it recognizes the status. It can not do otherwise, Mr. President, than to encourage a hope in Colombia which for the time at least will be disappointed; and I confess my surprise that in the Senate of the United States, made by the Constitution a part of the executive power of the United States so far as our foreign relations are concerned, while those relations are strained with the Government perhaps to the point of breaking, Senators should so confidently assert here that there will be war between the United States and the Republic of Colombia. It is such utterances in the presence of the world, and in the old days of the Senate they would not have been made in the presence of the world, which, in my opinion, tend to cause war.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator allow me?

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

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator, in my opinion, has never seen any day at all, no matter how antiquated, in which the truth could not be told in this body.

Mr. SPOONER. Oh, Mr. President, I have seen such days, and so has the Senator from Alabama. I have, during my short and entirely uneventful career in this body, a number of times known a Senator to be interrupted by a motion to go into secret session, which, being seconded, took him off the floor so far as the world was concerned.

Mr. MORGAN. I am not speaking of the galleries; I am talking about the Senate.

Mr. SPOONER. And, Mr. President, that was not because he was speaking what he thought was not true. Many times many of us have thought he was speaking the truth, but it was because

the situation was such that we, a Senate of the United States, a part of the treaty-making power, could not safely for the public interest, which we are here to conserve, say in the presence of the world what we might safely say in the presence of each other.

If there is not a collision, Mr. President, between the Republic of the United States and the Republic of Colombia it will not be the fault of some gentlemen here at home, in my opinion. The question mooted by the Senator from Georgia—

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator think sending our troops there is having anything to do with it?

Mr. SPOONER. I think it is susceptible of demonstration that our troops are where they have a right to be. That is what I think; and I think the statement made by the Senator from Virginia as to the true import of the transaction of which he complains, analyzed, is not supported by the documents. I think what he arraigns the Administration for, and what he criticises in the use of troops at Panama prior to the insurrection, the President of the United States is to be praised for, not blamed for. I undertake to say, Mr. President, if there had been no treaty of 1846 and a war ship of the United States had been in Panama or Colon under the circumstances, those troops would have been landed and utilized as they were, if the Government were not too pusillanimous to be beneath contempt.

This is not a party question. I have never called it a party question. I have never treated it as a party question. Some questions reach a point where they become national American questions, Mr. President, hardly susceptible of party division. I have never believed for one moment that there would be a division upon this subject upon party lines, and I hope the day never will come when mere partisan politics will creep into the action of this body as a part of the treaty-making power. But the proper time for criticism will come. That time will be when it involves no danger of strife.

Mr. President, it is worse than useless, it is dangerous, in my opinion, and I speak only for myself, to impeach the honor of the Government—the Administration, I will say, in this environment.

I am not going at large into this subject. I hope the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] will allow the resolution to be voted upon, and voted upon now. If Senators on the other side want to make a sharp issue they can easily make it. When I say "Senators on the other side," I do not mean all Senators on the other side; I mean the Senators who feel so intensely upon this subject—and I do not dispute the sincerity of any of my colleagues—can make it. They can propose that there shall be undone what has been done. They can invite both Houses to adopt a resolution that it is the sense of Congress that the President withdraw the war ships and withdraw the marines from Panama, except such as are needed to protect the mere railroad line, to permit the passage of cars and locomotives, and to interpose no obstacle to the overthrow of that Republic and to the reinstatement of the lost—I will call it—sovereignty of Colombia. That is the logical result of these contentions; that is the only way to right this wrong, as some Senators consider it a wrong.

Of course, Mr. President, I think such a resolution would receive very few votes in the presence of the American people, North or South; and the people South and the people North on questions like this are alike. I doubt if on such a resolution many Senators on the other side, who speak with such intensity—feeling, of course, just as they speak—would face the music and vote for it.

Mr. President, what was done at Panama? Did the United States, prior to the insurrection, prevent Colombia from landing her troops there to repress disorder? It has been assumed from these papers that we did. The record shows to the contrary. As I understand it, all the troops which Colombia, prior to the recognition by this Government of the Republic of Panama, sent to that Isthmus to repress disorder landed upon that Isthmus without let or hindrance from the Government of the United States.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SPOONER. Always.

Mr. CARMACK. Were not orders given, however, to our naval commanders to prevent the landing of Colombian troops?

Mr. SPOONER. Do you mean before the recognition of the Republic?

Mr. CARMACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPOONER. I will speak about that, but that is sticking in the bark.

Mr. CARMACK. I do not think so.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, then, I must be wrong.

Mr. CARMACK. Why, of course you are. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPOONER. But I think that is sticking in the bark. I do not think that the people of the United States will try and judge the Administration—and when I use that word I do not speak as a Republican—on the language of a cablegram sent, not to Colombia or to the world, but to one of our naval officers. It will

be judged, as it ought to be judged, by what was done, not by what was written. But what was written, Mr. President?

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. CARMACK. If the Senator is going to read that, I will not interrupt him.

Mr. SPOONER. Going to read what?

Mr. CARMACK. Going to read what was written.

Mr. SPOONER. Of course I am going to read what was written.

Mr. CARMACK. Then I hope the Senator will read it.

Mr. SPOONER. I am not afraid of what was written.

Mr. CARMACK. Of course, we all know that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SPOONER. Always.

Mr. CARMACK. We all know the Senator from Wisconsin is not afraid of anything.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not mean that.

Mr. CARMACK. We do not accuse him of being afraid of anything.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not mean that. The Senator knows that I was not speaking in the language of braggadocio or vouching my personal courage at all. I mean there is nothing in this language that I have occasion to be afraid to read. The Senator knows what I meant.

Here is the cablegram:

Maintain free and uninterrupted transit.

That no one objects to. My friend from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] does not object to that.

If interruption is threatened by armed force, occupy—

What?

Mr. DANIEL. That was not our duty under the treaty.

Mr. SPOONER. No, Mr. President, not our duty under the treaty, but our right under the treaty, and our right without any treaty in view of the fact that it was an American corporation, whose stock was partly owned by American citizens; and if there had been no treaty our right to protect that railroad, to prevent interruption of that transit, to prevent the shelling of the depots and the buildings of that railroad company, would have been a perfect right.

If interruption is threatened by armed force, occupy the line of railroad. Prevent landing of any armed force with hostile intent—

I agree with the Senator from Virginia that this did not mean hostile intent toward the railroad—either government or insurgent.

That explains it all. The Government of the United States did not intend that the line of that transit should become the theater of military operations between Colombia and the inhabitants of Panama; or, if you please, the insurrectionists. Colombia had guaranteed the freedom of transit, and we had made certain guaranties also. If Colombia failed in her guaranty, her duty, her failure to discharge it gave us a right to protect that transit, or the whole treaty stipulations was an empty and useless thing.

It was the duty of Colombia, with the warnings she had had as to the sentiment and purposes on the Isthmus, to have anticipated that disorder by seasonably providing an adequate force to discharge her guaranty; and if she failed to do it until there had been such organized insurrection on the other side as would lead inevitably, when she attempted to do it, to war on the line of transit, the United States, in that failure of treaty duty by Colombia, had not only the right but the duty to say, "You shall not fight on this line of railway; you shall not interrupt by military operations this right of transit or the fact of transit."

Mr. DANIEL. Or "within 50 miles of Panama."

Mr. SPOONER. Or within 50 miles. I would not perhaps have put that in the cablegram, but it is there, and there is some sense in it, too, because the Senator must admit that there could have been no contest there except at Colon, Panama, or the intervening territory. That would have been the theater of the fight inevitably, and that, because of the tardiness of Colombia in preparation, gave the United States some rights which, under ordinary circumstances, it might not possess. Criticise this cablegram or the officer, if you choose, I care not now to say more about that.

Colombia did not receive that cablegram or know of it; nor did the officer receive it to whom it was sent, or know of it. The officer did not receive it, Mr. President, until the 3d day of November at about 10.30 o'clock, and before that time a Colombian gunboat had arrived at Colon with 400 troops, sent by Colombia to repress disorder on the Isthmus, and they were permitted by this level-headed officer, acting entirely on his own responsibility and the precedents, to land, and they did land at Colon,

and their generals—for they had two or more general officers with this army of 400 men—proceeded by rail to Panama, where they were arrested by the insurgents and thrown into prison. That gave Colombia, the papers show, about 500 men on the Isthmus.

Now, how did the marines happen to land? The Senator from Virginia spoke about a battle line. I do not find the battle line we drew. The officer who commanded the *Nashville* has told that story.

There was not an American soldier, Mr. President, on shore when the Colombian troops landed, so far as these papers show, and there was but one war ship in the harbor, and that was the *Nashville*. Let me read this:

U. S. S. NASHVILLE, THIRD RATE—

One of the smaller ships—

Colon, U. S. Colombia, November 5, 1903.

SIR: Pending a complete report of the occurrences of the last three days in Colon, Colombia, I most respectfully invite the Department's attention to those of the date of Wednesday, November 4, which amounted to practically the making of war—

Not by the United States against Colombia—

the making of war against the United States by the officer in command of the Colombian troops in Colon.

Mr. TELLER. That is the officer's idea of war.

Mr. SPOONER. Wait and see what it was.

At 1 o'clock p. m. on that date—

Does the Senator from Colorado dispute the right and duty of the commander of the *Nashville* to land those marines under the circumstances detailed by him, and to use them as he did?

Mr. TELLER. No, Mr. President, I have not; but I do dispute the statement he makes that any act of the Colombian Government was an act of war against the United States.

Mr. SPOONER. That was a mere opinion. That might have been repudiated by Colombia.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator is putting that forward to show we did not begin the war, but that Colombia did. There is no war at the present time on the transit.

Mr. SPOONER. I am not disputing that. I am only reading this report in which that occurred.

At 1 o'clock p. m. on that date I was summoned on shore by a preconcerted signal, and on landing met the United States consul, vice-consul, and Colonel Shaler, the general superintendent of the Panama Railroad. The consul informed me that he had received notice from the officer commanding the Colombian troops, Colonel Torres, through the prefect of Colon, to the effect that if the Colombian officers, Generals Tobal and Amaya, who had been seized in Panama on the evening of the 3d of November by the Independents—

Not by us—

and held as prisoners, were not released by 2 o'clock p. m., he (Torres) would open fire on the town of Colon and kill every United States citizen in the place, and my advice and action were requested. I advised that all the United States citizens should take refuge in the shed of the Panama Railroad Company, a stone building susceptible of being put into good state for defense, and that I would immediately land such body of men, with extra arms for arming the citizens, as the complement of the ship would permit. This was agreed to, and I immediately returned on board, arriving at 1.15 p. m. The order for landing was immediately given, and at 1.30 p. m. the boats left the ship with a party of forty-two men—

Think of it—forty-two marines—

under the command of Lieut. Commander H. M. Witzel, with Midshipman J. P. Jackson as second in command. Time being pressing, I gave verbal orders to Mr. Witzel to take the building above referred to, to put it into the best state of defense possible, and protect the lives of the citizens assembled there—

Right on the line of transit, in one of the railway buildings on the line of transit, filled with American citizens, some foreigners, and women and children, who, frightened, had fled to that place for protection under the flag of the United States against the threat of the Colombian officer—

not firing unless fired upon, etc.

Can any man justly criticize the action of that officer under the circumstances? Is there a government in the world that would not have cashiered an officer if in that situation, treaty or no treaty, he had failed to respond to that call? Whether the call was justified or not, it was sufficient to him. It is the duty of a government to protect its citizens all over the world when they are in the right, and that is what this officer did, and that is all he did.

I do not intend to take the time to refer to what transpired there between these 42 marines barricaded in the railway building, one of its freight houses on the line of transit, and to the demonstration made there against them by the 400 Colombian troops. Those 42 marines did not drive out the 400 Colombian soldiers, but they left.

Mr. MORGAN. They were bought out.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator says they were bought out. That is legitimate for a revolutionary junta.

Mr. MORGAN. That is the fact, though.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not know whether it is a fact or not, but Senators can not ask us to be affected at all in our judgment upon

this transaction, nor could the President be, upon what was done by the insurrectionists or revolutionists in bringing about, without bloodshed, their independence. God knows, Mr. President, if ever there was a people in the world who were entitled to relief from tyranny, blackmail, extortion, neglect, and outrage, the people of the Department of Panama were, and I do not know a Senator on the other side who, if he had been a Panamanian—if that is the proper pronunciation—

Mr. MORGAN. Panamanian. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPOONER. Who would not have been an insurrectionist? They were not Panamanians; they were men, Mr. President, who wanted to be free and to have once again a government of their own. They wanted the open way to health, prosperity, and happiness in the future. They were not willing to have the door of hope, and the only hope to that people, barred forever at Bogota. They were not maniacs for that. Panamanians are not all confined to Panama. [Laughter.]

All I intended to say, Mr. President, I have said, but I can not see for the life of me, whatever you may say about a cablegram which was not received, I do not see how the United States, represented by that official, can be criticised for what was done in the landing of the marines, and I do not see that this Government is to be criticised for anything that was done prior to the declaration of independence and the recognition of that independence by the United States. What has been done since then, Mr. President, I shall undertake to justify upon principles of international law, upon reason, and upon precedent on another occasion. I rose mainly to say that I can not in this situation see what good purpose this resolution can accomplish, and to express the hope that we may have a vote upon it.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I am not going to discuss the Panama question. The issue made here to-day was on the resolution offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. Now, it is asserted that that is a dangerous resolution; it is asserted that it is one which the Senate has not any right to pass, and, if it had a right to pass it, that this is an inopportune time to pass it.

I propose to say a few words about the resolution, but I am not going to raise or argue questions of law with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. I think he and I would agree on most propositions of that kind, although I can not agree with him when he says the Senate is part of the executive department of the Government.

Mr. SPOONER. I said its treaty-making power is.

Mr. TELLER. No; not even that. I am not going to argue that, but I want simply to say that the best authorities in the world have declared—though, of course, this being a sui generis case, there is no other, and you can not apply to it precedents obtained anywhere else—that the relation of the Senate to the Executive, so far as the treaty-making power is concerned, is that of a legislative body and not that of an executive body.

Mr. SPOONER. What about the confirmation of appointments? Is not that executive?

Mr. TELLER. That is not executive, either. That is sui generis, as I say, unlike anything else in the world. It does not have to be determined to be either executive or legislative. John Adams, Madison, and other fathers of the Republic declared that the relation of the Senate to treaties was legislative, and not executive. But, Mr. President, I do not care to go into that question. I merely wanted to enter a caveat to that proposition.

Let us see, first, whether this is a resolution which is proper to come before this Senate or whether the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], for whose good faith the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] vouches, has simply made a mistake. What does this resolution propose? Does it propose any direction to the President of the United States? Not at all. Does it invade the right of the Executive in any way by directing him to do this or not to do that? Not at all. It is a suggestion proposed to be made by the Senate of the United States to the executive department of the Government.

I do not know but that in these modern times we shall abdicate and abandon the right of this body to make suggestions to the executive department; but in some cases we have the unquestioned right to direct the executive department.

Mr. President, if any Senator will take the pains to spend a little time in looking over the history of the country with relation to the executive and to this, the legislative, branch of the Government, he will find that the Presidents of the United States have recognized beyond question the right of this body to make suggestions. When Polk was President of the United States on more than one occasion he took the opinion of this body. You can find in the records of the country that he in detail wrote out and sent here a statement, and said, "I wish to consult the Senate as to whether it would be proper and wise to make a treaty on the following lines."

What does this resolution provide? Not that the President shall make a treaty, but that it is the judgment of the Senate

that it would be wise to make a treaty. Is there anybody here who will say under the condition existing that it would not be wise for us to make some kind of treaty with Colombia that would satisfy the Colombians that we do not intend any violence to them? Does anybody believe that it would not be a wise thing for us to make a treaty of some kind, if it could be done without too great sacrifice, to convince all the South American republics that we have not any desire to invade their rights? I do not know whether a treaty could be made with Colombia that would be consistent with the present condition of affairs. I know very well, as the Senator from Wisconsin has said, that what has been done is not going to be undone, and there is no suggestion in the resolution under discussion that anything that has been done is to be undone.

What is the suggestion? To make a treaty that must come here for our approval, and if we will approve it that will compromise and settle all the controversy between us and Colombia.

But if Colombia is not in a frame of mind, or if we are not in a frame of mind, to make a treaty, then what is to be done under this resolution? We are to do what the whole world has been saying ought to be done in national controversies—refer it to the arbitration of the great tribunal at The Hague or a special tribunal to be arranged by Colombia and our Government.

Mr. President, where is the vice in that? Where is the insult to the majesty, to the executive department, of this Government? Where is a violation of any of the decencies and proprieties of this body?

It is not very likely, if we should make an effort to accommodate affairs with Colombia, that Colombia would ask us to return Panama to her embrace. I am morally certain, so far as the executive department of the Government is concerned, and I am equally certain as to the dominant party in this Chamber, that that would be a hopeless effort, and Colombia must know that by this time. Colombia has received from the executive branch of the Government a denial of any attempt to consider even her complaints against us.

I am sorry the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] is not in the Chamber, because I wanted to say some things that I shall omit. The Senator from Ohio, with a great deal of zeal and assurance, stands up here and says there is not anything wrong in any act. Mr. President, suppose we should all say there is not any wrong act. Suppose everyone of us admitted that to be the fact now, which, for one, I am not inclined to do. When I shall get the floor with time, I shall try to demonstrate that these acts we complain of are infringements of the rights of Colombia, and not demanded of us by any treaty or by any law of the civilized world. However, I shall not attempt to do that now.

But suppose we were of the opinion that there was no offense. Colombia believes that there is. The entire South American people believes there is. There is not a republic on the American continent that does not feel affronted at our conduct. Although this great nation of ours might feel strong and self-reliant in our ideas that we were right, is it beneath our dignity that we should say to these offended people, "We will submit this question to the arbitration provided by that great conference which was held in Europe a few years ago?"

I know, Mr. President, that we did not accept the treaty made with Great Britain as to arbitration, and it has been repeatedly said that we were opposed to arbitration. What stood in the way of that treaty was a constitutional provision which was ignored in the treaty, that this Senate had the right to pass upon every treaty of every kind and every character that was made by the Government of the United States. That provision was not in that treaty.

The Senator from Ohio asks, "Who says there is any wrong?" "What Senator is going to point it out?" If the Senator was here, I would say something about the manner in which he addresses us on that subject. He is not here, and I shall pass that by.

On the 17th day of November, in this body, one of the oldest and most respected members of it, a man whose thorough competency to discuss here or anywhere in the world a question of international law nobody will deny, did discuss this question and did indicate as plainly as his words could do that he thought there had been a wrong perpetrated against the people of Colombia.

I know the public press said that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] administered to him a stinging rebuke because of his lack of loyalty to his party, but I doubt very much whether it changed that illustrious Senator's views upon this question. The Senator from Ohio knew that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] had taken the floor and discussed the question for a considerable length of time to show that this was not a proper and right thing for us to do.

The morning paper has given us an account of a meeting up at New Haven and of a petition that is to be sent here to be presented by the senior Senator from Massachusetts when he arrives.

Mr. MORGAN. Here is the statement of it.

Mr. TELLER. I have it right here. For the Senator from Ohio to assume that there is nobody complaining of this transaction is not to be quite tolerated without at least a reply. The Senator may think that everything that has been done has been done correctly and properly. He knows very well that many Senators in this Chamber do not think so. Of course they may be wrong and he may be right. They may be prejudiced by their political associations, he thinks. He may be prejudiced by his political association. I have yet to learn that the Senators who sit on the other side of the Chamber are any better qualified to judge upon a question of conscience and morals than those who sit on this side; and I have yet to learn that we who sit on this side of the Chamber are to govern our judgment according to theirs or that of the Executive.

When I read, as I shall do now, this statement from New Haven, there is not anybody here but will recognize that this is a question of more than ordinary political consideration. The men who met at New Haven are men who are entitled to discuss questions of this kind by virtue of their training and by virtue of their ability in the line of international law.

Twenty prominent citizens—

Says the paper—

Twenty prominent citizens of New Haven, headed by Prof. Theodore S. Woolsey, professor of international law at Yale University, have signed and forwarded to Senator GEORGE F. HOAR a petition asking that the Senate defer formal ratification of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty, and that this Government's action in Panama be subjected to careful and deliberate investigation.

Among the signers of the petition are Franklin Carter, formerly president of Williams College; Henry Wade Rogers, dean of the Yale Law School; Frank K. Sanders, dean of the Yale Divinity School; Profs. William G. Sumner and John C. Schwab, of the department of political economy at Yale; Secretary C. A. Lindsley, of the State board of health; the Rev. Dr. Newman Smyth, the Rev. Watson L. Phillips, and Thomas Hooker, members of the board of education, and Samuel L. Bronson, formerly a Democratic candidate for governor of the State.

After declaring that there is a recognized body of law which ought to govern the conduct of nations irrespective of their strength, the petition says that a belief has arisen in the minds of many in this country and abroad "that in our dealings with the State of Colombia we have violated and are about to violate the rules of international law, and that we are adopting a line of conduct toward that country which we would not have taken against a stronger power."

Mr. President, that is an indictment from a source that can not be cried down. The enthusiasm and the energy of the Senator from Ohio had better be directed somewhat to this class of people in the United States if he hopes to quiet this complaint that is so generally rife.

The petition further says that the fact of Colombia's comparative weakness should make us the more careful to avoid the suspicion that we are making an unjust use of our greater power; that the mere existence of such a condition is injurious to our honor and self-respect, and concludes: "We therefore respectfully ask that before final ratification of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty our action in Panama be carefully and deliberately investigated to the end not only that the Republic may do no wrong, but that its good reputation in the world, which is dearer than any gain of lands or trade, should suffer no loss."

Mr. President, that is all I care to read, because that is all really that is pertinent. There are some other things that I leave out.

Mr. President, it will not do for the Senator from Ohio or the Senator from Wisconsin or anybody else to say that when that class of men enter their protest here it is not entitled to consideration, and it will not do for them to say that it is inciting to war. Nor is it reasonable for them to say that of a proposition of this kind made in the American Senate for a treaty that might arrange difficulties between Colombia and ourselves or which provides that in case of the inability to secure such a treaty the controversy between Colombia and ourselves shall be submitted to arbitration.

Mr. President, everybody knows there is a controversy. Everybody knows that the world believes we have gone beyond that which is justified by the law of nations. That the President felt that he had gone beyond what he felt the treaty required is shown by the fact that he not only put it partly under the treaty, but partly under the law of nations, which he has applied, and stated that it was in the interest of civilization that these movements had been made.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] says that it is not an act of war on the part of the President of the United States. The Senator from Wisconsin is an international lawyer of whose ability I have a great opinion, but I believe that his anxiety to shield the Administration with which he is connected colors his views on this subject. I understand it to be an unquestioned principle of international law (I have never known it questioned in the books) that the recognition of a seceding government by another government with intervention at the same time was an act of war. I know it is not an act of war to recognize a government, even although it is unduly and improperly done; but if it is done with an act of intervention in favor of the rebels or the insurrectionists it is by all the authorities in this country and everywhere else an act of war.

If there is not an act of war between Colombia and the United States, it is because Colombia knew that she was not able to cope with us. Does any citizen believe if that had been done with reference to Great Britain there would not have been an active and vigorous war? Could we have done it to France, to Spain even, to Russia?

Oh, no, Mr. President, you can do with impunity with a baby what you dare not do sometimes with a man. When these citizens of New England come here and express the opinion that we have done with Colombia what we would not have done with the great powers of the world they express the opinion that is prevalent everywhere in the United States.

I do not care whether a man defends the action of the President or whether he criticises it, everybody knows that we would not have performed that act had even Canada, a country that we would like to have in our embrace and as a part of our territory, seceded from Great Britain. Does anyone believe we would have said: "We can not afford to have a war on our borders, and in the interest of civilization, in the interest of peace, commerce, and trade, we will say to Great Britain, Keep your hands off of Canada?" Does anybody believe she would have kept her hands off? But we would have been very far from making that suggestion even if conditions had been as they were down there in the Panama country.

Mr. President, I do not know what will be the result of this resolution, whether to-morrow we shall have a motion to lay it on the table, so that we may not vote on it, or whether it will go to the committee.

I submit that as an orderly, decent procedure this resolution should properly go to that committee, and if there is anything objectionable in it, if there is anything reflecting upon the President, if there is any assumption of facts that do not exist, it is then for the committee to arrange it in such a shape as that it shall be unobjectionable in that particular.

There is not a single controverted fact mentioned in the resolution. It is admitted here on this floor to-day. Let me read it:

Growing out of the recent revolution in Panama and the consequent secession of Panama from Colombia and the alleged aid and assistance by the land and naval power of the United States in the successful accomplishment of said revolution and secession.

Now, Mr. President, is that offensive? If so, the committee can readily put it in words that are not offensive. Everybody knows that Colombia is complaining of our action there. As I said before, although we may justify it as a nation, and suppose that all, every man, woman, and child in the nation, justified it, is it beneath our dignity to say to Colombia, "We do not think you have any right to complain, but if you have, you will submit it to the judgment of the tribunal at The Hague, or, if you prefer, to such a tribunal as we may select?"

Mr. President, there would never be any arbitration if both sides had to prove their case beforehand. One side will always assert that it is right and the other will assert that the other is wrong. That is all there is in this resolution. Colombia says that she has an offense against us, that we have treated her improperly. She may say that she does not want to go to war. We know that she can not.

The very fact that Colombia can not go to war ought to appeal to every generous-hearted man in the country to give her an opportunity to show before the world that she has been wronged, and if so to fix what shall be the compensation that she shall receive. I say that every man who is a lover of his country and who is not a lover simply because of her great strength, who does not think of her many millions of wealth, who does not think of her great Army and her great Navy, but thinks of her honor—every such a man ought to wish and hope and work and do his best to see that this question is put where we can be righted if we are right and where we can make atonement if we are wrong.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I had intended to reply to the criticisms of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and those of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. The resolutions, I thought, were conservative in their character and calculated to effect the very opposite of the opinions which the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin anticipate would be effected. The suggestion on my part was to have a reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations, for I had every reason to believe it would receive careful attention, such as the committee always gives to matters before it. In response to that suggestion, the Senator from Massachusetts proposed to treat the resolution with indignity, casting it out even without a reference, and the Senator from Wisconsin, though in very kindly terms, seconds the Senator from Massachusetts, not exactly in the main, but in the ground upon which he predicates it.

I had designed to say something in reply to those Senators, not for the purpose of controversy, but in the hope that I might con-

vince them that the resolution was not entitled to be treated with such indignity and that it was not liable to the criticisms which were bestowed upon it by these two distinguished Senators. But official business doubtless has demanded the absence of those Senators from the Chamber, and I do not feel like proceeding in their absence. Consequently I will forbear, with the hope that on to-morrow I may have at least the courtesy of the opportunity to reply to what they have said.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CARMACK. I hope the Senator will withdraw that motion for just a moment.

Mr. CULLOM. I withdraw it at the request of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CARMACK. Just for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETTUS in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. CULLOM. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee for the purpose indicated.

Mr. CARMACK. The Senator from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, now being present, I hope when this matter comes up on to-morrow no motion will be made to cut off debate. I desire myself, if I can have the opportunity, to address the Senate on this question.

I shall get the opportunity, sooner or later, I know, but I should like to have an opportunity to-morrow, if possible, to say what I have to say upon the resolution. I would be glad to know that no motion will be made that will cut off debate.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no authority to determine that question. I was not in the Senate when the resolution was introduced by the Senator from Georgia, and I have had very little opportunity, as a matter of fact, to see exactly what its terms are. Objection being made to its further consideration to-day, it went over until to-morrow, or the resolution will go over.

Mr. HALE. It has gone over.

Mr. CULLOM. It has already gone over, and it has been over for a couple of hours perhaps. The resolution will doubtless come up to-morrow, and while I make no agreement about the matter, because I do not feel that I have the right to do so, I suppose that reasonable debate will be allowed. But I hope also that we may dispose of the resolution to-morrow at some time and get rid of it either by a reference or by an actual vote upon the resolution.

Mr. BACON. I wanted to have it referred without debate.

Mr. CARMACK. I have no doubt about that, but I think it is just as well to have debate on it as anything else.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the resolution having been discussed at considerable length by the opponents of it, certainly they ought not to cut off anybody on this side. I did not myself care to go into the general discussion of the Panama question, which I intend to do at another time. I confined myself, as the Senator knows, to the resolution and its bearing.

I wish to say to the chairman that nothing will be gained by an attempt to crowd the resolution to a vote. I have no objection to voting on it. I did object to it. I did not know enough about the resolution this morning to vote for it. I can vote for it very cheerfully now. I am not expecting to debate it any further, but if we are cut off on this side from an opportunity to debate it we certainly know how to get an opportunity to debate any question in the Senate that we want to debate, and nothing will be gained by anyone moving to lay it on the table before the debate has taken place.

Mr. CULLOM. The purport of my remarks was that I hoped we would vote upon the resolution itself, after a reasonable discussion to-morrow, and pass upon the question whether—

Mr. TELLER. We will, if nobody wishes to discuss it longer.

Mr. CULLOM. I am ready to vote on it myself at any moment.

Mr. TELLER. You will not, if anyone wants to discuss it.

Mr. CULLOM. The suggestion is made by my distinguished friend from Colorado that we know how to do things in the Senate. There has been evidence enough of that without repeating it in the Senate, it seems to me, in direct terms. It has so happened that it has become the fact that it is almost impossible to do anything in the Senate except by unanimous consent, and I think the time has pretty nearly come when we have got to change our programme if we want to legislate for the country.

Mr. HALE. I hope the Senator will not say that.

Mr. CULLOM. I do say it, and believe it.

Mr. BACON. I should like to have the distinguished Senator state what particular measure has failed in the Senate by reason of debate.

Mr. CULLOM. I am not prepared to say just what measure has failed, but we all know that discussion goes on and on almost

forever before we can get to the point of finally disposing of a measure, whatever it may be. I am the last man, as I think the Senate knows, to undertake any gag rule or any intrigue to carry a measure through or get rid of it. I have always been disposed to be fair, and I think I feel that way now. At the same time I do not think there is any occasion for the announcement that we will find a way to do this thing or that thing or the other thing. Of course we will find a way.

Mr. BACON. I merely wish to say, as the Senator is not prepared to answer my inquiry—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is not in order.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. CULLOM. With pleasure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But the Senator from Georgia must get permission of the Chair.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. I ask the Senator from Illinois if he will permit me a single moment?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I simply desired to say, as the Senator was not prepared to answer the inquiry—and he has been here a great deal longer than I have—that during the nine years I have had the honor to serve in this Chamber I have seen but two measures which have been defeated by unlimited debate. One of them was the statehood bill, which at the last Congress was defeated by Republicans by unlimited debate, and the other was the river and harbor bill, which was defeated by Senator Carter, also a Republican, by unlimited debate. If there has been any other measure in the nine years which has been defeated by unlimited debate, I challenge the Senator to show what measure it was.

Mr. CULLOM. I am not going into particulars in reference to this subject, but we all know that there has seemed to be a growing disposition to debate and continue to debate until almost every Senator is worn out by waiting for an opportunity to get a vote.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator allow me to say a word?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I hope the Senator from Illinois, who is a veteran here, will be able to possess his soul in patience. We have all been through this same trouble that he is in now.

Mr. CULLOM. I am in no trouble whatever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is out of order.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator has misunderstood me.

Mr. HALE. I will substitute the word "felicity" for trouble.

Mr. CULLOM. All right.

Mr. HALE. We have been in the same felicity he is in now. Every now and then when any one of us has a measure that he wants passed and when we have a policy that we think ought to be established, we get very impatient and we want a rule and we want to stop debate. But it has been, as the Senator from Georgia has said, that in the end, out of this way that we have, Senators are enabled to be heard and debate continues, and in the end we pass everything that we ought to pass.

Mr. TELLER. And some measures we ought not to pass.

Mr. HALE. Occasionally we do, undoubtedly. I should hate to see the day when in neither branch of Congress was there allowed full liberty of debate. I have seen very few instances of what could literally be called filibustering—delays simply for the purpose of delay. I have been here a long time and I have seen very few instances of that kind. While I expect some time to have some measure that I should like to have put through subjected to the general practice of the Senate, I expect to bear it. If I have a good measure it will go through. In the end the majority, with rarest exceptions, always has its way in this body, because to the minority after a time comes a sense of responsibility that they can not afford to be merely obstructing for the sake of obstruction.

They feel that the responsibility is with the majority, and the minority in the end always votes, and we never have any difficulty in a solution, which is a thousand times better than the previous question. A unanimous agreement is made that upon a certain day a vote shall be taken that shall end the matter. That is the history of the Senate; and now on this occasion, where men have honest differences of opinion and want to be heard, and want to be heard at length, I hope the veteran Senator from Illinois will not become a convert of the theory that the Senate had better change its practice and shut off debate.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. TELLER. I wish merely to say a word. I did not mean to offend the Senator from Illinois, which I am afraid I did.

Mr. CULLOM. Not at all.

Mr. TELLER. I am afraid he did not take my statement as I intended it. I did not mean to make any threat or anything of the kind, but meant simply to say to him that any Senator who

has been here long knows he can discuss any question he sees fit on any proposition. That practice would enable this question to be discussed, and it might as well be discussed in an orderly manner as in any other way.

Now, I wish to say a word or two more. I agree with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], who has been here for a long time and who has always been an active participant in the affairs of the Senate and a useful and valuable member. I may be allowed to say this in his presence. I agree with that Senator. I know of nothing that ought to have passed that did not pass unless possibly it might have been the statehood bill, in which I was very much interested.

I did not have anything to do with the defeat of the river and harbor bill. I felt all the time that it was a badly arranged and an illy conceived bill, and I had a strong intimation from people in authority that it was very distasteful to the then President of the United States in the form in which it stood. Senator Carter took the floor and defeated it, but if there had been any real sentiment here for the passage of the bill it would have been passed. Senator Carter knew that he was doing what a great number of Senators on this floor were glad to see him do, and I confess I was one of them. That is the kind of measure that is sometimes defeated.

Now, Mr. President, there is one thing that I think is a great deal more dangerous than unlimited debate here, a thing that has attracted the attention of the public to a considerable extent recently, and that is the lack of attention on the part of the Senate when a debate is going on. The other day a Senator here in discussing a question of great and grave importance, and discussing it in a Senatorial way, was compelled to discuss it with three Senators on the Republican side of the Chamber a part of the time and three or four on this side a part of the time.

Once in a while the attendance would rise to the dignity of seven or eight Senators in the Senate, but most of the time during the entire debate there were not to exceed, besides the speaker, three on each side, of whom I happened to be one, because I was interested in the subject of the debate. I was not taking part in the debate, but I was interested in it. Now, that has attracted the attention of the public press in the United States.

Mr. BACON. And properly.

Mr. TELLER. And properly, too. While debate is free here and unlimited, it does not have the attention of Senators when it takes place. But, Mr. President, if it does not, if Senators do not intend to listen, if they make up their minds without hearing the discussion, as a great many people do on all subjects, and make up their minds without any investigation, as a great many people do on general subjects, the public have a right to have somewhere the ideas of the men sent here to represent them preserved and put in a place where they can get them.

So, whether Senators listen or whether they retire to the cloakroom, or go to the Departments, or wherever they may go during the meantime, it is a valuable privilege that a Senator here has a right to put in the RECORD his opinions and his protest if he is against a bill, his argument in favor of it if he is for it. They go into the RECORD, where the people and the public press can comment on them if they see fit. It will be a sorry time for this Republic when you shall limit debate over the only national legislative body that practically professes to be a place where discussion can be had upon the merits or demerits of measures before it.

I wish to say that I did not mean to intimate that there was any disposition to filibuster or anything else. I was unfortunate probably in the term I used.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, there certainly is no disposition on this question to try to prevent anyone from expressing an opinion. But the unusual character of this resolution is such that it seems to me to demand immediate action, or action as soon as it can possibly be reached, on the part of the Senate. This resolution is understood here. We know that it is a part of the exigencies of a political programme.

Mr. BACON. The Senator is entirely mistaken.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator will allow me to have my opinion about it.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. We understand here that it can not pass the Senate; that it does not in any respect represent the majority of the Senate or the Senate itself. We understand that; the people of the United States understand it; every Senator understands it.

But, unfortunately, it may be understood otherwise in another quarter. We are in the midst of a very difficult and delicate negotiation with a representative of the State of Colombia, and it may be possible, it may be quite probable from intimations which we have seen in the newspapers, that they will understand there has been some change in the attitude of the Government of the United States, or some change in the sentiment of this body in regard to this matter.

From that point of view and to avoid any possible dangerous consequences to us as a country and to the people of Colombia I say that we should act upon this matter at the earliest possible moment. We should let the people of Colombia and the Government of Colombia understand that the sentiments of this resolution are not the sentiments of the American Senate and of the American people, in my judgment.

Mr. TELLER. May I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

Mr. TELLER. Is the Senator from Rhode Island in favor of or opposed to submitting this question to arbitration? Is that the objectionable feature of the resolution?

Mr. ALDRICH. The resolution, as I understand it, by insinuation, by insinuation, says that the Government of the United States has been guilty of dishonorable conduct—

Mr. TELLER. It does not.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will permit me, it says by insinuation, by insinuation, that the Government of the United States has been guilty of dishonorable conduct in preventing Colombia from asserting her own rights and to her own territory and to part of her own country, and it proposes to submit that question on the part of the United States to arbitration. Is the Senator from Colorado willing to submit to arbitration the question whether the Government of the United States has been guilty of dishonorable practices?

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, that is not the question here.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. I tried to suggest to the Senate what it was. The Senator was conveniently out of the Chamber, and I do not intend to repeat the argument even for his benefit. But I should like to ask the Senator, if he will permit me, why not send the resolution to the committee and put it in form? If you want to say we do not propose to recognize Colombia as having any offense against us or that we have committed any offense against Colombia, put it in form and bring it in here and let the Senate act on it. Go to the committee. You have the committee. You own it. You have eight to five members.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not a question of its going to the committee. It is not a question of its coming back here for interminable discussion, as the Senator from Colorado mildly suggests it will be submitted to. That is not the question at all. I say that it will be misunderstood abroad. It is liable to be misunderstood by the representatives of Colombia; and in the interest of the public service and in the interest of the people of this country I say the Senate ought to dispose of it promptly and vote it down, and show those people that those sentiments are not the sentiments which have any hold upon the judgment of either the Senate or the people of the United States.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I did not intend to say anything more this afternoon, but the speech of the Senator from Rhode Island probably justifies me in doing so.

I feel very confident in the assertion that the criticisms made by the honorable Senator from Rhode Island and by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin are utterly unwarranted, and I propose in a brief way to analyze the resolution and see whether or not it is entitled to the criticism and to the denunciations which it has received to-day.

The Senator from Colorado pointed out that there is not a single allegation in the resolution as to the fact being the one way or the other. What is the case when there is a dispute between parties? The one side alleges its case and the other side alleges the opposite case, and the effort to submit to some tribunal the decision or the determination of the issue raised by those two opposing statements must always be accompanied by the proposition that there is an issue, that there are conflicting claims. That is the reason why there should be an arbitration or a submission to a tribunal.

Now, Mr. President, what does the resolution assert? It asserts simply that there is a controversy between the United States and Colombia, and we know that to be a fact. It does not say that the case of the United States is the correct case, nor does it say either directly or indirectly that the case of Colombia is the correct case. It merely asserts in the simplest of language the fact that there is a controversy and states what the controversy is. It states the controversy to be this, without assuming that either the one side or the other is correct, because a proposition to submit to a tribunal can not be accompanied by an assertion that one is right and the other is wrong.

The assertion simply is that it is alleged—and who denies that it is alleged?—by Colombia that the United States, by the use of its land and naval forces, prevented it from asserting its authority and maintaining its sovereignty in Panama.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BACON. I would rather the Senator would let me state the case, and then I will be very happy to yield. I will yield now, however, if the Senator insists.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was going to ask the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. BACON. I said I would, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator said it appeared that that was the attitude of Colombia. I ask him how it appeared that way? I have seen no official correspondence which showed that.

Mr. BACON. We have not been favored with the official correspondence, but we do know the fact that Colombia has had in this capital city a commissioner or minister, who has been here for the purpose of presenting that case, and we know the fact that there has been a controversy between himself and the representative of this Government in charge of diplomatic matters; and if we are—

Mr. ALDRICH. How do we know that?

Mr. BACON. If we are to rely upon the published account, that negotiation has ended without coming to a satisfactory conclusion.

Now, Mr. President, where is the outrage in simply presenting the fact that here is a controversy which is unsettled and which is liable to lead to trouble? That is all this does. It says that there is this claim on the part of Colombia and that it is liable to lead to war. That is the inference, and in the presentation of it that is the ground upon which it is put. Evidences are brought to the attention of the Senate that there is danger, and who doubts it? The sole purpose of it is not to bring on war, but to prevent war.

Now, what do the distinguished Senators on the other side say? They say that these resolutions are calculated to be misunderstood, and that that misunderstanding is calculated to precipitate war. Let us analyze that for a moment. Here are two parties, the United States on the one hand and Colombia on the other, who are known to all the world to have strained relations at this time.

It is true that the diplomatic relations are kept up, but it is known to every Senator in this Chamber, it is known to all people in the United States who keep informed as to ordinary current affairs, that the relations between the United States and Colombia are strained. The only reason why we are not disturbed about it is that we are so perfectly confident in our gigantic strength and in the feebleness of the other power that we are not alarmed by the fact. That is all there is in it.

Now, Mr. President, I am one of those who believe that we should avoid war with a feeble power as well as with a great power. In what way can a proposition to submit to peaceful arbitration such a controversy be calculated to lead to war? What is the situation? Here is this feeble country humiliated—whether justly so or not, we know such is the fact, believing that it has been unjustly treated. We say, if you please, on the other hand, to that country, you have not been unjustly treated.

Assume for the purpose of this argument that all is true that has been said here to-day by the distinguished Senators on the other side who propose to treat this resolution with such indignity. Assume that everything they say as to the justice of the American cause is absolutely well founded and can not be successfully controverted. Does that change the fact that there is a controversy? Assume that we are absolutely right, and certainly Senators can ask no more than that; assume that every act of the United States Government can be successfully defended. Senators can not ask more than that.

Then, if it be true, on the other side, that the other power does not so think, and that there is liable to be trouble grow out of such a difference of opinion, Senators say that a proposition to compose this difference, of trying to get together in the first place and agreeing about it, is calculated to bring on war.

Why, Mr. President, it is the most remarkable proposition, and yet that is the proposition of Senators. Here is a resolution in accord with the avowed policy of the United States Government, the avowed policy, as it has solemnly declared it, in the great treaty which has been made with most of the leading and a great many of the smaller powers of the earth. What is that? That whenever there is a controversy with another power which is liable to lead to violence that controversy it will attempt to compose. If it can not do so by agreement between themselves, then by submitting it to the arbitrament of others.

Yet Senators stand in this Chamber and solemnly object to a proposition by the great, strong power to a feeble, weak power, "Do not let us have violence; we do not think we have done you a wrong; we think we have done right to you; but you think wrong has been done. Let us get together in a friendly spirit,

talk this matter over, and see if we can not agree about it." Is it too much for a great nation to say, "If we have done you wrong, we will make you recompense?" Is it too much for us, the great power, to say to the weak power, "If we have not done you a wrong, when that fact is ascertained, you must not insist that we have?"

There is nothing more than that. This resolution proposes to advise the President of the United States as to the sentiment of the Senate of the United States, in the first place, that we should endeavor by this mutual interchange to agree with Colombia and, in the second place, that if we can not agree we will stand by the declaration which we made in the great treaty; and we will endeavor to have other parties adjust this matter for us rather than resort to war and bloodshed; yet the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], in a most emphatic manner, says it is known to everybody that the Senate of the United States does not agree to any such proposition as that; and the Senator from Rhode Island assents, by the nod of his head, to what I now say as to his position.

Mr. ALDRICH. I said, if the Senator will permit me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I did not say, as the Senator from Georgia now seems to think I did, that I was opposed to arbitration upon proper conditions. I did say that the Senate of the United States was not in favor of the proposition of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. Very well.

Mr. ALDRICH. And I said that as emphatically as I could, because I believe it to be true.

Mr. BACON. Then I want to see whether the proposition is one other than arbitration. What boots it for the Senator to say that he is not opposed to arbitration, but that he is opposed to my particular proposition, if my proposition is simply a proposition for arbitration, and nothing more? How can the Senator reconcile such statements? If my proposition is not a proposition for arbitration, then the Senator may consistently take his position; but if it is simply a proposition for arbitration, then there is no consistency in the position of the honorable Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was not undertaking to discuss the merits of the Senator's proposition.

Mr. BACON. Ah! But I am undertaking to do so.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is much more in it than the question of arbitration. I was simply saying that the pendency of the resolution without action would necessarily create trouble for us abroad.

Mr. BACON. Well, if its pendency without action creates trouble abroad, it will simply be because nonaction would raise in the mind of this poor, weak power, which, like the worm when tread upon, will turn, the impression that the United States Government does not intend to treat with it, but intends to use its giant power like a brutal giant; and that is the only ground upon which pendency can have such effect.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wanted to ask the Senator if he really thought that there was any danger or probability that the Colombian Government was going to war with the United States?

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If the Senator will permit me a moment further—

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. It seems to me that the Senator's entire resolution is based upon that proposition.

Mr. BACON. It is.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not think there is any danger of such a war.

Mr. BACON. I say the resolution is not solely based on that, but principally. I say, Mr. President, that if Colombia is too weak to go to war, if she has nevertheless a controversy, however fixed and determined we may be in the conviction that we are right and that she is wrong, the very great disparity of power, the very fact that we are a giant and she is a pigmy, lays upon us a high obligation to treat with her in a just manner; so that it is not simply, as the Senator says—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut rose.

Mr. BACON. I am coming to that, unless the Senator desires to interrupt me still further right now.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. It seems to me that the Senator

is assuming that Colombia has made some demand upon us, which we have not heard of officially, certainly.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I am coming to the particular point that the honorable Senator makes as to whether or not this resolution is predicated upon the danger of war with Colombia. It is true, so far as I know, that there has been made public no demand on the part of Colombia, but so far as general reports can be credited Colombia has sent here an official representative who has made a demand—whether she has made that demand in the nature of an ultimatum or not I am not prepared to say. But there can be no doubt about the fact that Colombia has had a representative here who has presented to this Government the fact that Colombia thinks she has a grievance against this Government.

We all know that fact. No man doubts that fact. The press is full of it every day. There are outgivings of things which must come by some inspiration from those who are in the inner circle and who know of facts which have not been disclosed to us.

But, Mr. President, is it possible that Senators doubt the fact that the failure of the United States to appease Colombia in some way will result in violence?

The newspapers are full of statements made by people who are upon the ground that that country is disturbed; that there is a state of great excitement over this matter; that they feel they have been humiliated; and that even if they accomplish nothing by it, to preserve their honor they must make resistance and not tamely submit.

The dispatch which I had read this morning, from the capital of that country to the Washington Post, stated the feeling was of such a nature that if there was no movement on the part of the Government of Colombia to secure her rights as her people understood them it would result in internal disintegration of the country; that the people would not support a government which would lie down under such treatment without resistance.

Mr. President, is there any Senator here who believes that Colombia will absolutely, without any resistance whatever, surrender the claim that she has a grievance against the Government of the United States?

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. HALE. Assuming what the Senator says, that Colombia will not submit and will inaugurate war, upon what issue, upon what proposition, upon what principle will Colombia inaugurate war upon us? Associated with this question is the fact that it is only lately that we have heard all these protestations and arguments and eloquence in favor of Colombia. We negotiated this treaty—

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me, I have not argued anything as to the merits of this case. I have studiously avoided that.

Mr. HALE. I am simply following out what I think is the logical result of the Senator's proposition, that Colombia will be obliged in self-respect to inaugurate war upon us.

I should like the Senator to tell us upon what proposition or upon what principle would Colombia inaugurate war upon us after she has rejected our treaty, made at her instance, made in negotiation with her, giving her every advantage that Panama now claims, and yet she deliberately, in the face of all that, rejecting it, adjourning her Congress, and throwing into our face the conditions that she made? The Senator says she will inaugurate war upon us. Upon what proposition, I ask, will Colombia inaugurate war upon us?

Mr. BACON. Well, Mr. President, I was probably a little unfortunate in the use of my language when I said Colombia would make war upon us. I should possibly have said, make war upon Panama for the purpose of recovering her sovereignty in that territory; and possibly that is an answer to the question of my distinguished friend.

Mr. HALE. But your whole proposition is that the danger—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. HALE. I beg pardon of the Chair. Does the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. HALE. The whole proposition is that the danger is not of war, out of which we would be excluded, in which we will have no part, but which will be a war to which we will be a party. We shall not inaugurate war with Colombia. If war comes, it will be the act of Colombia.

Again, I repeat, I wish some Senator on the other side would state the proposition upon which Colombia will take such steps as will result in war with us. I want to avert war. I have said

here and elsewhere that I think that nothing can be so abominable as war. I loathe it; I dread it; I abominate it. I would do almost anything—I would make almost any compromise with Colombia to avoid war. But I can not for the life of me see in the history of this matter where Colombia, in the eyes of the world, has a single shred of ground to stand upon in inaugurating a war that might result in hostility to the United States.

Mr. BACON. Now, if the Senator will permit me to answer his question, I shall endeavor to do so.

The Senator, in response to the suggestion I made, that war would be made by Colombia on Panama, then spoke of that as a war in which we would have no part. Of course, Mr. President, if that were the correct statement of the case, the inquiry of the Senator would be extremely pertinent.

But we all know from the situation, from what we have already done, from the pendency of the treaty, in which there is a distinct guaranty for the maintenance of the independence of Panama, that war upon Panama means a war on us. Everybody knows that.

But, Mr. President, I do not wish to be led off from the point I am on in this case, and I want the Senate to witness that I have used no argument in this discussion in support of any contention that Colombia is right and that the United States is wrong.

I have scrupulously avoided that. I have uttered no word to the effect that the United States is wrong. I have uttered no word, directly or indirectly, that Colombia is right. I have endeavored carefully, in the drafting of this resolution, to present simply the fact that there is a controversy, without saying who is right or who is wrong. I say it is a controversy which should be composed by agreement, if possible, and, if not by agreement, then by arbitration. That is all there is in it.

Mr. President, the honorable Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] says that no Senator here is in favor of such a thing.

Mr. ALDRICH. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BACON. I did not mean to say that. I mean the Senator said the Senate is not in favor of this.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; I say the Senate is not in favor of this.

Mr. BACON. Of course he did not say "no Senator," because I am in favor of it, if nobody else is. Of course that was a slip of the tongue. Every Senator, Mr. President, it seems to me, if he could divest himself of any consideration of the particular case before us, would be in favor of it if I have succeeded in doing what I attempted to do. This was simply to present the fact that there is a controversy between the United States and the Republic of Colombia, and that in the presence of that fact there should be an effort at agreement between us, rather than a fight, and that in the failure—

Mr. ALDRICH rose.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment—and that in the failure of such an agreement we should submit it to arbitration—the point I am coming to, and that is the reason I asked the Senator from Rhode Island to postpone his interruption for a moment, is this: If that is my purpose in these resolutions, is it not a laudable purpose? Can anybody object to that purpose?

If the purpose is to present the fact that there is a controversy, and to try to have that controversy smoothed over by an agreement, or, in the absence of ability to agree, by an arbitration, is there a Senator here who will say that is not a laudable purpose?

Now, if I have been unfortunate in the use of language, if I have not correctly phrased these resolutions, their purpose being as I have stated, what is the duty of the Senate?

If that is the purpose, and if it is a laudable purpose—if that is in accord with the avowal of this Government when it gave its adhesion to the great treaty of arbitration—what is the duty of the Senate if I have failed to carry it out properly? Manifestly to put it before a committee and let that committee put the resolution in proper shape.

Mr. President, there are some considerations in this matter which I do not think have occurred to Senators. I recognize the fact that what has been done in Panama is an accomplished fact.

I know that revolutions do not go backward. The history of the world has never shown a case where a revolution went backward. They are sometimes diverted, going in different directions from those originally anticipated, but the status quo ante has never in the history of the whole world been restored. I recognize the fact that revolution in Panama is an accomplished revolution. I recognize the fact that it is an impossibility to undo it.

If the revolution is an accomplished fact and can not be undone, then, if wrong has been done and restitution can not be made through a restoration of the status quo ante—

Mr. HALE rose.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment—

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. BACON. Therefore, if in the accomplishment of this fact a wrong has been done, the only possible way to do justice is by

an agreement or an adjudication in some way. If no wrong has been done, then there is no harm in the effort to make our adversaries see that no wrong has been done and to satisfy them that we are in the right.

Mr. HALE. Right there—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. HALE. I recognize two things here. There ought not to be too much interruption—

Mr. BACON. I do not object to it at all.

Mr. HALE. But the life of the Senate and debate comes from the kind of interruption that is suggested by the remarks of a Senator—

Mr. BACON. The Senator is always privileged to interrupt me when he desires to do so.

Mr. HALE. Such interruption brings out his own thought as well as that of the objector. Now, right there, the Senator said that he recognized that this was an accomplished revolution. I thought that was a large statement—

Mr. BACON. Well, I so recognize it.

Mr. HALE. A large admission; and I rose to ask the Senator if his resolution is based upon the recital that this revolution is accomplished.

Mr. BACON. I am perfectly willing to include that.

Mr. HALE. That a government has been set up in Panama which is self-existing, which we have recognized, and with whom we have opened relations.

Mr. BACON. I do not think it is self-sustaining.

Mr. HALE. That is a matter of the future.

Mr. MORGAN. Nor self-existing.

Mr. HALE. And such being the fact, upon the question of whatever compensation or consideration may be allowed to Colombia because of her dismemberment and because an important province has been rifted away from her and is to have charge as a nation and possess the territory over which we build the canal, therefore the Senator from Georgia contends that it is incumbent upon the United States to recognize some claim of Colombia for compensation for what has been taken from her. I agree to that.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will propound his inquiry, and let me answer it, for it is very difficult, when the Senator makes an inquiry and then makes a speech, for me to answer his question.

Mr. HALE. The Senator understands that you can not always make an inquiry—

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will not ask a question, I have no objection to his continuing; but if he asks a question, I desire to reply.

Mr. HALE. The Senator understands that one can not always ask questions without also giving one's views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. BACON. I have yielded to the Senator from Maine temporarily.

Mr. HALE. I do not mean unduly to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. President, I would go further than the Senator. Instead of leaving the question of what compensation shall be granted to Colombia, either by guaranteeing what Panama shall do in payment to Colombia, or outright for our own part in connection with the canal, I would be in favor of a liberal adjustment, a liberal compensation to Colombia, without referring the matter to The Hague tribunal.

I suppose the Senator feels as I do about The Hague tribunal. I think the Senator agrees with me that The Hague tribunal is a paper tribunal. Russia originated it, but Russia would not consent that the question of Manchuria should be sent to The Hague tribunal. We would not consent that the question of the occupation of any territory we have taken outside should be decided by The Hague tribunal. It is rather, I may say, in the air.

I am sorry that it is so; but does not the Senator appreciate that the time has not come to send real controversies to The Hague tribunal?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. HALE. I am willing to go to a great extent in compensating Colombia.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. PATTERSON. I want to ask the Senator from Maine a question in connection with his statement of making liberal compensation to Colombia. Upon what ground would the Senator make liberal compensation to Colombia, and compensate Colombia for what?

Mr. HALE. Not in the least for anything that we have done.

Mr. PATTERSON. Oh!

Mr. HALE. Not in the least; but we are bound up and tied up to this gigantic world-wide enterprise of a canal across the Isthmus, and I would be in favor—not in any way granting for a moment that we have done more than we ought to have done, for I do not think we have—of going further. I would help Panama, if Panama shall declare that she will compensate Colombia for the loss of territory, the loss of prestige, all that a nation desires, and all she is sensitive upon.

I would go so far as to guarantee Colombia's claim for that in order to avoid war. I do not think that a war would be doubtful; but I think it would be a poor business for us to be involved in war with Colombia, Mr. President. I am free to say that I do not want to see it; I want to avert it. That is why I would take the action I have indicated.

Mr. PATTERSON. I presume the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. BACON. I have yielded.

Mr. PATTERSON. The Senator from Maine would not maintain that it is the duty of the United States, or that it is incumbent upon the United States in any way, to make large donations to the different nations of the world, whether great or small, because in a perfectly legitimate way, through a legitimate revolution that was successful, those countries had lost territory.

The only ground upon which the Senator from Maine or the Administration can think of consenting to the granting of compensation to Colombia is because away down deep in their hearts they are conscious that the United States has been guilty of a wrong in connection with this so-called revolution.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I must ask the Senator from Maine to let me reply to him, and in order that he may do so I will ask the Senator to repeat his question without a speech, because I really have lost the thread of it and have forgotten the question the Senator first asked me.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] has interposed in such an effective way that he has drawn my attention away from the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators must understand that this conversation is not in order.

Mr. HALE. I only want to say now—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is out of order.

Mr. HALE. Then I will retire.

Mr. BACON. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Maine repeat his question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. I yield, and I have so stated.

Mr. HALE. I do not know what the Senator wants.

Mr. BACON. Of course it is an exceedingly difficult thing for me to resume the thread of my argument.

The Senator from Maine asked me a question. He then made a speech on it of some length and propounded several other questions in the course of it. I recollect distinctly that his question was one to which I desired to reply, and then the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] intervened with a speech.

Mr. HALE. To which I desired to reply.

Mr. BACON. Well, Mr. President, I return to the main proposition. Senators have criticized the resolution in the severest manner. They propose to treat it with an indignity which I have never seen since I have been in the Senate and refuse it even a reference to a committee. I say that the action proposed by the majority in this case is absolutely without defense.

There is not a single line or letter in the resolution which says that there is any just claim against the United States. There is not a line or letter which says that the United States has committed any wrong. There is not a line or letter which says that the Republic of Colombia has any just claim. The sole statement is that which is made in the case of every proposed submission to arbitration, that there is a controversy; that the parties are at issue; that they are at a disagreement; and it is proposed, in view of that fact, that the parties shall get together and agree.

Mr. HEYBURN rose.

Mr. BACON. I ask the Senator to pardon me for just a few minutes and then I will yield to him with great pleasure.

Mr. HEYBURN. I wanted to ask a question of the Senator.

Mr. BACON. In a little while I will yield with great pleasure, but I must be permitted to state my proposition. As I said, this resolution simply presents the fact that there is a controversy. The fact is implied, if not stated in direct language, that such controversy is liable to lead to war, to violence.

Is there any difference between that and any other proposition submitted to arbitration? How can Senators say they favor arbitration but are opposed to this particular arbitration?

One of the Senators asked whether or not that which is alleged to be an act of dishonor is to be submitted. There is no such intimation in the resolution; but if it is there, take it out.

I have not any pride in phraseology. I simply want the United States Government to proclaim to the world that while it believes it is right and has committed no wrong, in view of the fact that the opposite party thinks otherwise, rather than submit to violence and war it will endeavor to agree with its adversary.

The Senator from Maine says he would be willing to compensate her. He is very wise in that. But the Senator objects to a submission to The Hague tribunal. That is only the last alternative, and that can be stricken out if the Senate should think otherwise. There are two distinct propositions. The resolution, like all other resolutions, is doubtless imperfect, and when the Senatorial mind is applied it will be changed.

Now, here is a plain proposition, which I will submit to the Senator from Maine. The first of these clauses advises an endeavor, by treaty and agreement, to arrive at some adjustment of this matter. There is no mention in the first clause of The Hague tribunal. If the Senator goes that far, then it is a very simple matter, when the resolution comes up for consideration, to reject the other alternative proposition of The Hague tribunal.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. HALE. I have said right there that if the Senator confined his resolution to a recital that there was an accomplished revolution and a government set up in Panama, and that the United States, recognizing the entire situation, not in any way admitting that it had done more than it should have done; that Colombia had been by this revolution dismembered, it was a subject worthy of negotiation between the United States and Colombia, and in any compensation which Panama, representing this accomplished revolution, should make to Colombia the United States would consider, owing to its interest in the canal over Panama, the question of adopting or guaranteeing Panama's payment; not that we owe anything, but that it is worth considering and worth avoiding war to negotiate with Colombia upon the basis of an accomplished revolution to compensate Colombia for the dismemberment of her territory. I am in favor of that (I do not know whether any other Senator on this side is in favor of it) rather than war.

Mr. BACON. While the suggestion of the Senator from Maine does not go as far as I want it, I am so anxious that there should be something which shall pacify that people and produce upon them the impression that the United States Government proposes to deal fairly with them, and to endeavor if possible to adjust their differences, if the Senator will frame his resolution, I will accept it as an amendment.

I repudiate and I deny that there is any ground for the charge of favoritism to Colombia as against the United States. It simply says that Colombia alleges thus and so, and says that that controversy should be settled without a resort to arms.

I say now to the Senator from Maine that while his resolution as suggested by him does not, in my opinion, go to the entire extent of this controversy, still, if he will frame it upon the lines which he has indicated, I will very gladly accept it as a substitute. What further guaranty can I give of good faith, or what further argument could be advanced as to the utter groundlessness of the charge which Senators on the other side have made as to this resolution?

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator and I are approaching each other. This matter will undoubtedly go over.

Mr. CULLOM. It has gone over.

Mr. HALE. It has really formally gone over. If I can frame a substitute for the Senator's resolution which covers the thought which is in my mind, it will not in the least interfere with the ratification of the treaty.

Mr. BACON. Not in the least.

Mr. HALE. Not in the least.

Mr. BACON. It has nothing to do with it.

Mr. HALE. It has nothing to do with it. It is only a question of adjusting and pacifying—

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. HALE. The condition that exists between Colombia and us.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator allow me right there, before passing from that, to make a suggestion, and I will yield the floor to him again. I said it had no reference to the ratification of the treaty. I wonder if Senators on the other side have had the thought in their minds as to whether or not the passage of such a resolution as this might not pave the way for the voting of the treaty by those who can not now vote for it.

Mr. HALE. I am inclined to think it would.

Mr. BACON. Of course it might, for this reason: There are

Senators who think that the United States has not been altogether justified in what has been done and who are averse to the treaty, not because of any objection to the treaty, but because they do not wish by their votes to give their assent and their approval to what they conceive to have been illegal acts.

They know the fact that those illegal acts can not be undone. They know that an accomplished revolution can not be set aside, and they know the only ground upon which they can stand consistently with that objection is upon the ground that the United States proposes to do justice; and when that assurance is given all is done which could be shown by a vote against the treaty.

Mr. HALE. My proposition does not in any way go upon the ground that the Administration has done otherwise than what under the circumstances it was obliged to do.

Mr. BACON. Neither does this resolution.

Mr. HALE. While I regret the condition, I think that everything which has been done had to be done. I think we should ratify the treaty.

I think that without any question, without raising the point, and not admitting that we have been rash or harsh or unjust or aggressive, we have done just what we should have done; that the revolution is an accomplished fact, and that we can afford now, ratifying that treaty, to negotiate on a fair basis with Colombia, so that if Panama, the new State we have recognized and which has been recognized by the world generally, compensates Colombia for her loss of territory we can well afford, under the conditions, to recognize that action and in some way indorse or adopt or ratify what Panama does. We are taking no back track. In fact, it is on the basis and on the proposition that we have done what we ought to have done. The revolution is accomplished.

The proposition of the Senator that the revolution is an accomplished fact is the most important.

Mr. BACON. There is one thought I wish to submit to the Senator in connection with that. We ourselves have a very great interest in it outside of the matter of the desire to do what is right. We have a very great interest in the fact that when that canal is located it is of the utmost importance that there should not be in the immediate vicinity of it four millions and a half of hostile people.

There is no doubt about that fact, so that we can afford to do what the Senator from Maine said he is willing to do—provide that out of whatever Colombia shall be adjudged to be due her we will guarantee the payment. We have such a personal, such a material interest of the greatest kind, that we can afford to pay money that we do not owe if by that we are to have material benefit therefrom.

Now, Mr. President, as I said before, recognizing the revolution as an accomplished fact, and I am glad to see the Senator from Wisconsin in his place—

Mr. SPOONER. I was obliged to be absent.

Mr. BACON. I stated the fact that the Senator was called away by official business. I am glad to see him back, because I desire to reply to that part of his speech.

I have stated before, and repeat now, that I recognize the fact that this is an accomplished revolution; that it is no exception to the general rule that no revolution goes backward and it can not be undone. Those who are dissatisfied with what has been done know that restitution, or compensation, if you please, can not be made by the restoration of the status quo ante. That is an impossibility.

Therefore, the only possibility for those who occupy that ground is to have the assurance, not that the United States will do anything, but that it will stand ready to do if it shall be determined it ought to do. I appeal to the Senator from Wisconsin to know if, under such a proposition as that, his criticism upon the resolution was not unjust and unfounded.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. BACON. I do. I am sorry the Senator has not been here to hear my comment on the resolution.

Mr. SPOONER. So am I. I did not know until this morning that the Senator would introduce the resolution.

Mr. BACON. I had no idea that there would be any debate upon it.

Mr. SPOONER. Therefore I had made a different arrangement of my time.

Mr. BACON. I stated that the Senator was absent necessarily.

Mr. SPOONER. I am always present when I can be here.

Mr. BACON. I stated that the Senator was absent on official business.

Mr. SPOONER. Now, Mr. President, of course the power to negotiate with Colombia about any matter of controversy between Colombia and the United States will continue to exist. That power is conferred upon the President by the Constitution.

I do not think in this situation that the Senate ought to pass

any resolution which would not pass except for the opinion of the Senate that prima facie there was a wrong done.

Mr. BACON. No.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, I think so.

Mr. ALDRICH. Or about to be done.

Mr. SPOONER. Or about to be done.

Mr. BACON. No.

Mr. MORGAN. Contemplated.

Mr. SPOONER. A contemplated wrong. The Senator thinks that wrong has been done and wrong will be done.

Mr. MORGAN. That is my opinion. It cuts going or coming.

Mr. SPOONER. But, Mr. President, what about the effect upon the court, the tribunal whose arbitrations the Senator invokes by this resolution, if it were even inferentially assumed, as it is here, that the Government of the United States has been wrong?

Mr. BACON. I regret extremely the Senator has not been in the Chamber during the debate, because I traveled all over that ground.

I desire to say to him now that I have said if the resolution is phrased infelicitously, and if the great prominent purpose is correct, to wit, to avoid controversy, then it can be redrafted by the Senate or by the Committee on Foreign Relations in such a way as to absolutely negative the suggestion which the Senator now makes. The Senator from Maine himself has indicated on the floor of the Senate a resolution which would so negative it, and I have said to him that I would accept it if he framed it.

Mr. HALE. In the absence of the Senator from Wisconsin—and I am very sorry that he was obliged to be away—the Senator from Georgia stated an advanced ground, that he recognized the revolution was an accomplished fact; that he was not seeking in any way to involve a proposition that the Administration had conducted wrongly in the matter, but that his desire was for some negotiation with Colombia which would result in the prevention of open war.

I thought, as I said, that that was an advanced doctrine. I do not know that anybody on this side agrees with me in that view. I do not know that anybody on the other side agrees with the Senator from Georgia in that advanced doctrine.

I stated that if that was the Senator's idea, that it did not involve any proposition that the Government had been wrong, that it recognizes the revolution, and only involved a negotiation with Colombia in which the United States might properly take an interest in what Panama should do, compensating Colombia for her bereft territory, I was in favor of that.

Mr. BACON. The only suggestion I made in addition to that—

Mr. HALE. I did not think the Senator and I were very far apart. So the points the Senator from Wisconsin is now making are all eliminated by the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. I wish to say to the Senator, as I see he is examining the resolution, that I am not wedded to that phraseology at all. I am perfectly willing that it should be changed in any way reasonable and stated as strongly as you please that the United States does not admit, directly or by implication, having done any wrong, but that there is a controversy, a claim, on the part of the Republic of Colombia, and that we propose that that shall be composed between us by a treaty—a negotiation—in which we will endeavor to arrive at a conclusion.

Then the additional proposition is that in the event that can not be done it shall be referred to some tribunal. But if the Senator does not wish to go that far, strike out the last proposition.

All I want is now, at a time when I believe if there is any reliance to be put upon the information which comes to us there is danger of bloodshed, that the United States Government shall say to this weak and feeble people, who can not demand or require anything of us, that we propose to investigate this matter and in some such way as the Senator from Maine indicates, or in some other way, try to do whatever the circumstances may prove to be our duty in the premises.

That is all. If it is not in proper shape, put it in proper shape. I am not at all wedded to that particular phraseology. Change it in any way you wish, just so that you embody that principle.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON. If the Senator is through, I owe the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] an apology for having delayed so long in my promise. I was at a point of my argument which did not permit me to stop at the moment, and now I do so with pleasure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia yields to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HEYBURN. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Georgia. I wish to ask the question whether or not this resolution is directed to the payment of a claim which has been made by the Colombian Government or only to one the making of which is anticipated?

Mr. BACON. In reply to the question of the honorable Senator, I can say this and only this, that of course I have not seen the official papers. We know the fact that there has been here a representative of the Government of Colombia, and we know from general statements in the papers the nature of the claim which has been made.

We know from the facts which have been stated what would naturally be the character of the claim. But, if the Senator will pardon me, in the recast of the resolution, as proposed by the Senator from Maine, there could possibly be no criticism upon that ground. I have shown the utmost liberality of disposition in the matter by saying that I will accept any modification and any phraseology that may be desired and which does not go to the extent of asserting that either one or the other is either right or wrong, because in that event there could be no proper basis for arbitration.

But I will accept anything which will preserve the general proposition of the design on our part not to treat this feeble, impotent people, who can exact nothing of us, otherwise than in a kindly and considerate manner and do what justice may require.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will ask the Senator whether or not he can define or cares to define the limits of the questions to be submitted to arbitration upon which an attempt might be made to agree?

Mr. BACON. We can not define that. All we can do is to suggest to the Executive that we favor the opening of negotiations with the general view. The details, of course, must be worked out by the executive department.

If the Senator from Idaho desires more definite information, I will simply refer him to the statement which has been made twice by the Senator from Maine as to the scope of the resolution which he proposes to kindly draft as an amendment.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask the Senator if it is not premature at this time to take the initiative in anticipating questions that may be presented for settlement on the part of a government that has as yet made no claim?

Mr. BACON. Is the Senator aware of the fact that it has made no claim? On the contrary, we have every reason to believe that it has.

Mr. SPOONER. Had we not better wait?

Mr. STEWART. Until we know.

Mr. SPOONER. In other words, if the Senator will permit me, why should the Senate of the United States resolve itself into the vicarious representative of Colombia to assert for it claims against the United States which we do not know Colombia has asserted against the United States?

Mr. BACON. The Senator from Wisconsin is not generally as unfair—

Mr. SPOONER. I did not mean to be.

Mr. BACON. As that inquiry makes him appear to be.

Mr. SPOONER. It may be a mistake, but it is not intentional unfairness.

Mr. BACON. I understand that, but the Senator misunderstands me. I say, as unfair as that presentation of it appears to make him to be. The unfairness to which I alluded was in the suggestion that there was anyone here representing the claims of Colombia. I have stated repeatedly that I did not follow the lead of my distinguished friend or of others in discussing the merits of the controversy between Colombia and the United States.

All who heard me will bear witness to the fact that I have scrupulously avoided a single argument to show that Colombia has a grievance or that the United States had acted improperly with reference to her. Whatever may be personally my opinion I make no such statement in this discussion. It would be unworthy of a proposition for arbitration to accompany it with any such statement.

I have confined myself all along to the proposition that our relations are strained, and we know that they are, that there is an alleged grievance, a claim of grievance. Assuming, I said in the Senator's absence, that every claim was unfounded and that the cause of the United States was absolutely impregnable in its defense as right from beginning to end, still, if there is this disputed claim it is a matter for agreement, especially in view of the fact, if the statements in the press are correct and state the feeling in Colombia, that there may be at any time an outbreak. We have the statement frequently made that the Colombian people have only been held quiet because their representative was here, and that in the absence of his final report they would not act, but that there is every reason to fear that upon his report there would be an outbreak.

These are a weak, feeble people, whose outbreak can not hurt us except in the loss of the lives of some of our officers and soldiers. That power can not be measured against ourselves, as I have said in the course of this debate. We are a giant and they are a pigmy.

But the fact of their feebleness does not relieve us from the responsibility of recognizing the great principle to which we have given our adherence in the great arbitration treaty, that be the power strong or weak, great or small, we will not resort to violence, or not stand still in the presence of threatened violence, but whenever such violence is threatened, whether we are right or wrong, or rather I will put it more strongly, assuming that we are in every particular right, we will not sit still, but will endeavor that the difference shall be settled in some other way than by a resort to arms; that we will do what we can to carry that idea out, and that we will do it more quickly in the case of a weak nation than we will do it in the case of a strong one.

Mr. SPOONER rose.

Mr. CULLOM. Some little time ago I rose to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. I supposed the Senator from Wisconsin had taken his seat; but as he has risen, I will not proceed with my motion at this time.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I have no desire to discuss this matter further for the sake of discussion. I said when I had the honor to address the Senate on this resolution in the first instance that it would be impossible for me to be wanting in appreciation of the patriotism, sincerity, and high purpose of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON].

But the Senator has not used infelicitous language in this resolution. My objection to this resolution is not to its form, but its theory and substance. The Senator thinks clearly and, as almost every man who thinks clearly, expresses his thought clearly. It is, as a rule, only those who do not think clearly who speak without clearness.

I have regarded this resolution as inopportune. The Senator assumes, and I think at the wrong time, that the Administration, the Government, if I may so speak, has committed questionable acts—

Mr. BACON. No; I do not. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. SPOONER. Ah, let us see; questionable acts in connection with this great transaction. If the Senator does not imply that by his resolution, what is there to negotiate about with Colombia? What is there to be referred to The Hague tribunal, with Colombia a party on the one side and the United States a party on the other?

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to answer the question?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I can not answer it more forcibly, I think, than to repeat what I have said, that if we assume that we are absolutely right in every particular and that the ground of complaint of Colombia is absolutely unfounded, still if that complaint is made and the controversy exists, that is a question to be referred and does not imply any recognition of any wrong on the part of the United States.

And more especially will that be so if the resolutions are framed in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Maine, absolutely making the reservation and denying that there is any wrong perpetrated on the part of the United States.

Mr. SPOONER. Upon what does the Senator from Georgia predicate the assumption of this resolution?

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator allow me? I understood the Senator from Georgia to say that his proposition did not involve an insistence upon this matter being referred to The Hague tribunal—

Mr. BACON. Of course.

Mr. HALE. That his main object was first recognizing an accomplished revolution.

Mr. SPOONER. As a fact.

Mr. HALE. As an accomplished fact. Then with no declaration or assumption, and he has just at this moment repudiated that the Administration had been wrong, stating that to avoid war it was worth while to negotiate with Colombia, not for changing the status on the Isthmus, not upon subverting that set-up Republic, but simply with relation to any compensation that Panama might make to Colombia for the loss of territory.

Therefore, from our association with the Isthmus and with this great enterprise, we could afford, I said in the absence of the Senator and I say it here, although I may be alone, rather than have a war, a poor war, a lean war, a successful war, that in two weeks would spend much money with no gain to us, I would much rather guarantee anything that Panama may seek to do to compensate Colombia for her loss of territory; and I understood that was the proposition for consideration. Going back is not consistent.

Referring to the tribunal is only to negotiate. I may say further that I believe to-day negotiations are going on in the direction the Senator has indicated in his last proposition, and that anything we do here, instead of contravening that, would help us. That is the situation, which, of course, the Senator did not understand because he was not here.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; I understand it. I sympathize with the general purpose of the Senator from Maine and the general purpose of the Senator from Georgia. I have not been able to see, however, any theory consistent with the action of the Government of the United States by which the Senate can recognize an interest in Panama or a cause of action or claim growing out of the revolution in Panama on the part of Colombia.

We have passed the stage where the United States can recognize Colombia as having any longer any proprietary interest in or sovereignty over Panama.

It has seemed to me, Mr. President, that the only avenue of approach to Colombia between the United States and Colombia must be through the Republic of Panama.

If this were a resolution suggesting to the President the good offices of the United States to bring about an adjustment between the Republic of Panama and that of an independent republic and the United States of Colombia, that would be one thing.

Mr. HALE. That is about what it is.

Mr. SPOONER. No; it is not.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not this resolution.

Mr. HALE. It is not this resolution.

Mr. SPOONER. That would involve no imputation in any way upon the Government of the United States; no impeachment of its honor. On the contrary, it would recognize the Republic of Panama as an accomplished fact, as it is.

It might perhaps proceed wisely enough upon the theory, all things considered, that it would be for the advantage of the Republic of Panama, as well as for ourselves, in view of our relationship to the Isthmus, that arrangements should be made to bring about peaceful and pleasant international relations between Colombia and the Republic of Panama.

Mr. BACON. I understand that to be practically what the Senator from Maine says.

Mr. SPOONER. But that is not this resolution.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator bear in mind that the Senator from Georgia has abandoned that?

Mr. SPOONER. Has he done so? I have not heard it from him.

Mr. BACON. No; I said I would accept the substitute of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. That is abandoning it.

Mr. SPOONER. I have not heard it from him.

Mr. HALE. The Senator stated it very clearly.

Mr. SPOONER. No; the Senator from Maine and I understand each other.

Mr. BACON. And the Senator from Maine and I understand each other, too.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Georgia and I may soon understand each other.

Mr. HALE. I consider when the Senator says that he would accept the suggestion I had made—

Mr. BACON. I asked the Senator from Maine to frame a resolution.

Mr. HALE. That I would frame a resolution his resolution was to be withdrawn.

Mr. BACON. No; I would accept it as a substitute in place of it.

Mr. HALE. Now, the Senator from Wisconsin is felicitous in his praise.

Mr. SPOONER. Thank you.

Mr. HALE. He has brought in a phrase that is well known in diplomacy—"the good offices of the United States"—in an adjustment not between us and Colombia, but between Panama and Colombia.

Mr. SPOONER. Now the Senator is on more solid ground.

Mr. HALE. That is only a matter of expression.

Mr. SPOONER. No, it is not; it is a matter of substance.

Mr. HALE. That is precisely what it would come to. I should be in favor of it, and I think it would help negotiations that are now going on. I think it would do more to avert war than anything that can be done. Then we will go on and ratify the treaty.

Mr. SPOONER. It is absolutely impossible for the Senator from Georgia, with all his ability, or for the Committee on Foreign Relations, with their ability—

Mr. BACON. We are both on it.

Mr. SPOONER. To recast these resolutions on the theory which the Senator had in mind when he drew them, which would eliminate, in my judgment, the fatal objection to them.

Mr. BACON. Let the Senator from Maine try it.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Maine can do almost any intellectual thing he tries to do.

Mr. HALE. I thank the Senator; I will try it.

Mr. SPOONER. But this resolution recognizes inherently an allegation or the existence of a wrong on the part of the United States which either ought to be adjusted by the United States

with Colombia, or, failing in that, be referred to some international judicial tribunal for adjustment.

Mr. BACON. I will say to the Senator what I have said repeatedly. I do not know whether I repeated it since he has been in the Chamber. I have disclaimed any such intention. If I have been infelicitous in my language that is my infirmity and not my intention. I do think when half a dozen times I have disclaimed it and on the contrary said I designed it otherwise, I should have at least a surcease.

Mr. SPOONER. I have not imputed to the Senator any purpose different from that which he expresses. I am giving my opinion about the effect of this resolution, that is all. He says "the alleged forcible prevention by said land or naval forces."

Mr. BACON. That is what Colombia alleges—nobody else.

Mr. SPOONER. How do you know? Who says so?

Mr. BACON. I will not answer the Senator, because I have studiously avoided discussing the question whether or not there is right or wrong on either side. I have not gone into that. I may do so at some other time.

Mr. SPOONER. Ah, that is the trouble with this matter. We are certainly not in this situation to act upon newspaper statement. It will befit us to wait until we know what Colombia asserts.

Mr. BACON. It would be well to hold the resolutions, then, until we can ascertain, and not consign them to the wastebasket.

Mr. SPOONER. I think, so far as the structure of the resolution is concerned—and I say that with all deference to my friend from Georgia—it ought to wait. I think the resolution ought to be disposed of. The controversy, if there be one, between the United States and Colombia can very easily be taken up in the usual course of diplomacy later.

It ought not to be taken up by the Senate, especially in the absence of all knowledge of any contention upon the part of Colombia. The resolution is premature, and it is calculated to do harm instead of good.

Mr. BACON. I do not think so.

Mr. SPOONER. If there is anything in the implication of this resolution, it impeaches the honor of the United States. We have never agreed to refer a question of national honor to any outside tribunal.

Mr. BACON. The Senator is not justified in making any such statement. Is there anything in the resolution that impeaches the honor of the United States? The Senator was not here; I went all over that ground.

Mr. SPOONER. But I am here now, and I have read this resolution.

Mr. BACON. The Senator is here, and I will repeat what I said before. The resolution makes no allegation as to the right or the wrong.

It simply recites the fact that there is a controversy, and aside from that I said to the Senator from Maine, and the Senator from Maine has said it to the Senator from Wisconsin, that I am willing to have the resolution recast as suggested by him, because it would carry out the central thought in my mind.

But the Senator insists on taking this resolution as the one to be discussed, when I have already said to the Senator from Maine that I would accept his substitute for it when he put it in proper form.

Mr. SPOONER. Then I understand the Senator from Georgia to abandon his resolution.

Mr. BACON. No, I do not.

Mr. SPOONER. I understand that—

Mr. BACON. No.

Mr. HALE. That is only a phrase. He does abandon it.

Mr. BACON. The Senator desires to put me in a wrong position. I do not abandon the resolution. I think, as I said to the Senator from Maine, the suggestion made by him does not go as far as I would desire, but as it contains the great central proposition of arbitration in this matter, I am willing for him to phrase it in the way he suggests.

Mr. SPOONER. This question of international arbitration is one, of course, which is exciting and will continue to excite great public interest. There are some questions which I am willing for one to arbitrate before The Hague tribunal, but an allegation that the Government of the United States has violated a treaty obligation for which it is responsible in damages to another government I am not willing to say I would refer to the arbitrament of a tribunal constituted from abroad.

Mr. BACON. I have expressly said to the Senate in the Senator's absence that that was an alternative proposition, which was not the material one in that case.

Mr. HALE. I should not—

Mr. SPOONER. Now, let us get at some point about it.

Mr. HALE. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not care anything about words.

Mr. HALE. I know the Senator does not.

Mr. BACON. Evidently.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Georgia is objecting to my use of the word "abandon." He must abandon the whole theory of his resolution and substitute for it another.

Mr. HALE. Is not the Senator glad of it if he does?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; but I am trying to get him to do it.

Mr. HALE. He says he is entirely willing that the resolution should be framed on this side.

Mr. SPOONER. I am perfectly willing; I do not want war. I want to avert it.

Mr. HALE. I know the Senator does not. I do not think we shall have to resort to arbitration. I think we can get out of it without any reference to The Hague tribunal.

I think we can go on and ratify the treaty, open negotiations with Colombia, or continue negotiations with Colombia, and that we can afford instead of war to exercise our good offices between Panama and Colombia; and, if necessary, I say it frankly—I do not want to be misstated hereafter—in carrying out those good offices I would be willing, in order to avoid war, that in some way we guarantee Panama's pledges that she makes.

I objected in the Senator's absence to the phraseology of the resolution. I am one of those who believe that events were bigger than we were and that the Administration had to do what it did. I would not draw a line that would in any way declare expressly or by implication that the Administration had done more than it should have done.

But events having culminated, revolution being acknowledged and established as an accomplished fact, I say we will stand better hereafter and that we can not afford to reject a proposition that opens or continues a friendly negotiation with Colombia. I am not particular on a technical point, whether Colombia has asked it. Colombia has a representative here now.

These things are being negotiated. It would only help negotiations. It would not interfere with them. I do not know anything about it, but I think the Senator from Georgia recognizes, from what he has said, that this is an accomplished revolution.

Mr. BACON. I say that.

Mr. HALE. We can not go back, and I am willing to meet him more than halfway.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senator from Wisconsin the floor?

Mr. CARMACK. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor, I believe.

Mr. SPOONER. I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. I just want to say that even if the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Wisconsin should arrive at an agreement among themselves, I am not sure that that would signify a unanimous agreement of the Senate to their proposition.

Mr. HALE. I was afraid of that.

Mr. SPOONER. I expect the Senator from Tennessee to be an irreconcilable.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, my opinion, I suppose, is like Touchstone's wife; it is a poor thing, but my own.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not propose any agreement for the Senator.

Mr. CARMACK. I did not understand the Senator to suggest that they were coming to a unanimous-consent agreement, but I did not want it to be understood that the Senator from Georgia who is the only Senator who has been speaking on this side of the Chamber was speaking for all.

I simply want it understood that everybody has not agreed with the proposition the Senator from Georgia was about to agree to, because I think that he and the Senator from Maine between them have about got this resolution in a shape where I can not possibly vote for it. That is a matter of very small consequence, but I want it understood.

Mr. SPOONER. I am perfectly well satisfied, from what the Senator says, that he will never vote for the resolution unless it is in the wrong shape.

Mr. CARMACK. I am not responsible for the Senator's wrongdoing.

Mr. SPOONER. Of course not. You are fortunate in not being responsible. I want to say that as far as I am concerned, after this debate and the observations of the Senator from Georgia, I am perfectly willing that this resolution should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations instead of being voted upon now.

Mr. BACON. I would be very glad to have that done.

Mr. BERRY. Let it go over.

Mr. HALE. That is the better way, undoubtedly.

Mr. BACON. I am perfectly willing for that course to be taken,

but I simply desire to repeat what I said to the Senator from Maine, that while I am willing to accept his substitute, I do not mean by that to indicate that in my private judgment it goes as far as it should.

But it recognizes the principle of arbitration, and therefore I am willing to concede it. As I have occupied so much time to-day, I want to felicitate myself upon the fact that I have had the testimony of the Senator from Wisconsin to the Senate and the country that I was once silent. I do not know when that was.

Mr. SPOONER. I will tell the Senator. The Senator from Georgia was opposed to the attitude of the United States in the Philippines, but—

Mr. BACON. I thought I said something on that subject.

Mr. SPOONER. I know the Senator did, but when war was flagrante there the Senator gave no word which could by any possibility be construed as an incentive to a prolongation of it. As I now remember it, that is what I meant.

Mr. BACON. I do not think there is any other Senator on this side of the Chamber but would have done as much.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I do not wish to occupy any considerable time of the Senate now. I do not seem to be one of the plenipotentiaries of the Senate who have been commissioned to make a treaty to compromise the disagreement which has arisen between Senators here, but I want to say, following, perhaps, the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee, that I do not wish to commit myself in advance to any treaty which may be drawn up here in the Senate by the plenipotentiaries.

I think the resolutions of the Senator from Georgia, with all deference to him, and recognizing in the fullest sense his motives in the matter, were very inopportune and liable to misapprehension; that they were liable to put the country even in an embarrassing position.

I do not see how it is possible that those resolutions outside of the Senate Chamber should not be construed as an acknowledgment or an admission on the part of the Senate that Colombia had some grievance against us which we ought not only to submit to arbitration or compose without submission to arbitration, but which we were bound to recognize and to pay for. I think that will be the construction put upon the resolutions.

I will go further than that, Mr. President. If as the result of the discussion here this afternoon these resolutions should be dropped and another resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Executive should exercise his good offices to try to bring about an understanding between Colombia and Panama should be passed, I think under the circumstances that would be misconstrued; and I do not think there is any necessity for it, either.

Although I admit freely that we would have a right to pass the resolution, it seems to me that it is not necessary to pass it. Can we not trust the President and the State Department for a little while to negotiate with Colombia and to offer the good offices of this Government, if they should be needed, to compose the differences which exist between Colombia and Panama?

It appears to me that the very first notice which was given to Colombia contained in it an intimation—and more than an intimation, a declaration—that this Government would be willing at all times to use its good offices to compose whatever controversy and whatever complaint there might be between Panama and Colombia.

In the very first dispatch, directing Minister Beaupré at Bogota to inform the Colombian Government that the Government of Panama had been recognized, Mr. Hay, speaking of the fact that the Government of the United States has entered into relations with Panama, goes on to say:

In accordance with the ties of friendship which have so long and so happily existed between the respective nations, most earnestly commends to the Governments of Colombia and Panama the peaceful and equitable settlement of all questions at issue between them.

There is an offer in the very first paper that was passed.

Mr. HALE. Now, does the Senator feel so exact upon the question of etiquette and time that he does not think it would be a good thing for the Senate to express itself in accord with the suggestion that this Government shall exercise its good offices?

I hope that if the real substance of the thing is done the Senator will not stand upon a question whether we should do a thing to help the Executive or let him alone without doing it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not think it is necessary, Mr. President.

Mr. HALE. Could it do any harm?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I think it would be unfortunate, after the discussion which has been had here this afternoon upon these resolutions, to have any action taken by the Senate at this time. That is my feeling about it.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, I want to say just a word or two.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] has twice during the discussion to-day complimented the Senator from Georgia

[Mr. BACON] upon the fact that he has never done what some others did here in the course of the Philippine debate—said anything that would be an incentive to war. Of course, Mr. President, I have no objection whatever to the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Georgia making love to each other, provided their intentions are honorable.

Mr. BACON. I hope my friend from Tennessee will permit me. Did he hear what I said in reply to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. CARMACK. Yes; I heard what the Senator said. I was going on to say that I have no objection whatever to the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Georgia hugging and kissing and making love to each other, provided, of course, their intentions are honorable. [Laughter.]

But I wish also to add that the most terrific arraignment of the course of the Administration in the Philippine Islands and the most terrible picture I ever heard drawn of the widespread desolation and of the atrocities perpetrated there was drawn by the Senator from Georgia upon the floor of this Senate.

I want to say further, Mr. President, that I quoted here on the floor of the Senate an extract from a public address made by the President of the United States, and I proved by Governor Taft before the committee that just such expressions as were used by President Roosevelt had a very great effect in stirring up the people of the Philippine Islands and promoting and encouraging the insurrection.

I offered to prove upon one occasion that speeches made by Senators defending the Administration's policy in the Philippines, and especially one particular speech by a very distinguished Republican Senator, had been circulated broadcast over the Philippine Islands, and had had more effect than anything else that had been uttered to incite those people to insurrection.

I think I did prove that the President of the United States himself, by the language he used, language which would have caused any other man, if he had uttered it in the Philippine Islands, to be arrested for violation of the law and put in jail, had a greater effect in stirring up insurrection in the Philippine Islands than anything else.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I leave the Senator from Tennessee alone with his conscience.

Mr. CARMACK. My conscience, Mr. President, has not pained me in the least. I will leave the Senator from Wisconsin alone without a conscience. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not sure whether any request has been made relating to the disposition of this resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A request was made that it should go over until to-morrow, and it has gone over, but the debate has not.

Mr. LODGE. The debate will, though.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will suggest, as the resolution has gone over, that it retain its present position until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent it was agreed that the resolutions relating to the Post-Office Department investigation should be taken up to-morrow morning immediately after the routine business.

Mr. HALE. They will not take very long. This morning, by unanimous consent, those resolutions were passed over to be taken up after the routine morning business to-morrow.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the purposes and wishes of the various Senators who have been discussing this matter for the last half hour remain to-morrow morning as they are, then we may have some concrete proposition before the Senate for consideration. I do not know whether Senators desire any disposition of the pending resolution now. I think we had better let it go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has gone over.

Mr. ALDRICH. And see what the day will bring forth.

Mr. LODGE. I ask leave to print in the RECORD a statement of Mr. Olney, when Secretary of State, in regard to the power of the President to recognize a new government. It is brief and, I think, a very interesting statement. I will not delay the Senate by reading it unless it is insisted upon. I should like, however, to have it go in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made.

The statement referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. OLNEY, SECRETARY OF STATE.

[Washington Evening Star, December 19, 1896.]

I have no objection to stating my own views of the resolution respecting the independence of the so-called Republic of Cuba which it is reported is to be laid before the Senate on Monday. Indeed, as there are likely to be serious misapprehensions regarding such a resolution both in this country and abroad, and as such apprehensions may have serious results of a grave character, it is perhaps my duty to point out that the resolution if passed by the Senate can probably be regarded only as an expression of opinion by the eminent gentlemen who vote for it in the Senate, and if passed by the House of Representatives can only be regarded as another expression of opinion by the eminent gentlemen who vote for it in the House.

The power to recognize the so-called Republic of Cuba as an independent

state rests exclusively with the Executive. A resolution on the subject by the Senate or by the House, by both bodies or by one, whether concurrent or joint, is inoperative as legislation, and is important only as advice of great weight tendered to the Executive regarding the manner in which he shall exercise his constitutional functions.

The operation and effect of the proposed resolution, therefore, even if passed by both Houses of Congress by a two-thirds vote, are perfectly plain. It may inflame popular passion both in this country and elsewhere, may thus put in peril the lives and property of American citizens who are resident and traveling abroad, and will certainly obstruct, and perhaps defeat, the best efforts of this Government to afford such citizens due protection.

But except in these ways, and unless advice embodied in the resolution shall lead the Executive to revise conclusions already reached and officially declared, the resolution will be without effect and will leave unaltered the attitude of the Government toward the two contending parties in Cuba.

ALABAMA RIVER BRIDGE, NEAR MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, by way of introducing a new subject, I will ask unanimous consent of the Senate for the present consideration of a bridge bill, which covers only half a page. It is the bill (S. 2842) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Montgomery Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Alabama River near the city of Montgomery, Ala.," approved March 1, 1893.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, in line 10, after the word "this," to strike out "amendment" and insert "act and completed within three years from same date;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the said Montgomery Bridge Company shall have authority to construct said bridge mentioned in said act, across the Alabama River, under and subject to the limitations and restrictions mentioned in said act, and in the amendment thereto approved March 3, 1897, if the actual construction of the bridge therein authorized shall be commenced within one year from the approval of this act and completed within three years from same date.

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.

ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. CARMACK. I ask to have published as a Senate document the concluding chapter of the report of the Isthmian Canal Commission, which is contained in about seven pages. It is a summary of statements in the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee, and the order to print will be made.

LETTER OF COMMODORE M. F. MAURY.

Mr. TELLER. I ask leave to have published as a Senate document a letter written by Commodore M. F. Maury in July, 1886, addressed to Capt. Bedford Pim, of the royal navy and a distinguished member of Parliament. It is a very interesting and instructive letter, and I have only been able to find one copy of it. The letter is taken from Van Nostrand's Engineering Magazine. It covers the Panama and Nicaragua routes and the whole canal controversy. I think the Senate will be very glad to have it in print.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado, that the article referred to be printed as a document? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 13, 1904, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 12, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by Rev. Dr. JOSEPH SILVERMAN, of New York.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, changes of reference were made as follows:

House Documents Nos. 280, 94, and 29, from the Committee on Appropriations to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

House Document No. 359, from the Committee on Appropriations to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

House Document No. 142, from the Committee on Appropriations to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the appointment of the following regents of the Smithsonian Institution: Mr. ROBERT R. HITT, Mr. ROBERT ADAMS, Jr., and Mr. HUGH A. DINSMORE.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:
To Mr. LAMAR of Texas, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. HOLLIDAY, for one week, on account of important business.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move you, sir, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9480) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9480, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is suggested that we make some arrangement in reference to general debate before going into the Committee of the Whole. I am ready for any suggestion from the other side of the House.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have applications for two hours and thirty-five minutes on this side on this bill. I do not know yet whether there are others who desire time or not.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will state to the gentleman that I have but two requests from this side of the House, one asking for half an hour and the other for five minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have five requests, which cover two hours and thirty-five minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. How much time does the gentleman require?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We can leave out thirty minutes and consume, say, two hours and five minutes on this side.

Mr. BINGHAM. We may not exhaust our portion of time on this side of the House. If agreeable to the gentleman, we will fix the limit at two hours on a side, he having charge of the time on that side of the House and I having charge of the time on this side.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Making it two hours to a side.

Mr. BINGHAM. I move that the limit of debate be four hours, two hours upon each side, I having control of the time on the majority side and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] having control of the time on the minority side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to four hours, two hours and five minutes of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the remainder of the time by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9480, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 9480. A bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, in submitting to the House the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, it might be well for me to state that the bill in all of its details carries out the requirements of the civil-service law, as well as the orders of the President, in regard to that statute. In other words, save where the exceptions run in the law or the orders of the President under the law, the bill is consistent. Further, the bill carries with it nothing partisan. It is simply proposed legislation for the conduct of the existing Departments of the Government without regard to political or partisan bias, and without regard to appeals from individual Members of the House or from anyone for special consideration of individuals where salaries were being considered for increase.

Therefore we present to you a bill, after careful examination, that will not only stand the general scrutiny of the House, but legislation wholly in the line of wise economy. We have taken the statutes covering the appropriations for the current year, and, as I will submit to you in the round figures, show but little if any increase for the next current year. I read from the report,

and if, after I have made my statement, any gentleman desires in my time to make inquiry concerning any paragraphs or proposed amendments to the bill I will take great pleasure in answering him.

In presenting the bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, the Committee on Appropriations submit the following in explanation thereof:

The estimates on which the bill is based will be found on pages 9-93 and 115-129 of the Book of Estimates for 1905, and aggregate \$29,711,700.48, of which amount there is recommended in the bill \$28,258,893.22.

The appropriations for the same purposes for the current fiscal year, including \$565,561.20 carried in the sundry civil, deficiency, and other acts, aggregated \$28,164,214.88, being \$94,680.36 less than is recommended in the accompanying bill for the service of the fiscal year 1905.

The total amount recommended in the bill is \$1,452,805.20 less than the aggregate of the estimates submitted.

The whole number of salaries specifically provided for in the bill is 796 less than the number estimated for and 487 more than the number provided for in the law for the current year.

Of the 13,403 specific salaries provided for, it is not proposed by the terms of the bill to increase any one of them beyond existing rates fixed by the current appropriation act.

The net additional number of salaried places provided for, 487, over the number existing in current appropriations includes:

For the Library of Congress.....	11
For office of Comptroller of the Treasury.....	6
For office of Auditor for the Navy Department.....	4
For office of Auditor for State and other Departments.....	8
For office of Auditor for Post-Office Department.....	88
For offices of the Treasurer.....	83
For office of Comptroller of the Currency.....	9
For Bureau of Insular Affairs, War Department (in lieu of 72 salaries now paid from a general fund).....	55
For General Land Office.....	12
For Patent Office.....	10
For Post-Office Department (including 19 clerks now employed and paid from a general sum).....	44
For Department of Justice.....	5
For offices of Secretary of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Corporations, and Bureau of Manufactures (in lieu of salaries now paid from general fund as well as for increase of service).....	185
Bureau of Statistics.....	12
Bureau of Standards.....	13
Census Bureau.....	10

The principal reduction in number of salaries in any one bureau or office is that of 25 clerks, at \$1,000 each, in the Pension Office.

It may be well, before I proceed, to emphasize this statement. Your committee believes, not only from experience, but from testimony, that the normal changes in the Departments in reduction, coming from resignation, coming from removal, coming from death, give the chief or the head of any of the Departments ample opportunity, from his immediate knowledge of the deserving subordinate, to give him a reasonable and fair promotion; that his judgment, under the normal condition of change, is far better than the casual investigation by your committee in connection with the increase of salary of the subordinate place. Therefore your committee throughout the bill, instead of advancing the high-paid clerks or adding increased number to the high classes, have given the increase of clerks to the lower classes in order that in the future they may advance gradually, and under normal conditions of changes in the Departments the meritorious clerk can be promoted.

In that connection I will refer in detail to the War Department when we reach that paragraph of the bill. It has been the common experience of every Member of the House, not only with reference to this proposed legislation, but in every bill carrying appropriations for the Departments, that when the bill reaches the Senate there are innumerable additions and changes. I say that with all respect, speaking only from the history of legislation.

I believe by the action of the Department in the issuance of the order now made public and generally known, that the seven hours of labor and its results on the part of the subordinates in the Departments will be so ample and great that this bill, so far as the salary and compensations are concerned, as well as the number of subordinates, will come back to the House from the Senate without any radical or important changes. The order of the Department covers almost 7 per cent of the time, and when you average that in relation to the money it saves to the Government, I can say without contradiction that, in effect, the Department will receive almost everything that they have asked for in their estimates.

For the Library of Congress the following additional employees are recommended: In the office of the Librarian, 1 stenographer and typewriter, at \$1,000; in the copyright office, 3 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 clerk, at \$900, and 1 messenger boy, at \$360; and under the superintendent of the Library building and grounds, 5 additional charwomen, at \$240 each, and a skilled laborer, at \$720, are recommended.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman state if the Committee on Appropriations has made any estimate as to the actual number of days gained by this new arrangement?

Mr. BINGHAM. We have not taken that subject up in any form. I can, speaking for the committee, submit that while we

were cognizant of the change ordered several days before it was made public, we have not deemed it necessary to estimate and recommend legislation, because its operation is undetermined so far as actual results are concerned.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman misapprehends my question. I ask if the committee made any estimate as to the actual number of days gained by each clerk?

Mr. BINGHAM. We have not.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then I want to say to the House that a few members of the Agricultural Committee have made an estimate—whether it is correct or not I can not say, but it is approximately correct—and the actual gain is between fifteen and sixteen days per clerk. So that the total gain, as the gentleman has well said, will be very large.

Mr. LIVINGSTON rose.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would submit, representing the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, that the official notice came to us after we had concluded our bill, ready to report it to the general committee, and we determined that if changes were to occur in the lines of economy they can be made in the other Chamber, where they have full knowledge of this order. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to make any statement?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; the gentleman has made just the statement which I wanted him to make.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That our knowledge of the matter came after we had made up the bill, and we had nothing at all to do with it one way or the other.

Mr. BINGHAM. In the report it would appear that your committee has not been sufficiently considerate in connection with the estimates of the Department of State. In the organization of the Department of Commerce and Labor the consular division of the State Department is directed to be bodily transferred to the new Department.

In the consideration of the estimates for the Department of State we determined to give the current law, which would be an easing around the entire Department and warrant the ignoring of their requested additional force, so that, in fact, we appropriate in this bill, although not apparent in the report, one chief of division, at \$2,100; two clerks, at \$1,800; one clerk, at \$1,400; two clerks, at \$1,200; one assistant messenger, at \$750, and three laborers. Therefore we give the Department of State every possible convenience for general administration. There are eight bureau divisions now in the Department of State. One chief receives \$2,250 and the other seven \$2,100. We have reduced the \$2,250 chief to \$2,100, in order that the eight may receive the same compensation, making consistent our allowances.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman stated that the Bureau of Foreign Commerce in the State Department had been transferred to the Department of Commerce and Labor, which, of course, is the fact; but in that organization there was left to the State Department the work of collecting and transcribing the special consular reports.

Mr. BINGHAM. And the revision.

Mr. MANN. That is still covered.

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, yes; and we have allowed the whole existing force under current law to remain, so that it gives the Department generous appropriation.

With reference to the Treasury Department, more especially with reference to the Comptroller and the Auditors, your committee has been most considerate and allow almost wholly the estimates made. We recognize the labor and the watchful care that have become necessary in the settlement of the unlimited number of accounts as well as a more critical examination, and we have determined, so far as we can, to accept the estimates submitted and to expect in return safe and creditable results.

Appropriations for the collection of internal revenue are virtually existing law. Independent treasuries are but slightly increased. There is a limited increase in mints and assay offices. Sometime during the debate of the bill, not at this time, if it is suggested from the other side of the House, under the appropriation for mints and assays, I shall be glad to take up the question of the New Orleans mint. That item can be taken up in debate when we reach the paragraphs. At this time I do not consider it necessary, unless the proposition comes from the other side of the House to change the recommendation which is made in the bill. The allowances for the Territories are somewhat increased in amount to meet the requirements of what is known as the assembling every other year of the legislatures of the Territories. The amount is therefore increased to that extent.

To the War Department we consider we have been generous; but we ask for the consideration of this provision as an amendment:

Provided, That no person employed hereunder shall be paid any greater rate of compensation during the fiscal year 1905 than he was paid under this

appropriation prior to January 1, 1904, except on promotion to fill a vacancy, nor shall vacancies occurring from any cause hereunder be filled except by promotion of persons employed under and paid from this appropriation.

Under the temporary allowance for the current year the Department has had at its discretion the sum of \$541,000. We have reduced that allowance to \$325,000, but in making that change and reduction we have given a permanent clerical force to the Bureau of Insular Affairs, in number fifty-five and salaries aggregating \$65,240, together with an increase in the Record and Pension Office, which I submit:

Record and Pension Office.—The Secretary of War having transferred to this Office certain work heretofore done in the offices of the Adjutant-General and Surgeon-General, there were transferred to the former from the latter two offices seventy-five clerks; but on estimates submitted by the chief of the Office the force is reorganized, making a reduction of twenty-seven clerks, with a compensation aggregating \$25,780. The following table shows the force of the Office as now organized and the changes proposed therein:

Grade.	Force of R. and P. O. under act of Feb. 25, 1903 (permanent roll).	Transferred from A. G. O. and S. G. O. under orders of Secretary of War of Aug. 19 and 26 and Sept. 23, 1903.		Total present force of R. and P. O.	Estimated for 1905 (permanent roll).	Proposed decrease in present force.
		Perma- nent roll.	Tempo- rary roll.			
Chief clerk.....	1	-----	-----	1	1	-----
Chiefs of division.....	4	-----	1	5	5	-----
Clerks of class 4.....	34	2	-----	36	36	-----
Clerks of class 3.....	50	3	-----	53	53	-----
Clerks of class 2.....	77	6	-----	83	83	-----
Clerks of class 1.....	167	19	8	189	188	1
Clerks at \$1,000.....	35	2	18	55	48	7
Clerks at \$900.....	-----	-----	15	15	-----	15
Clerks at \$840.....	-----	-----	1	1	-----	1
Engineer.....	1	-----	-----	1	1	-----
Assistant engineer.....	1	-----	-----	1	1	-----
Firemen.....	2	-----	-----	2	2	-----
Skilled mechanic.....	1	-----	-----	1	1	-----
Messengers.....	6	-----	1	6	6	-----
Assistant messengers.....	85	2	1	88	88	-----
Messenger boy.....	1	-----	-----	1	1	-----
Watchmen.....	5	-----	-----	5	5	-----
Laborers.....	17	-----	-----	17	17	-----
Superintendent of building.....	1	-----	-----	1	1	-----
Total.....	437	35	40	512	485	27

So that in fact the bill reduces the temporary allowance for clerks but \$114,000.

This we think will be ample, aided by the economies which the Secretary of War in his testimony before the subcommittee stated he might be able to carry out; and it is further to be considered—the fact was disclosed in our hearings—that the Secretary was abroad under the direction of the President—was not in the city of Washington—at the time when the estimates were submitted; and, without in any wise questioning the judgment of the Assistant Secretary, his whole testimony led to the conviction on the part of the committee that we could make a radical reduction in the temporary force.

In the Navy Department, as gentlemen will recollect, a year ago under existing law the millions of dollars carried in the naval bill for the "Increase of the Navy" are subject to this provision:

That the Secretary of the Navy may employ and pay out of the appropriations for new ships such civilian experts, aids, additional draftsmen, writers, copyists, and model makers on the designs thereof as may be necessary.

In other words, with this vast sum of money, running into millions, the Secretary can, without limit or qualification, under the existing law, employ such subordinate force on his own suggestion or upon the request of his chiefs of bureaus as he may see fit to order. In other words, Secretary Moody a year ago, in reply to a question whether he had such discretion, replied as I read:

Absolutely; you could do with me just as you please and I could laugh in your faces, and I could go back to my Department and employ just as many clerks as I care to under the appropriation for the "Increase of the Navy."

That exact language was in his testimony before the committee one year ago. In view of the suggestion of the Secretary, opened, I think, in the general hearing by my friend from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY], as to the wisdom of his action under existing law, the Secretary and the committee agreed that he should take the matter into consideration for one year, and he now comes to us, taking the clerical and subordinate force now on the rolls, amounting in round numbers to \$155,000, and transfers it bodily to the permanent force of the Navy Department, so that the exhibit may be correct, so that there shall be a limitation upon this allowance under existing statutes.

He then asks that he may have leeway for draftsmen and such technical men as may be needed; that from the fund for the

increase of the Navy he shall be limited to \$120,000 the next year, having full knowledge of the increase of the Navy as it now exists, and possibly to some extent as to the recommendations. In addition we allow, as he requests, \$30,000 for public works—largely to employ draftsmen and to put it within his power in that character of work, as the work increases, to use perhaps the full amount, or, as the work decreases, to make such changes or removals as he may think justified. This is the whole purpose of the amendment in the bill covering this change in existing law.

We had the pleasure of inviting before our committee the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. Foss]. We gave him a hearing and invited him to make suggestions. I do not see him now present, but I think he will be in full accord with our action in the interest of better administration for the reason that this is the earnest recommendation of the Secretary and wholly in the lines of economy.

In the items for Department of Commerce and Labor we have made careful scrutiny and have been compelled to make some reductions in the estimates. We feel, however, that as the appropriation for the next year is so much larger than the appropriation made in the current law, this Department shall have opportunity to broaden its field of action throughout all of its bureaus.

It would seem, and I make reference to it for no invidious purpose, but to show you that in the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor he made a statement that his Department, if allowed the estimates submitted, would become the fourth Department of the Government. Your committee feel, in view of his requested allowance, that we might wisely go slowly in the development of the manufacturing bureau as well as the corporation bureau, and, in fact, throughout all the details of this new Department in its proposed development.

It appeared in the report on the Department of Commerce, by Senator NELSON, of Minnesota, that the bill then under consideration would increase the salary roll only to the extent of \$15,000, and all expenses would reach about \$50,000. In the bill under consideration the exhibit shows that the appropriations for the current year amount to \$1,667,690; estimated for 1905, \$2,799,660; recommended in the present bill, \$2,098,370.84. Of course I do not make these comparisons invidiously, but to suggest that we were compelled to make reasonable limitations and reductions for the coming year.

If it is necessary as we proceed with the bill to explain any of the suggested changes, I shall have pleasure in doing so. While, of course, some of the amendments in the bill may be subject to a point of order, I would emphasize to the House that every amendment we have submitted is wholly in the line of good administration and economy. We have provided, in connection with the contingent funds of the several Departments of the Government, that the allowances shall be lived up to and no Department shall exceed the law in contingent expenditures.

Almost every Department comes to Congress each year asking for deficiency. This is all wrong. Congress in its enactment desires to hold the contingent funds the same as we hold the classified force. It shall not exceed the allowance; and the purpose in putting the limitation upon the appropriation demands a more watchful care over the fund.

I will reserve the balance of my time, and as we proceed with the bill will explain any of the paragraphs—

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

Mr. BINGHAM. With pleasure.

Mr. BOUTELL. I would like to ask whether there is any provision in the general statutes or in these annual appropriation bills which authorizes the "detail," as it is called, of clerks or laborers in the classified service, or outside of the classified service, from one Department in which they are employed and paid to service in another Department?

Mr. BINGHAM. There is nothing in this bill covering the gentleman's inquiry, nor do I think there is any statute. I believe from some experience I have that the transfer of a clerk from one Department to another Department, acceded to by the Secretaries of the several Departments, and submitted to the approval of the Civil Service Commission, is not frequently, but is occasionally done. I know of no statute. I do know that we do not carry it in this bill.

Mr. BOUTELL. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the law provides for transfers, by which a clerk in the classified service may be transferred from one Department to another, and thereby ceases his connection altogether with one Department and goes onto the roll and receives his pay in the Department where he renders the service. But I have been told, and I would like to call the attention of the gentleman in charge of this bill, and also the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, to a statement which I have lately heard repeated and have since seen in the public press, that there are scores, if not hundreds, of clerks in the classified service in this city and labor-

ers in the various Departments who are regularly on the rolls of one Department, but are "detailed," as it is said, months at a time, and perhaps years at a time, for service in other Departments.

Now, I have been trying to find such a statute giving authority for this practice, but I have been unable to discover any. My opinion is that this practice is an unbusinesslike practice. If there is a statute authorizing it, in my opinion it should be repealed, and if there is no statute authorizing it, the practice should be stopped.

Mr. LIVINGSTON and Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts rose. The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. As the gentleman appealed to me, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is very much mistaken in his facts. I do not think there is any such condition of which he says he has heard. I know of no such condition.

Mr. BOUTELL. I will say to the gentleman that if there is not I am very glad of it.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I think so. I simply say I do not know of it, and I am quite confident the gentleman is mistaken. I only know of one case in which the law does allow details, and that is, I think, in the Civil Service Commission, and there, I think, there are very few employed—

Mr. BINGHAM. None.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. None, the chairman says; and I do not think there is any other in the other Departments.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I wish to say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL], with the permission of the chairman, that transfers can not be effected without the consent of the Civil Service Commission. They have, furthermore, no power to transfer generally from one Department to another. But in regard to details from bureau to bureau, in the last twelve or fourteen years there has been a great deal, and there is still a great deal of it, and it is increasing continually.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, I said the word "detail" should be placed in quotation marks. I understood the transfer of a clerk from one Department to another is authorized by law and does take place. This matter of details, I have been told and have seen it stated in the papers, is a practice which has grown up here in the Departments at Washington, and it results in our appropriating money for the pay of clerks in a Department where they are not needed, and if this practice has been to any extent carried on, of course the statement of the expenses necessary to carry on a Department in which the custom prevails is incorrect. I saw recently a statement, I would say in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts, which referred to one bureau in which the number was given of twenty-three clerks detailed from that bureau to another Department.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Do you remember in which bureau that was?

Mr. BOUTELL. As the statement may be incorrect, as I hope it is, I should prefer not to do so, as it might be construed as a reflection upon the officer having in charge that bureau. I certainly hope the statement and all other similar statements are incorrect, because if there is any such practice it certainly is very clear that it is an unbusinesslike way of conducting the service of the Government. It is not only contrary to the civil-service law, but contrary to the spirit of the civil service, and, what is of more importance, contrary to plain, common, business sense to appropriate money for the pay of employees in a Department where they are not needed and then detail them, with or without sanction of law, to another Department, where they render their services, appearing only twice in a month at the Department on whose roll they are carried to draw their pay.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will say, if the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. SNAPP rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am of the opinion the gentleman may be in error in leaving the House under the impression, when he has not the assurances of that fact, that there are twenty-three detailed from one Department to another. Now, the detail may be from some bureaus in the same Department to other bureaus in the same Department. That is quite common. When a division of a Department has more than usual work, they call upon some other bureau through the Department chief—

Mr. SNAPP. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BINGHAM. I think that the gentleman should not say that unless he can make a positive statement as to whether or not it was from one bureau to another bureau in the same Department or from one Department to another.

Mr. SNAPP. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if his attention has been called to the report of the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the current year? This statement appears in that report, on page 1:

Of the amount expended, \$51,054 was for new machinery and \$29,376 for employees detailed to other branches of the public service.

Mr. BINGHAM. What page is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. SNAPP. On page 1, from the Report of the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. They were detailed from the same Department, I think.

Mr. SNAPP. No, sir; the report says they are detailed to "other branches of the public service."

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Were they not in the same Department?

Mr. SNAPP. No; the report says they were detailed to other branches.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. But in the same Department—the Treasury Department?

Mr. SNAPP. As a matter of fact it was not. It was to the Post-Office Department.

Mr. MANN. From the Bureau of Engraving and Printing?

Mr. SNAPP. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. I think that procedure of transfer is understood by the House.

Mr. BOUTELL. I understand that transfers are fully provided for by law; also for details from one branch to another branch of the same Department. What I allude to is the practice which I say I have seen reference to—of detailing clerks and employees from one Department to another.

Now, I do not want to be misunderstood. I have no personal knowledge of the general prevalence of this practice, and was very much surprised when I saw it stated in the press that such a practice was common. Of course I have not the slightest objection to mentioning any bureaus that I have heard mentioned when it becomes necessary; but it would not seem to be right to mention a bureau which was incorrectly and therefore unjustly criticised outside this House. I simply called attention to what I have heard, and I am sincerely glad that, as appears from the statements that my inquiry elicited, the practice does not prevail, as has been stated. Let me say, in this connection, that I am sure we are all more interested in efficient service than in civil service.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have nothing to say upon that, as it does not belong to this bill.

Mr. SNAPP. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if the committee investigated this question; and if they did, if they did not discover that a large number of clerks were being detailed from one Department to another, primarily to the Department of the Post-Office?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will say that it only came to us in a qualified and limited form. I think the committee was cognizant of the fact that under what you might call "the past," in connection with these transfers, they were made by the approval of the heads of the Department, say of the Post-Office Department and the Interior Department, and then went to the Civil Service for approval, and the right resting with the Civil Service Commission to approve or disapprove. It came to the knowledge of the committee that transfers had been made in that way. I suppose in that matter of transfer the exigency existed in the Post-Office Department.

Mr. MANN. Let me suggest that that case was probably a transfer in connection with the printing of postage stamps, which are printed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and are turned over to the Post-Office Department. It might readily occur that the same employee might be employed by each Department, and properly so.

Mr. BINGHAM. That would be wholly within the rule, for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing is in the Treasury Department. That would be for the Civil Service Commission to approve. However, this is a discussion that does not present itself very forcibly to us in this bill.

Mr. SNAPP. If the gentleman will allow me, I would like to make myself plain.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNAPP. I understand there is a large number of employees in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing detailed permanently to service in the Post-Office Department.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. But is not that, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, for the printing of postage stamps?

Mr. SNAPP. No; they are being paid out of the appropriation for the Treasury Department.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am losing a large part of my discretionary time, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRINCE. I wish to make a suggestion. My colleague from Illinois has read from the annual report of the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and that is a branch under the Treasury Department. The printing of postage stamps for the Post-Office Department really belongs to the Treasury Department, and it is quite likely, carrying out the suggestion made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, as well as the chairman, who has the bill in charge, that these men have been detailed from one branch of the service into another branch both under the Treasury Department.

It seems to me that that opinion should prevail in the House until it is clearly shown that some one has been detailed from one Department to another Department, and I suggest that this report and the suggestion made by my colleague does not clearly show that one branch of the service has been detailed to another and different branch of the service.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BINGHAM. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I only wanted to ask a question of the gentleman from Illinois. Has the gentleman not noticed in the report of nearly every bureau officer that some number of clerks from his bureau are reported as having been detailed to some other bureau or some Department, or from some Department to some other Department? I also ask the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] to the same question. If I am not mistaken, I remember that the number detailed from the Bureau of Pensions is 34. It is not specified in the report whether they are detailed to other Departments or not.

I think that about one-half of them are detailed to other Departments entirely outside of the Department of the Interior, and upon that subject no regard is paid to the matter of details from one bureau of one Department to another by the Civil Service Commission, but that it is a method of avoiding the duty of transferring when it is applied for and can not be obtained. I want to say in this connection that I have not the slightest respect for the civil service as a system and not much for the Commission as a commission. [Laughter.]

Mr. BINGHAM. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I shall have to exact my privilege.

Mr. LIVINGSTON rose.

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GROSVENOR rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I have been anxious to put some questions to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I have not been able to hear anything. I do not know, therefore, but he may have covered the ground.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio in order that he may cover the ground.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is any truth in the statement which was made elsewhere on yesterday and repeated in the press generally to-day that there is a large, a very large force of incompetent clerks in the various Departments, being men of such age and decrepitude as that they can not work in the same room with other clerks, and that the ventilation of the rooms has to be varied and shifted for the purpose of fitting it to the condition of these aged and decrepit clerks? And if these statements yesterday are true, is there any remedy, not by legislation—for no legislation is ever permitted in this House upon that delicate and tender subject—is there any remedy by any other process by which the Treasury of the United States can be relieved from the enormous burden of incompetent clerical force?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will answer the gentleman to this extent. In the hearings before the committee in connection with this proposed legislation the question came before us. Under existing law, current as it has been for several years past, section 3, on page 150 of the bill, is the paragraph applicable to the employees of the Government. In that paragraph, as it is now in the bill, we use the language "compensation of any persons incapacitated for performing such service," whereas it formerly read "permanently incapacitated for performing such service." In other words, we strike out the word "permanently" for the reason the Department in its action rarely if ever finds a man permanently incapacitated.

The House can debate that proposed amendment when we reach it, but I simply give this to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] as the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations, that it would be wise legislation to change the language and strike out the word "permanently." That would leave the law for the next year as it now appears in that section of the bill. We then throw the onus of conclusion upon the Department heads. I do not suppose anyone could determine whether a man is perma-

nently incapacitated unless he were suffering from such a thing as a stroke of paralysis in most serious form or injuries of extremely serious character.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That would be new legislation upon this bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is new legislation upon this bill. It can be debated when we reach the paragraph and then discussed generally.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman for just a moment to make a suggestion?

Mr. GROSVENOR. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has not quite answered my question. I want to know to what extent this incapacity, permanent or temporary, partial or complete, exists in the Department.

Mr. BINGHAM. I can not answer how they would construe our law.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Take it all, take the whole line of incapacity, what per cent of the present clerical force in the various Departments does the gentleman believe, from his knowledge, comes under the classification of "incapacity?"

Mr. BINGHAM. That is a question I can not answer the gentleman, because I would not desire to answer him incorrectly. There was nothing before our committee which would enable us to determine, but it has been a subject of debate, as the gentleman remembers, for several years, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] has taken up the subject and discussed it several times in the House. It is a matter that we will leave to the heads of the Departments.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It has been going on since 1883, but no bill for the relief of this sort of situation has ever been reported back to this House during a period of twenty years.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But, briefly stated, the appropriation bill has twice borne the express language that the gentleman now reports. Twice it was presented by me as an amendment accepted by the Appropriations Committee; but four times the bill has gone to the Senate and has come back with this provision eliminated.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is true.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And I complain that the conference committee permits it to be eliminated.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Showing that fortifications are along the entire line of frontier, guarding the sacred entrances to the office of the purveyors of the patronage of this entire Federal Government. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield sixty minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, it is now apparent to all that the leaders of the Republican party in national affairs are wedded to their idols and are firmly resolved to maintain without change their do-nothing, stand-pat policies in reference to the taxation levied under the present tariff schedule. Notwithstanding the warnings given them in the last public utterances of our martyred President, William McKinley, notwithstanding their repeated promises for a modification of the present tariff rates, and notwithstanding the threatened industrial stagnation, caused partially by overproduction and a glutted market, they appear to wholly misapprehend the industrial conditions of the country and seem determined to maintain the present rates of the Dingley bill so long as they remain in power, regardless of consequences.

It is not my intention to engage in a general discussion of tariff schedules. I will leave that to the statesmen in Congress, and to them I will leave also the theoretical question as to whether industrial America of to-day obtained her supremacy in the markets of the world by reason of her natural resources or by reason of protective policies and paternal legislation. It is not a question of inventing a locomotive engine; it is a question of carrying freight. It is not a question of whether the sun will shine; it is a question of what we shall do in the broad light of day. It is not a question of the past, but of the present. It is not a theoretical question, but a practical one. It is not a question of keeping other nations out of our markets, but of selling our products in their markets. It is not a question of production, but one of disposing of our surplus products. It is a question in which capital and labor alike are interested; but within the time allotted to me I can not discuss the question in all its phases and will limit my discussion to the statement of a few facts showing the effect of the present policies of the Republican party on the capital and labor of the country engaged in the iron and steel manufactures.

CONDITION OF COUNTRY WHEN REPUBLICAN PARTY FIRST CAME INTO POWER.

When the Republican party first came into power and entered on its protective-tariff policies, more than one-half of the area of the United States was a wilderness. The great continental railroads connecting the Atlantic with the Pacific Ocean had not been

built. Civilization had not reached much farther than those States bordering the western banks of the Mississippi River, and even on the east side of the Mississippi River there were vast tracts of uncultivated and unoccupied public lands. The civil war gave a market for and encouraged manufactures of all kinds. Immediately after the war the building of the transcontinental railroads was begun, and the settlers followed the building of these roads and developed the country. For more than twenty-five years after that time a vast army of immigrants poured into this country from northern Europe, people of our own blood, who went into this western country to build their homes and develop its resources. From 1865 to 1885 the total amount of this immigration amounted to as much as the population of the thirteen colonies during the Revolutionary war.

A HOME MARKET THAT WAS ABLE TO CONSUME ALL THE GOODS WE MANUFACTURED.

The development of this western country and the vast number of immigrants going into it created a great market for our manufactured goods. The manufacturing plants of that day were not able to supply the demand. The home market consumed the entire products of the factories and foundries of America. Necessarily very little regard was given by the manufacturer of that day, or of the workman of that day, to foreign markets. He realized that he could not supply the home demand, and his sole idea was to hold the American market without competition.

But conditions have vastly changed since that day and time. The West has become settled. There is but little available land left for settlement. The immigration has changed. Instead of immigrants coming from northern Europe, who went West as home builders, the great percentage of the immigration to-day comes from eastern Europe and remains congested in the great cities of the East, as competitors of the labor of the country, instead of supplying new markets for the manufactures, as they did at the former period. Instead of the manufacturers of this country being unable to supply the home demand, the home market to-day is unable to consume the manufactured products of the country. Instead of the manufacturer looking solely to the home market to take care of his productions, he is now earnestly endeavoring to find foreign markets to consume his surplus products.

DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTION OF IRON AND STEEL IN THE LAST FOUR DECADES.

It is hard to realize what a vast development there has been in the production of manufactured goods in this country in the last four decades and especially in the last ten years. It would be impossible for me, within the time allotted, to take up all the great manufacturing interests of the country and show their enormous productions and development. But as iron is one of the necessities of life and commerce, and as it ranks foremost in the gross value of the manufactured goods produced, I will endeavor to show how enormously the production of iron and steel manufactures has grown, the amount of their production to-day, and the necessity of obtaining an outlet in the markets of the world for the sale of their surplus production. We find to-day that instead of there being any great danger from the importation of iron and steel into this country, the manufacturers of the Birmingham, Pittsburg, and Chicago districts are shipping pig iron, steel rails, and other steel and iron manufactures into the markets of Europe, where they are able to compete with the manufacturers of England, Germany, and Belgium after paying freight across the Atlantic Ocean.

In order to obtain some idea of the vast proportions to which this industry has grown, it is necessary for me to call your attention to a few facts showing the amount of production to-day. I find that during the year 1902 the fuel consumed by the blast furnaces of this country was about 16,000,000 tons of coke, 1,600,000 tons of coal, and 300,000 tons of charcoal. In order for the human mind to grasp these vast figures, it is necessary to state them in some other terms than just the number of tons that were consumed.

The 16,000,000 tons of coke would make a pyramid 400 feet square and 6,500 feet high, towering as high as a mountain, and its base being as large as an ordinary city block. The coal would make a pyramid 200 feet square and 1,300 feet high, and the charcoal a pyramid 200 feet square and 850 feet high. The limestone used as a flux in the production of pig iron made that year was 9,490,000 tons, which would make a pyramid 5,500 feet high and 200 feet square. The above-mentioned material produced 17,821,307 tons of pig iron, about doubling the production of ten years ago. Of the above pig iron, 2,947,933 tons represent the amount of iron and steel converted into steel rails.

If all of these steel rails had been converted into one rail, proportioned according to the standard rail, it would be a mile and one-fifth long, 81 feet high, 81 feet across the base, and 43 feet on the tread. Two million six hundred and sixty-five thousand four

hundred and nine tons of iron that year were converted into steel plate. If this had all been converted into the thinnest steel plate known and in one sheet it would cover an area of 420,000 square miles, or seven times the area of the District of Columbia, and two-fifths the size of Jefferson County, Ala., in which my home is situated. Out of the iron produced that year 10,982,246 hundred-pound kegs of wire nails and 1,633,246 hundred-pound kegs of cut nails were made. There were in operation 725 established plants engaged in the manufacture of iron and steel, employing 222,490 wage-earners, who received wages to the amount of \$134,739,004, and the total value of whose products amounted to \$835,749,034.

These figures give some idea of the enormous plants, the production of iron and steel, how greatly the value of its products have entered into the general business of the country, and how many American citizens are dependent on its success for their daily wages. The reason for the enormous increase of the production of iron and steel in this country is, probably due to two causes: First, the enormous home and foreign demand for iron and steel growing out of the fact that it is used so much more largely in construction work of all kinds than formerly; secondly, it is due to the fact of the great decrease in the cost of production. In the early history of the iron and steel development of this country the Bessemer steel converter was unknown. Its invention greatly decreased the cost of making steel, and the rapidity with which it could be done greatly increased the production.

At that time the great veins of ore on the southern and western coasts of Lake Superior were undeveloped and unused. The close proximity of the iron ore to the coal and lime rock in the Birmingham district had not been realized by the world at large and was practically undeveloped. To-day, besides the labor-saving devices that have been employed in recent years, the ore fields of the Lake Superior region have been developed, and it is notable that out of one mine alone 5,800 tons are taken out a day; that they have steam shovels with a capacity of 5 tons of iron ore at a stroke, and with them they can fill a 25-ton car in two minutes and a half, or at the rate of 600 tons per hour.

These trains are moved to the wharves and the cars automatically dump into ships. From there they are carried to Cleveland or other ports near the Pittsburgh market and the ore is raised and reloaded on cars automatically, so that now the Pittsburgh district has obtained a most excellent and very cheap ore for the manufacture of its pig iron. In the Birmingham district the iron ore, coal, and lime rock, all the ingredients that are necessary to produce a ton of pig iron, lay within a very few miles of the furnaces, and the cost of assembling the raw material at the furnaces has been reduced to a minimum, so that the cost of production has been vastly reduced since the Republican party first entered upon its policy of protecting the home market for our home manufactures against foreign competition, and on the other hand, as I have stated, the American manufacturers of to-day are now seeking foreign competition in foreign markets. It has long been the boast of the Republican politicians that the protectionist legislation of the Republican party was friendly to the workingman because it protected him against foreign competition. Whatever that may have been in the past, I want the wage-earners in the furnaces, factories, steel plants, rolling mills, mines, and quarries of my district to understand what effect that policy has, so far as they are concerned, to-day.

PRODUCTION OF IRON AND STEEL.

In 1897, with a Democratic tariff on the statute books, Mr. McKinley was elected President of the United States. The Republicans and protectionists obtained control of both branches of the Congress and had the President. They enacted what has since been known as the Dingley bill, and placed on the statute books the highest tariff schedules that have ever been known in the history of this country. I therefore think that as fair a comparison as we can obtain as to the result of this legislation can be found in a comparison of conditions from 1897 down to a period as near the present day as the figures can be obtained. The table which I will now read is taken from the annual report of the American Iron and Steel Association.

Articles.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.
	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>
Pig iron.....	9,652,680	11,773,994	13,620,703	13,789,242	15,878,354	17,821,307
Spiegeleisen and ferromanganese, included in pig iron.....	173,665	213,769	219,768	255,977	291,461	-----
Finished iron and steel:						
Bar, hoop, skelp, etc., and structural shapes, not including wire rods....	3,081,760	3,941,957	4,996,801	4,390,697	5,785,479	-----
Structural shapes, included above.....	583,790	702,197	850,376	815,161	1,013,150	-----
Wire rods.....	970,736	1,071,683	1,036,398	846,291	1,265,934	-----
Plate and sheet, except nail plate.....	1,207,286	1,448,301	1,903,505	1,794,528	2,254,425	2,065,409
Cut nails and cut spikes.....	94,054	70,188	85,015	70,245	68,850	-----
Wire nails.....	401,663	391,181	340,095	322,945	437,671	-----
Rolled, including cut nails and excluding rails.....	5,353,896	6,532,129	8,021,719	7,101,761	9,474,688	-----
Rolled, including both cut nails and rails.....	7,001,728	8,513,370	10,294,419	9,487,443	12,349,327	-----
Rails:						
Bessemer steel.....	1,644,520	1,976,702	2,270,585	2,383,654	2,870,816	-----
Open-hearth steel.....	500	1,230	523	1,333	2,066	-----
Iron.....	2,872	3,319	1,592	695	1,730	-----
Total.....	1,647,892	1,981,241	2,272,700	2,385,682	2,874,639	2,947,933
Street rails, included above.....	122,244	143,815	154,246	101,312	-----	-----
Steel ingots and castings:						
Bessemer.....	5,475,315	6,609,017	7,586,354	6,684,770	8,713,302	-----
Open-hearth.....	1,608,671	2,230,292	2,947,316	3,368,135	4,656,309	-----
Crucible.....	69,359	89,747	101,213	100,562	98,513	-----
All other.....	3,012	3,801	4,974	4,862	5,471	-----
Total crude steel.....	7,156,957	8,932,857	10,639,857	10,188,329	13,473,595	-----
Ore, pig, and scrap blooms for sale.....	8,614	8,112	13,074	12,947	10,547	-----
Tin plates.....	256,598	326,915	360,875	302,665	399,291	-----

From this table it will be seen that in the year 1897 the total production of pig iron in this country was, in round figures, 9,650,000 tons and that in 1902 it had increased to 17,800,000 tons. You say this is an argument in favor of the Republican party and shows its development of this industry. But wait. In order that this increase shall be of benefit to the wage-earner and the American manufacturer, you must show that the conditions are such that markets can be found for the sale of this product in normal times and that it will not be followed by idle furnaces and idle factories. To some extent the market that has consumed this enormous amount of iron was caused by the consumption of iron in the Spanish-American war and the Boer war in South Africa, and also by the great increase of the navies of the civilized nations of the world.

FOREIGN MARKETS FOR SURPLUS PRODUCTS.

A great deal of our pig iron has gone abroad, but, as I will

show later, the markets of Europe are being closed to us by reason of our present policies, or, rather, the policies of the party in power; and if we do not find markets to consume this product, we will shortly find the wheels of industry stopped and men out of employment. The enormous increase in production can not be due to the fact that a protective tariff has prevented foreign competition, for you will find from the table of imports of iron and steel which I will now read that the importation of pig iron into this country in 1897, under a Democratic tariff, was only 22,159 tons; that in 1902, under a Republican tariff, it had increased to 158,961 tons, a very small amount in either case, but showing an increase under the present tariff rates rather than under the former one, which does not indicate that the tariff controls the question as to iron and steel at all. And again, we find in the table that I will read that in 1897 the total importation of iron and steel manufactures, in round figures, amounted to \$16,000,000, whereas in 1902 it had increased to \$27,000,000 under the Dingley bill.

Articles.	Year ending June 30--						
	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	
Iron and steel, and manufacturers of:							
Iron ore.....dutiable.....	(tons dollars ..	543,241 778,084	352,455 470,089	269,013 401,595	946,194 1,457,022	771,457 1,135,271	1,189,739 2,332,544
Pig iron.....dutiable.....	(tons dollars ..	22,159 52,745	25,640 675,883	23,316 711,088	61,100 2,109,501	39,325 1,355,231	158,961 3,367,172
Scrap iron and steel, fit only to be remanufactured.....dutiable.....	(tons dollars ..	3,410 72,258	1,502 14,931	4,642 65,185	28,431 562,685	20,414 340,732	49,188 768,753
Bar iron.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	30,148,571 598,382	33,996,958 683,429	44,745,118 907,435	47,663,467 1,028,877	39,747,497 1,035,232	49,110,456 1,002,581
Bars, railway, of iron or steel, or in part of steel.....dutiable.....	(tons dollars ..	7,777 208,054	529 18,824	624 20,353	2,487 83,738	1,091 48,650	15,017 371,452
Hoop, band, or scroll.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	5,584 1,930	69,443 3,097	19,800 3,029	1,529,651 81,749	768,117 22,526	11,723,203 178,202
Ingot, blooms, slabs, billets, and bars of steel, and steel in forms not elsewhere specified.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	39,560,628 1,554,438	30,821,157 1,202,055	23,797,994 1,088,847	32,223,218 1,380,028	19,844,640 1,231,329	202,555,407 3,506,375
Sheet, plate, and taggers iron or steel.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	9,553,233 225,410	5,899,900 183,402	4,243,296 178,892	23,032,157 608,657	4,801,523 236,403	17,968,383 601,249
Ties or hoops for baling purposes, barrel hoops, and hoop or band iron or steel, flared, splayed, or punched.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..						
Ties for baling cotton.....free.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	16,265,506 239,498					
Tin plates, terneplates, and taggers tin.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	230,073,633 5,344,638	171,692,345 3,809,148	108,434,826 2,613,564	147,963,804 4,799,736	117,880,312 3,770,062	198,996,086 6,065,624
Wire, rods.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	33,153,178 632,803	30,601,639 844,841	34,610,656 730,958	47,096,565 1,114,145	41,588,192 1,082,827	38,486,353 902,296
Wire, and articles made from.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	6,328,110 380,297	5,318,193 348,854	5,278,044 348,080	4,114,078 386,318	6,242,160 488,304	9,465,330 633,301
Manufactures of--							
Anvils.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	733,482 44,781	777,903 47,797	530,113 32,806	580,438 36,420	525,673 35,372	448,079 28,778
Chains.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	698,481 52,666	176,346 11,429	362,855 21,006	630,020 43,730	322,300 23,893	657,972 45,778
Cutlery.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	2,339,963 47,407	944,056 35,344	1,188,916 42,700	1,534,332 59,707	1,596,663 59,779	1,706,454 72,239
Files, file blanks, rasps, and floats.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	753,112 1,283,696	409,032 1,875,222	758,575 1,630,542	838,528 3,699,036	924,447 3,324,705	1,155,088 3,643,572
Firearms.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	309,754 33,089	862,606 48,885	407,746 138,871	367,598 182,906	383,034 285,276	408,973 282,979
Machinery.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	1,283,696 309,754	1,875,222 862,606	1,630,542 407,746	3,699,036 367,598	3,324,705 383,034	3,643,572 408,973
Needles, hand sewing and darning.....free.....	(pounds..... dollars ..	33,089 1,886,696	48,885 1,107,596	138,871 1,210,827	182,906 1,671,899	285,276 1,570,269	282,979 2,346,327
Shotgun barrels, in single tubes, forged, rough-bored.....free.....	(pounds..... dollars ..						
All other.....dutiable.....	(pounds..... dollars ..						
Total, not including ore.....	(dollars.....	16,094,557	12,626,431	12,100,440	20,478,728	17,874,789	27,180,247

OVERPRODUCTION AT HOME.

A few years ago pig iron was selling in the Birmingham market at \$18, \$19, and \$20 per ton. To-day it is selling at \$9.50 and \$10 a ton, and proportionately the same prices obtain in Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Chicago, although a little higher than the Birmingham market. A few years ago the yards of the furnaces were empty. In none of them could you see a pile of surplus iron. To-day there is hardly a furnace in the country that is not carrying a large quantity of pig iron in its yards. With a falling market and a diminished demand, as indicated by the iron remaining in the yards of the furnaces or on the warrant yards, it is evident that the market for the sale of pig iron has diminished, and the same is true of all other manufactures of iron and steel. As I stated, in 1897 we had commenced the sale of our surplus products abroad. From a third to a fourth of the production of pig iron in the Birmingham district was sold in foreign markets. Since that time we find that the enactment of the Dingley tariff bill has largely affected our foreign sales to our own detriment.

FOREIGN NATIONS DISCRIMINATE AGAINST AMERICAN EXPORTS ON ACCOUNT OF THE DINGLEY BILL.

We find that on account of the discriminations of the Dingley bill, France, soon after its enactment, discriminated against American manufactures and practically drove them out of the French market. We are able to sell our iron and steel in the markets of England and can not compete with the English iron-master in the French markets because we are compelled to pay \$1.50 a ton on pig iron and \$11.60 on steel rails, and so on throughout the iron and steel schedule, for the importation of our goods into France—more than other countries have to pay to take their manufactures into France. This practically destroys this market for our manufactured goods, but we are still left a great market for our agricultural products, as shown by our exports for 1903, which amounted to \$75,092,466, whereas our imports from France into this country amounted to \$90,050,072, and now, because the Senate of the United States rejected the French reciprocity treaty, France has recently discriminated against the products of our farms, which will still further increase the balance of trade against us.

The building of the transcontinental Russian railway and opening up of the Siberian country is developing a vast market for the products of the world. We should have our share of this market, but shortly after the enactment of the Dingley tariff bill the Secretary of the Treasury, under President McKinley's Administration, used the machinery of that act to discriminate against Russian beet sugar, excluding an amount less than \$300,000 in value under the pretense that it was bounty-paid sugar, with the result that Russia has enacted a new tariff law increasing the tax on American goods exported to that country over 50 per cent, and this applies to agricultural as well as manufactured goods. Russia

bought of us in the year 1903 \$15,889,601 worth of the products of this country and sold to us \$9,234,739 worth of their productions, leaving a balance in our favor of \$6,654,862, which balance will be greatly diminished by Russia's new discriminating tariff against us, instead of our greatly increasing our exports to that country and finding markets in the newly developing regions of Siberia, as we could if it were not for the discriminations made against our products.

On account of the discriminations of the Dingley Act against products of Germany, mostly beet sugar, that country has passed an act discriminating against the products of this country. This tariff increased the duty on flour \$4.06 per barrel, or 149 per cent; on wheat, 58½ cents per bushel, or 115 per cent; on rye, 100 per cent; on oats, 148 per cent; on corn, 113 per cent; on horses and mules, 400 per cent; on cattle and beef, 100 per cent. This is but an illustration, under this new tariff act, of the effect it will have on our commerce on farm products as well as manufactured goods exported from this country to Germany. Now the discrimination of Germany against us amounts to more than 50 per cent of the former tax we had to pay on our exports to that country.

This is injuring our foreign trade in an enormous market, and one where the balance of trade was strongly in our favor, for in the year ending June 30, 1903, we sold to Germany \$190,896,447 worth of our products, and we bought from her \$119,772,511 worth of her products, leaving a balance in our favor of \$71,123,936. Switzerland, Venezuela, and Brazil have all increased their tariff taxes against our goods, decreasing our exports and narrowing our markets, and now the news comes across the water that Mr. Chamberlain, the English statesman, is endeavoring to persuade the English Parliament to adopt a policy of discrimination against us. In 1903 we sold to the United Kingdom of Great Britain \$516,986,416 worth of our manufactured and farm products and bought of Great Britain \$190,021,658 worth of her products, leaving the enormous balance of \$326,964,758 in our favor. Let me read you a table showing the imports and exports of the United States for 1903:

Imports and exports for 1903.

Country.	Imports.	Exports.
Europe.....	\$547,226,887	\$1,029,256,657
North America.....	189,736,475	215,432,769
South America.....	107,428,323	41,187,872
Asia.....	147,702,374	58,359,016
Oceania.....	21,043,527	37,468,512
Africa.....	12,581,651	38,436,853
Total.....	1,025,719,237	1,420,141,679
Balance in our favor.....		394,422,342

Which shows a balance in our favor of \$394,422,342 of exports over imports with the entire world, which is little more than the amount of the balance of trade in our favor with Great Britain. Now, should the British Government enact a discriminating tariff against us, as France, Germany, Russia, and other European countries have done, by reason of our discriminating tariffs against them, practically the entire balance of trade that is now in our favor would be wiped out, our foreign markets destroyed, and idle furnaces and factories would be the result in this country, with thousands of workmen without employment.

CONDITIONS THAT GOVERN THE TRADE OF THE TIME.

The trade of nations is largely governed by the same rules and the same causes that govern and affect the trade of individuals. We trade with the man that we like, and we refuse to trade with the man that we dislike; we trade with the man that we believe gives us the best bargain, and not with the man that we believe tries to take advantage of us; we trade with the man who is willing in turn to trade with us, and not with the man who refuses to buy that which we have to sell. We can not expect foreign nations to invite us to their markets when we exclude them from ours. We can not expect them to grant us advantages which we are unwilling to return. There was a time when our home market, as I have said before, consumed our entire manufactured products and when it was unnecessary for us to consider what effect our action at home would have on our foreign trade. But to-day, when we are admittedly producing more than we can consume in both our manufactures and agriculture, our development must cease or we must find markets for our surplus products.

As I have shown above, foreign markets instead of being developed are being closed to us by reason of the discriminations made against the importations of other countries, and yet the Republican party contends that it is benefiting the American workman by the maintenance of the present discriminating Dingley rates and its stand-pat policies. Another reason why we can not expect to develop our foreign trade without we are willing to allow other nations to trade with us is the fact that it costs a ship just as much to cross the seas empty as it does to cross the seas with a cargo. We can not sell our products in the South American markets in competition with English manufacturers, not because they manufacture and sell their goods cheaper at home than we do, but because they can reach these markets with a less freight rate than we can. To illustrate, when they send abroad a cargo of coal or manufactured goods, the ship after it reaches its destination in the South American ports is reloaded with the products of that country and returns home with a full cargo. The return freight pays the charges of the ship coming home, and the exported goods are only required to pay the transportation charges for the outgoing voyage.

On the other hand, when we ship our goods to the South American markets, on account of our high discriminating Dingley tariff rates most of the products of that country are excluded from our markets and the ship is required to return home empty and the owners of the outgoing cargo are required to pay the freight both ways. In other words, the English exporter pays one freight and the American exporter pays two freights. The difference in the freight charges amounts to a fair profit, enabling our competitor to undersell us and exclude us from those markets. Now, what effect will these conditions have on the American manufacturer and the American wage-earner? The Republican party claims that it is through its management and through its policies that the wages of the American laborer have been increased.

EFFECT ON LABOR.

Unquestionably the wages have slightly increased during the last decade, but in all probability a large portion of this increase is due to the American labor organizations and not to conditions existing then and now. But can the American laborer maintain this increase in his wages in time to come? I can conceive of a condition where there is a demand for all the goods produced by the American manufacturer at a price at which the manufacturer can make a profit, where every laborer in the country is employed, and no surplus labor in the market. With united action these wage-earners can maintain or increase their wages up to a point where they would destroy a fair profit for the manufacturer. But the furnaces and factories will run only so long as the owners thereof can run at a profit.

The same is true of any other business. When the conditions in this country reach a point where no market can be found for a large portion of our manufactured goods somebody must stop manufacturing. When that plant shuts down it leaves men without employment. These men can not starve. They must get employment, and in the end they become the competitors of those who have employment. Where you have two positions hunting for one man, labor can maintain its wage scale; but where you have two men hunting for one position—whether there is organized labor or not—it will be impossible to maintain a wage scale

until wages are reduced to a point where the surplus labor in that industry can not find employment and is driven to other occupations.

HOW DESTRUCTION OF FOREIGN MARKETS WILL AFFECT OUR MANUFACTURES.

Now, in my judgment, the destruction of our foreign markets by the Republican party is leading to-day and must ultimately lead to idle furnaces and factories. When that is done, necessarily a large number of men will be thrown out of employment and are being thrown out of employment to-day. Then the price of labor in the iron and steel manufactures will be reduced, as it has always been reduced in the past under these conditions, and unless some action is taken to open again the markets that are being closed to us the American laborer will be the sufferer as well as the manufacturer.

For this reason I believe that the time has come when a change in our present tariff schedules is growing imperative. We can not have free trade no matter what theories we indulge in. It is an impractical question to-day. We must raise revenue to support this Government, and when the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the income-tax law was unconstitutional the effect of that decision was that for all time to come a part of the revenue of this Government, and a large part of it, must be raised by taxes levied on goods imported into this country. But that does not necessarily mean a tax placed so high that it practically prohibits the importation of any goods at all. On the other hand, you can place it so low that very little revenue will be derived from the importation of foreign goods. Unquestionably a greater amount of revenue could be derived than at present by lowering the present Dingley rates without injury to the manufacturing interests of the country, and at the same time it would give us an opportunity to make terms with foreign nations that would allow us to trade in their markets.

As I have stated above, it is absolutely necessary to the prosperity of the iron and steel industry of this country that we should have markets in which our surplus products can overflow in times when a normal home market can not absorb them. The iron and steel industry is one that is so great and one that comes in contact with the daily life of every individual to such an extent that it is impossible for any man or set of men, corporation or combination of corporations, to control it in good times or bad times. The average cost of production of a ton of pig iron in the United States is probably somewhere near \$10 per ton, although pig iron can be produced in some sections of the country at a much lower figure than this, and of this \$10 per ton over \$8 is expended for labor in the production of it, and for the labor used in the mining of the raw material—such as coal, limrock, and iron ore.

As I have stated above, in the year 1902 the production of pig iron in this country amounted to 17,821,000 tons. At a cost of \$10 per ton for production this would amount to \$178,000,000 that the furnaces of this country are required to pay out each year. The combined iron interests of the country are not strong enough to carry this enormous outlay in their yards in the shape of pig iron for any great length of time. Therefore, when the demand falls off and there is a surplusage of pig iron in the market the weaker furnaces must cut the price, with the result that it falls very rapidly. In other words, although articles manufactured of iron and steel are a necessity in civilized life, yet they are the one necessity in life in which the greatest economy can be shown in times of depression.

When hard times come the housewife can make the cooking stove last a few years longer. The railroads buy no more equipment or new rails than is absolutely necessary. There is no money for investment, and the building of steel-frame buildings stops. The farmer patches his old plow, and along the whole line the demand for iron falls off, with the result that stagnation follows, prices come down to the cost of production, and many men are thrown out of employment. But if we can find a market abroad to absorb this surplus product when dull times come at home, the prices can be sustained and the factories and furnaces kept in operation and the laborer receive his wages. Of course, after a long era of depression, when the rails of the railroads are worn out, new equipments are required, and the house needs refurnishing and the farmer a new plow, an era of prosperity sets in and with it comes an enormous demand for iron and steel, a demand that this country is unable to supply.

Everybody wants iron and steel at the same time, and necessarily the price advances away beyond the cost of production. Profits become enormous and old plants are put into operation that can not be worked at a profit at normal times. Surplus capital is induced to rush into the iron and steel business without considering the effect of the investment when the time of overproduction is reached. This is partially brought about by a high protective tariff that prevents foreign iron and steel from coming into the country and relieving the excessive demand. In

my judgment, as I have stated above, it is impracticable at this day and time to have absolutely free trade. On many articles the iron and steel schedules under the Dingley bill are prohibitive, allowing little if any relief in times of great demand to come from the outside, and it seems to me that it would be better for the producer of iron who has capital invested in the business, and the wage-earner in iron and steel manufacturing, to seek a normal market if possible rather than to contend with the two extremes.

In times of low prices there is no question about the American manufacturer controlling the home market, because he can make iron and steel cheaper than can be made anywhere else in the world. In times of excessive high prices, in my judgment, it would be better to allow some foreign iron to come in and relieve the situation and hold down the prices to a reasonable profit rather than to have excessive high prices that induce old furnaces, that can not be run at a profit in normal times, to go back into operation, and induce the abnormal building of new plants that go to swell the amount of overproduction in normal times. In other words, for a man who derives his income or earns his daily bread from the manufacture of iron and steel it is better to avoid the two extremes of the market as far as possible and feel that he can rely on his trade or investment as a certainty, year in and year out; and it goes without saying that under these conditions a government would derive a revenue from the importations of iron and steel in years of excessive high prices, whereas under the present prohibitive tariff it practically derives none at all.

WHAT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY HAS DONE FOR THE WAGE-EARNERS.

But to return to the comparison of what the Republican party has done for the wage-earner in this country in the period between July, 1897, and the present day, it is well for us to look at what it cost a laborer in this country to live at that time and what it costs to-day. The table which I will read shows the prices proportionate to consumption of the various necessities of life, and cost of living from January 1, 1897, to January 1, 1903.

Prices proportioned to consumption.

Date.	Bread-stuffs.	Meats.	Dairy and garden.	Other food.	Clothing.	Metals.	Miscellaneous.	Total.
January 1—								
1897	\$11.729	\$7.327	\$10.456	\$8.170	\$12.407	\$13.014	\$12.399	\$75.502
1898	13.511	7.396	12.371	8.312	14.654	11.572	12.184	79.940
1899	13.816	7.520	11.458	9.096	14.150	11.843	12.550	80.423
1900	13.254	7.258	13.702	9.200	17.484	18.085	16.312	95.295
1901	14.486	8.407	15.556	9.504	16.024	15.810	15.881	95.698
1902	20.002	9.670	15.248	8.952	15.547	15.375	16.793	101.587
1903	17.104	9.522	14.613	9.418	15.938	17.185	16.576	100.356

Cost of living nearly 30 per cent greater in 1903 than in 1897.

From these figures it is shown that on the 1st day of January, 1897, the proportionate cost of living amounted to \$75.50, and on the 1st day of January, 1903, amounted to \$100.35, showing that there has been an increased cost of living of over 30 per cent. In breadstuffs the increase amounts to \$3.40; in meats to \$2.20; in dairy and garden products to \$4.16 and other food products to \$1.24; in clothing to \$3.53, and in miscellaneous articles to \$4.18. On the other hand, the increase in metals amounts to \$4.17, and on account of the rapidly decreasing prices of iron and steel manufactures in the last year and its continuance, I have no doubt that if I had the figures down to the 1st of January, 1904, they would show practically no increase at all in the metal schedules since 1897. So, so far as the worker in iron and steel is concerned, he finds the cost of living has increased a very great deal since 1897, when the Dingley bill was enacted, and, on the other hand, he finds that the overproduction in the home market is driving the prices of iron down where, if it continues, it must necessarily force his wages back to the level of that year. In order that I might have accurate data in reference to the wage scales, I requested the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor to inform me on the subject, and in answer to my request I received the letter which I will now read:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF LABOR,
Washington, January 7, 1904.

Hon. O. W. UNDERWOOD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your verbal request some days ago for information as to the increase of wages since 1896, I beg to say that this Bureau has no information as to wages from 1900 to 1903 which would enable me to furnish you with a definite statement as to the increase. The last report on wages, which is contained in Bulletin 20, a copy of which is sent you by to-day's mail, under separate cover, carries the data only to the end of 1899.

The Bureau has been engaged for some months on an extensive investigation into rates of wages, which will cover a great number of representative establishments and thereby furnish a perfectly fair basis for a calculation as to the course of wages from 1890 to 1903, inclusive. Unfortunately, this report will not be made until the latter part of this year, as much of the field work yet remains to be done.

An estimate which was made in 1902 indicates that the increase of wages from 1896 to 1901, inclusive, amounted to about 15 per cent. It should be remembered, however, that this is but an estimate, and that the results of a

more extensive investigation from actual pay rolls, which is now being carried on, may show a somewhat different figure.

Regretting that I can not furnish you with more definite information in regard to the matter,

I am, very respectfully,

G. W. W. HANGER,
Acting Commissioner.

The bulletin referred to in this letter on an average shows practically no increase in wages from 1896 to 1899, as far as it carries the investigation, for those engaged in iron and steel manufactures; but the net result is that the cost of living has been increased over 30 per cent and the increase in wages is not over 15 per cent, for all of which our Republican friends say the American wage-earner must thank the present Administration. For when the manufacturer can no longer sell his product at a profit he must of necessity either reduce wages or close down his furnaces or his factory, so that the wage-earner in the furnaces and factories, coal mines and iron-ore banks gains nothing by the stand-pat, do-nothing, exclusive idea of the Republican party. On the other hand, it puts their daily wage in jeopardy and is bringing about stagnation in the business interests from which they earn their daily bread.

REPUBLICAN PARTY REFUSES TO PROTECT AMERICAN LABOR AGAINST PAUPER LABOR OF EUROPE.

As I have said before, the Republican party makes its boast that it is the friend of the laborer in this country, and that by its protective policies it has protected him against the cheap labor of Europe. Yet, as I have shown, we are to-day producing the cheapest iron and steel in the world, and the same is true in most of our other manufactures. When we can undersell the European manufacturer in his own market, certainly there is no protection to the American laborer no matter what the wages that may be paid to the foreign wage-earner. Our great natural resources, American inventions, and the greater skill and capacity of the American workman enables us in most instances to produce our goods at a lower cost than the same goods are produced in European countries and pay a better wage scale to the laborer at home. But there is an instance in which the Republican party has had, and still has, the opportunity to protect the American laborer against the competition of the pauper labor of Europe, but instead of doing so it has kept the flood gates for foreign immigration open wide and has entered into an unholy alliance with the steamship lines of the world to flood the United States with European labor that is not up to the American standard and pulls down the American wage scale.

With the exception of two years, during the first part of President Cleveland's second Administration, the Republican party either has been in absolute control or partial control of this Government since 1861. In the first part of that period there was no necessity to close the doors against European immigration, for most of it came from Germany, France, Sweden, Norway, Great Britain, and other European countries. They went into the western country and developed our Republic. They were people of our own blood, our kith and kin. We absorbed them in one generation, and they created new markets for our manufactures. But in the last two decades a very small proportion of our immigrants are from northern Europe. Most of them are gathered up by the steamship companies and their agents from southern and eastern Europe. They are a people who are not capable of coming up to the American standards of living and of life and pull down the American wage scale. Yet the Republican party has made no effort as a party, except by promises and broken pledges, to relieve the situation at all.

During the last Congress I offered on the floor of the House, and succeeded in passing, an amendment to the immigration laws, by which this flood tide of foreign immigration into this country would have been decreased. The Republican Committee on Immigration in the House refused to support the bill; but with the Democratic votes and the aid of some of the Republican members the amendment passed the House and went to the United States Senate, where it was killed in a Republican committee and by a Republican Senate. And yet this indiscriminate immigration is not only a menace to the labor of the country, but is an enormous tax that the wage-earners as well as the capitalist of the country must each give their proportion to sustain, for of the 401,057 aliens who landed at the port of New York during the six months ending June 30, 1903, 580 have become public charges, applying voluntarily for aid.

The average cost of maintaining a pauper is \$80 per year. It will cost \$46,400 to maintain these 580 paupers each year. There were 66,400 paupers in the State of New York maintained for the year ending September 30, 1901, at a cost of \$15,941,622. Of these, 28,976 were native born and 37,424 were foreign born. It also cost the city of New York \$5,000,000 to maintain its insane asylums, and more than half of the inmates of the insane asylums were shown to be persons born in foreign countries. The value of the public buildings and grounds that it was necessary for the State to build and maintain to keep

up these establishments was \$86,177,725. The interest on it at 5 per cent per annum amounts to \$3,408,886, making the total cost to the State of New York to maintain her insane and poor \$24,350,508.

More than half of these were foreign-born persons who became a charge on the State shortly after they came in this country. So that the people of the State of New York are paying \$12,000,000 a year to maintain and support the paupers and insane of foreign countries by reason of our lax immigration laws. During the year ending June 30, 1903, all the records as to the number of immigrants landed in this country were broken. Eight hundred and fifty-seven thousand and forty-six immigrants were landed in the United States, as against 648,743 the year before. When will this enormous importation of foreign labor cease, and why is it continued? It will not cease so long as the party in power listens to the demands of those who are making a profit out of it, and it is very easy to put your hand on the influences behind the present Government who have prevented an amendment to the present immigration laws being passed.

One hundred ships a month are bringing immigrants into the single port of New York, and at the average rate of \$30 a person for steerage passage an enormous revenue of \$25,711,380 was received by the steamship companies last year; and of the great number of immigrants that have been brought in, many of whom were admitted in violation of our present lax and unsatisfactory immigration laws, not one-half of 1 per cent were returned as coming in in violation of the law which prohibits a pauper or insane person from being landed. The statistics show that 30 aliens out of 10,000 who landed became objects of charity, while there is only about 9 out of every 10,000 native born who became objects of charity. Out of the 648,743 immigrants who came into this country in 1903, 3,000 were engaged in professions, 80,000 were skilled workmen, 400,000 were unskilled laborers, and 150,000 were women and children.

If these came from northern Europe, where they are capable of coming up to the American standards and American ideas, it would not jeopardize the present wage scale or injure the present wage-earner, but, as I stated before, the great bulk of this labor comes from southern and eastern Europe, where through centuries they have been down-trodden and oppressed, where they have been compelled to fight for existence, coming to this country without education, ready to pull down rather than build up in the fight for their daily bread. And still the stream continues to pour in upon the American labor market. More than 80,000 skilled workmen and 420,000 unskilled laborers coming each year in competition with American labor because the Republican party will not pass legislation that will protect American workmen against this competition. What can home labor do when it has to come in daily contact and daily competition with foreign labor that is not up to its standard? How can any organization increase or maintain its present wages when a constant oversupply of labor through immigration coming into this country is tearing down the American standards of labor and living? You can not increase the wages or maintain the standard when you have two men fighting for one position, and the man who will get the position in the end will be the man who can live the cheapest, for he will work the cheapest.

The time for a change has come; continued victories at the polls and unchecked power for nearly a decade has made the Republican leaders forget the interests and needs of the men who elected them. Corruption stalks in the great governmental departments; extravagance in public affairs is the price they are willing to pay to special interests for the sinews of war for the coming campaign, and a reckless disregard for public interests makes them willing to maintain the present excessive tariff schedules, burdening the people with enormous taxes, accumulating unsurpassed surplus revenue in the Treasury, to loan to banks in the East friendly to the present Administration.

The Republican party must be driven from power before we can have reasonable taxes, economy in public expenditures, and an honest administration of public affairs. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. How much time did the gentleman from Alabama occupy?

The CHAIRMAN. He occupied fifty-five minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield fifteen minutes, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE].

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, before beginning my remarks, I desire to ask permission to extend them in the RECORD, as there are some matters to which I shall refer which I shall not have time to read in full.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask the same privilege for all Members who address the House on the bill now under discussion, that they may extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the request of the gentleman will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I have no set speech to make to-day to the House, but I want to read an indictment against the Republican party, an indictment made by one whose authority I do not think any Member on that side of the House can dispute. It is an indictment which if true ought to drive the present party out of power. It is a charge which I believe to be true and which I believe will drive that party out of power. I can already see the signs of decrepitude in the grand old elephant. Now, Mr. Chairman, I read from page 8 of the President's message. He says:

In my last annual message, in connection with the subject of the due regulation of combinations of capital which are or may become injurious to the public, I recommended a special appropriation for the better enforcement of the antitrust laws as it now stands, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney-General. Accordingly (by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act of February 25, 1903, 32 Stat., 854, 904) the Congress appropriated, for the purpose of enforcing the various Federal trust and interstate-commerce laws, the sum of \$500,000, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney-General in the employment of special counsel and agents in the Department of Justice to conduct proceedings and prosecutions under said laws in the courts of the United States.

I now recommend, as a matter of the utmost importance and urgency, the extension of the purposes of this appropriation, so that it may be available, under the direction of the Attorney-General, and until used, for the due enforcement of the laws of the United States in general and especially of the civil and criminal laws relating to public lands and the laws relating to postal crimes and offenses and the subject of naturalization. Recent investigations have shown a deplorable state of affairs in these three matters of vital concern. By various frauds and by forgeries and perjuries, thousands of acres of the public domain, embracing lands of different character and extending through various sections of the country, have been dishonestly acquired.

It is hardly necessary to urge the importance of recovering these dishonest acquisitions, stolen from the people, and of promptly and duly punishing the offenders. I speak in another part of this message of the widespread crimes by which the sacred right of citizenship is falsely asserted and that "inestimable heritage" perverted to base ends. By similar means—that is, through frauds, forgeries, and perjuries, and by shameless bribes—the laws relating to the proper conduct of the public service in general and to the due administration of the Post-Office Department have been notoriously violated.

There is a declaration, sanctioned by the language of your President, that under this Administration thousands of acres of the public lands have been stolen, numerous and incalculable frauds upon citizenship have been practiced, and that the laws relating to the various branches of the Government have been notoriously violated. How can you answer this? Not by the one-sided investigation which has been attempted in the Post-Office Department. You can only answer it by joining with this side of the House in an independent Congressional investigation that will be thorough and energetic and that will go to the bottom of these crimes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When you do that the infamy and crimes that will be shown will be such, in my opinion, as to drive you from place and from power, as it ought to do. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We ought to remember that Jefferson said that "the whole art of government consisted in the art of being honest." No crime can be of greater concern, no criminal deserves more severe punishment or more speedy punishment than the man occupying official position who violates his trust, and the sooner the lash can be placed in the hand of every honest man to whip the rascals naked through the world, even from east to west, until these things be corrected, the better it will be for the country.

The President is powerless to correct the evils as long as he depends upon partisans interested in party success, if not in shielding themselves, to make the investigations and conduct the investigations. You dare not, under this cruel arraignment of the President, go backward, and you dare not offer to this House a fair and full investigation where both parties are interested. Nothing short of the latter course will satisfy the public, already alarmed by the disclosures that have forced themselves upon the public. You must open up the books, turn on the lights, and drive the undaunted rascals out of public life, and put stripes upon those who deserve it.

The President in his message also felicitates the country on having accomplished so much by way of legislation looking to the control of trusts. He says:

With a nation as with a man the most important things are those of the household, and therefore the country is especially to be congratulated on what has been accomplished in the direction of providing for the exercise of supervision over the great corporations and combinations of corporations engaged in interstate commerce.

Why, Mr. Chairman, a year ago the sum of \$500,000 was placed in the hands of the judicial officers of this Government to enable them to prosecute the trusts, to hunt down these thieves and prosecute them. Yet, to-day, in the beginning of the year 1904, we read constantly in the press of the aggression, the extortions, the unmitigated robberies of the United States Steel Trust, and your Attorney-General and your President, the trust buster from Oyster Bay, seem never even to have heard of the existence of that organization.

Mr. GILBERT. The Attorney-General does not even mention in his report the matter you speak of.

Mr. LITTLE. These combinations are not mentioned by the President. The appropriation which I referred to, I am advised by my friend from Kentucky, is not mentioned by the Attorney-General in his report. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but we find that this corporation has turned out, defenseless and without employment, 62,000 of its workmen at this season of the year. It has not only done that, but it has cut down the wages of 200,000 of its employees from 10 to 20 per cent. Not only that, but I have good Republican authority for the statement that it has robbed 40,000 honest investors, many of them the employees of this great robber institution, of more than \$200,000,000. Yet the executive and judicial officers of the Government have not been able to discover the existence of this criminal institution.

Not only that, we hear nothing of the great oil monopoly, we hear nothing of the great sugar trust, except that it is laying its hands upon the independent beet-sugar industry of the West and taking it within its grasp.

We hear nothing of the great beef trust that continues to divide the beefsteak of the poor man in half. There is no complaint about that. Only yesterday I noticed an Associated Press dispatch that there is now being organized a great beef trust that will involve all the packing houses of New England. Yet this Administration is silent; like a sheep before its shearers, is dumb, powerless to enforce the law or to attempt to enforce it; not willing even to institute civil proceedings against these highwaymen.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that the people will put men in power next November who will enforce the law. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, I will publish in connection with my present statement an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer, a great stalwart Republican paper, which is a supporter of the Administration, in which the editor agrees with me that the men who have done these great wrongs to the honest people and the honest laborers of the United States ought not to stand higher than the ordinary thieves in this country. It is the only Republican paper of importance that has been able to discover it, and I hope through its instrumentality that the attention of this Administration will be called to it.

[The Philadelphia Inquirer, Saturday morning, January 9, 1904.]

IT WAS A SHAMEFUL CONSPIRACY TO ROB THE PEOPLE OF THEIR SAVINGS.

The story of the paying and of the scaling and of the passing of the dividend on the common stock of the United States Steel Corporation is the story of an infamous assault upon the savings of the people. It is the story of a conspiracy entered into against the pockets of a trusting but deluded community by a number of so-called highly honorable and eminently respectable gentlemen who would be stigmatized as scoundrels and arrested as swindlers and put in jail as thieves if the operations in which they are engaged and in which they amass their millions were conducted upon a smaller scale and if they lacked the money wherewith to hire smart lawyers to tell them how to rob with impunity and how to lie without personal risk. It is the story of the most gigantic confidence game that was ever played with success upon a hypnotized community. It is a story of dishonor, of dishonesty, and of ineradicable shame.

Looking back at the past in the light of the present it is easy to follow the inception and development of the diabolical plot whereby it was designed to ruin or to despoil the thousands of innocent investors, whose money it was proposed to divert into the possession of the plotters. The organization of the United States Steel Corporation was originally supposed to be a business proposition, having for its object the consolidation of a great industry and the steadying of prices through the elimination of a ruinous competition. The scheme was said to be to realize important economies through centralization, to retain large profits by cooperation, and to prevent the suicidal cutting of rates, which had been the bane of the trade under the old conditions. That is what the public was told repeatedly, and that was the ground upon which it was invited to put its confidence and its money in the enterprise. Such was the theory, but the reality was quite different.

Subsequent events have shown the truth to be that the United States Steel—suggestive word!—Corporation was actually organized to enable its promoters—that is, J. P. Morgan & Co.—to make millions of unearned dollars in the shape of commissions. It was an ingenious device contrived by Mr. Morgan for the purpose of conveying your money, our money, everybody's money who could be bamboozled into believing in his probity and in his promises into his own already well-filled coffers. It was not in its essence or in its intention a commercial proposition at all. It was a scheme for bleeding the public of its cash, for cheating—there is really no other appropriate word—the widows and the orphans and all that crowd of unsophisticated people who have old-fashioned ideas of honesty and do not understand the connection between low fraud and high finance out of everything they might have to lose, and along that line it certainly has been worked to the limit.

It is a plain statement of fact to say that the people who put that common stock upon the market and who represented that it had a substantial and intrinsic value of its own were guilty of obtaining money under false pretenses. They knew that what they were offering for sale had nothing in the shape of property behind it. They knew, as the public which was invited to buy did not know, as it had no means of knowing, that it was all "bonus" stock, that it was nothing more than the chromo which had been given away to facilitate the transfer of the property for which it was alleged to stand. They knew that it had no more real substance than so much bottled moonshine; and, when knowing all that they urged it upon the public as a good thing, they were guilty from the moral point of view of precisely the same offense as that which, upon conviction, sends the "green goods" man to jail.

They wanted the public to buy steel common because they had rafts of it for sale, and because they knew the extreme desirability of selling it at the highest price obtainable and at the earliest possible moment. To that end one fraudulent pretense was piled on top of another, and during a period of two years and a half about \$50,000,000 were distributed in the shape of dividends, not because the business done by the concern justified the disbursement, but because it was necessary for the purposes of the plotters that the price of the stock should be sustained. They had so much of it that it took

a long time to work it off, and it was essential that the payment of the dividend should be maintained until that was accomplished.

So glowing reports were published, in whose veracity no intelligent man any longer believes, and the management which published those reports with a purpose, as a part of the conspiracy that was in course of execution, received great praise for the honest candor which its action indicated. How Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan and his pals must have grinned at those eulogies!

The end and aim of the conspiracy was reached and its purpose accomplished when the men who had received the common stock in part payment of their services as promoters, underwriters, barkers, or what not succeeded in getting rid of their certificates. Then the pins were withdrawn, the bottom fell out, and everything was allowed to go to smash. It ceased to be necessary to pay dividends on the common stock any longer, but just for the sake of appearances, because it would not look well to stop the now accustomed distribution all at once, the goal was not reached at a single bound.

The dividend was first cut in half as a preliminary to the abolition which had been all along intended, and this latter was effected at the next meeting. The plot had been executed. However great a failure the United States Steel Corporation had been as a business enterprise, as a means of enriching its promoters it had proved a most conspicuous success. There is no means of estimating precisely how many millions of dollars it had served to transfer from the pockets of the relatively poor to the pockets of the predatory rich, but the sum must have been large enough, one would think, to satisfy the cupidity of the most rapacious. One day last fall, after the decline had already gone pretty far, a correspondent, writing from a fashionable watering place, reported having seen Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan and ingeniously commented upon his aspect of serenity. It is not difficult to guess the secret of that serenity. He had realized in full.

And the public? Oh, the public can go hang. It has got experience for its cash, and if it does not like the exchange, what is it going to do about it? That is the old question which is revived for the occasion by the more defiant of the conspirators, and the Inquirer is not at present prepared with an answer. It may be that the whole gang of thieves and swindlers who engineered this colossal steal are too strongly entrenched behind the bulwarks which crafty attorneys have reared for their protection to be within the reach of the law. It may be that robbery not different in its essence from that for which the pirate Morgan was hanged can now be committed with impunity. It may be that the men who have deliberately enriched themselves out of the ruin of the thousands whom they deceived must be left now to the enjoyment of their loot.

But, as there is such a thing as justice, as there is such a thing as honesty, as there is such a thing as right, as men and women have hearts and minds and memories, and as in the end the interests of the majority will prevail, this infamous outrage committed by organized wealth against the American community will, sooner or later, in one way or another, attract and receive its due retribution.

In the meanwhile the Inquirer, in the words of Emilia, says of the knaves who commit these wholesale frauds:

O Heaven, that such companions thou'dst unfold,
And put in every honest hand a whip
To lash the rascals naked through the world,
Even from the east to the west.

Mr. Chairman, this is plain talk from a leading Republican journal and puts the issue squarely up to the officers intrusted with the execution of the law.

No intricacies in this scheme of robbery, no excuse for it; an acknowledged trust and combination for the purpose of monopolizing and controlling the trade in the products of steel and iron.

With all the branches of the public service in the hands of the Administration, with \$500,000 of cash to aid in the prosecution, and the President congratulating the country on the sufficiency of the law, what can be the matter—gross indifference to duty or willful neglect of the rights of the people, which?

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another question that is interesting the people just now, and that is the nomination of the respective parties for President. A prominent Republican was quoted the other day as saying that "all the Republicans, at least the official constabulary, were for Roosevelt, but none of them wanted him." I believe that is substantially correct. You are not only not in favor of him and do not want him, but you do not dare to turn him down, for just as certain as you move him out of the White House he will pull down her pillars on your head.

I want to read from another stalwart Republican paper, the Commercial Tribune, of Cincinnati, of the strength of this proposed candidate of the Republican party, Theodore Roosevelt, the trust buster. [Laughter.] It says this:

THE HIDDEN HAND OF DEMOCRACY.

In our efforts to awaken Republicans to the dangers confronting the party if Mr. Roosevelt should be the nominee, we have not overlooked nor been oblivious to the important fact that there is a systematic and well-organized, compact and solidified, steady and persistent power at work to counteract our purposes.

We do not allude to the members of our own party who differ with us as to the folly of taking up Mr. Roosevelt.

Many of them sincerely favor him, the majority of those who do so having scarcely thought of the subject, and after so many years of success have not dreamed of the possibility of defeat.

We know that when our people give attention and thought to the actual situation—earnest, sincere, unselfish study of the risks we are asked to take with him as the nominee—there will be only one result, and our danger will be over.

HE WILL NOT BE NOMINATED.

We have men in our ranks whose names insure victory. Why take the one name that threatens defeat?

Speaking of Roosevelt.

Let Republicans reflect for one moment upon the ominous unanimity with which our Democratic foes assume that we are bound to nominate Roosevelt.

Everybody who has sense enough to stay out of the fire knows that you are compelled to nominate him and can not avoid it.

Let Republicans note carefully the complete concert of action of all the Democratic newspapers in carefully ignoring the possibility of any other Republican candidate than the incumbent. Let Republicans listen to the

Democratic sentiment in every voting precinct in the Union, and they will find it knows no Republican but Roosevelt that is fitted for the nomination.

Why is it that these enemies of ours, so discordant upon their own candidates and policies, are so unanimously in favor of the Republicans nominating Roosevelt?

Why is it?

Not through love of our party! Not through affection for Roosevelt!

No! No! Their wish is father to the thought. Our political enemies have instinctively detected and accurately measured his weakness with the voters, and they are working with might and main to aid his nomination.

Ninety-nine out of every hundred Democrats from Canada's line to the Gulf shore, from Maine to Oregon, are hoping and secretly rejoicing at the thought of Roosevelt being the Republican candidate. By every means at their command they are doing their best to fasten him upon the Republican ticket, believing they will have "a walk over" if he is their opponent. The San Francisco Examiner, the Chicago American, the New York American, the Evening Journal, the Cincinnati Enquirer, the New York World, the Pittsburgh Post, one and all of them, take it for granted, daily assert it, and studiously keep it before their readers that Mr. Roosevelt will be nominated, and at the same time they are confidently grooming candidates to defeat him.

Democratic hopes have grown tremendously since Roosevelt came into power. We say it with poignant regret that Roosevelt has given them strong and powerful reasons for hopes of success in case he is the candidate, and has embarrassed the party whether he is a candidate or not.

Poor old party! You are embarrassed, and your embarrassment will encompass your defeat.

The Democrats know full well his chronic and continually increasing weakness in New York State. They have seen Maryland turned over completely to their party by and through Roosevelt's Administration.

They witnessed Kentucky, so nearly won to Republicanism under McKinley, lined up solidly in Democratic ranks.

North Carolina, taken by the Republicans, and two Senators acting with our party, now represented in the Senate by two Democrats, and no hope of Republican success in the State.

Delaware Republicans torn to pieces by Roosevelt shifting and twisting until they do not know whether they are afoot or on horseback, and are only sure that they can not hold the State.

Colorado, ditto, and hopelessly gone; Utah, between Mormon troubles and miners' strikes, absolutely lost to Roosevelt.

Indianapolis furnishing a Democratic mayor in the chief city of an always doubtful State.

Boston giving a tremendous Democratic majority in the State election last month, 18,000, and piling 9,000 more upon it this present month at the mayoralty election.

Stanch, true little Rhode Island, never recreant until Roosevelt became President, electing a Democratic governor two terms in succession, and, if she votes next year as she has done the past two, will give the Democratic candidate for President her electoral votes.

The town elections of Connecticut showing Democratic gains in every direction this present year, and corresponding Republican losses.

The New Jersey elections telling the same sad story of discord and discontent among our voters, and it is currently reported that the leading Republican of the State, Hon. Franklin Murphy, felt it his duty to tell Roosevelt of the powerful opposition in New York and New Jersey to his candidacy, and to his election, if nominated.

As to New York State itself, when veteran Republican prognosticators and political prophets, while swearing fealty to Roosevelt, state we can elect him without the vote of New York, it is an open admission that Roosevelt can not carry it.

Two years of Roosevelt in the White House have done all these things for the Democratic party—why wonder that they desire his nomination?

They are secretly planning, plotting, and scheming to that end. They need him as a candidate.

They are fully aware if some one else is the candidate they can accomplish nothing.

This hidden, inimical force is working night and day to nominate Roosevelt and accomplish the Republican defeat.

If the Republican party should nominate FORAKER, HALE, ALLISON, FAIRBANKS, ELKINS, HANNA, DALZELL of Pennsylvania, Taft, Cornelius Bliss, DRYDEN of New Jersey, or Seth Low, our enemies would be powerless. Any of these men are stronger in New York State than their party; any of them are stronger in each and every State in the Union than Roosevelt.

Nominate any of the Republicans named, then Democratic hopes would fade like darkness before the rising sun, and Republican banners would be glorified by the golden gleam of victory.

If, however, the Republican national convention concludes to gladden Democratic hearts by doing that which they so eagerly desire, and the members of it shall say, "We choose Roosevelt," then, so say all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call particular attention to the closing paragraph of this article. The editor says:

But if the national convention says Roosevelt, then so say we all.

This willingness to walk into the jaws of defeat is truly commendable, though pitiable—a great party that can not free itself from Rooseveltism when it sees the jaws of death gaping wide to devour it.

I pity but I rejoice that it will be the means of restoring to the people their rights. In conclusion I can only offer this consolation and say:

Come, disappointment, come,
But not in thy terrors clad;
Come in thy meekest, saddest form,
To the wicked and the bad.

Mr. BINGHAM. I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as a custom I think it is beneath the dignity of this House to take any notice of after-dinner speeches, but when the party in opposition, elated by their municipal victory in New York City, a victory won by catering for the votes of those who desire free license in rum and free license in immorality, wish to celebrate this victory by a feast to

which is bidden all the ex-dignitaries of their party, the ex-President and some of his Cabinet, ex-Senators and ex-Congressmen galore, and they assemble in their hoped-for harmony to put forth the principles on which they shall appeal to the country, and one of the great leaders promulgated the platform upon which they proposed to stand, and an ex-Secretary of State took it upon himself to forcefully and vigorously criticize the foreign policy of the Republican Administration—he opened his remarks with the statement that this municipal contest had been taken up by the people and fought out on national issues—I wish to state for the benefit of those who are about to cast their ballots that this free license in rum and free immorality is a national issue that will appeal to the people of the country, but not in the way that they expected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I decline to yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The statement of the gentleman is a libel on the decent people of this country.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I wish the people to consider the issues that the Democratic party submit to the American people. They generally find they are decided adversely to their party, and on this particular question we have placed upon the statute book the removal of the canteen from the Army of the United States and forbidden the sale of liquor in the National Capitol. So I think that it is an unfortunate action for them, as the result of their great municipal contest, for their great leaders to take up and say it was fought out on national issues. In doing so they have taken an issue which will rebound upon themselves. It is one upon which the people have already set their stamp upon in this Hall of its National Legislature.

The ex-Secretary of State then turned his attention to foreign affairs, and he adverted to the "needless war against Cuba" and the "wanton war against Colombia." Strange sentiments to come from the ex-Secretary of State of the Cleveland Administration! The war with Spain may have been needless, but if that is true the responsibility lies at the door of the Democratic party more than anyone else in this country. Had the Cleveland Administration taken a firm position with Spain and insisted that the wrongs of Cuba should be ameliorated or righted instead of consulting with the Spanish minister and the rich Cuban planters, that war might never have taken place. And when the Republican Administration had to meet this question, and that great, patient, peaceful man, William McKinley, was doing all in his power to find a peaceful solution of that question, those of you who were here in those days and those who kept abreast of public discussion in the nation will remember that the Democratic party hounded the Administration for two years to recognize the independence of Cuba.

As the chairman of the subcommittee on those resolutions I carried them around in my pocket in order to prevent that issue being forced upon the country, while William McKinley endeavored with all the force and courage at his command to avoid that calamity. And it is a historical fact now well known that negotiations were already under way looking to the peaceful solution of that question when the unfortunate explosion of the *Maine* in the harbor of Habana took place, and then you might as well have tried to stay the current of Niagara as to try to stop the wrath of the American people that sought for revenge for the loss of their noble sons who went down in that treacherous explosion.

Mr. Chairman, "The wanton war on Colombia!" For such an expression to come from a man versed in international law as is Mr. Olney, whom I wish to say I hold in the highest regard and am proud to believe that he considers me worthy to be one of his friends—that such a term should have been used, when I would like him or anyone to point out any act of war that has taken place on the part of this country with regard to Colombia.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I have declined to yield to a gentleman on the other side.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] will allow me, I should like to read a paragraph from a Democratic platform on this very subject.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. HEPBURN. I want to read a paragraph from the platform upon which James Buchanan was elected President of the United States—adopted in 1856.

Resolved, That the great highway which nature as well as the assent of the states most immediately interested in its maintenance has marked out for a free communication between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans constitutes one of the most important achievements realized by the spirit of modern times and the unconquerable energy of our people. That result should be secured by a timely and efficient exercise of the control which we have the right to claim over it, and no power on earth should be suffered to impede or

clog its progress by any interference with the relations it may suit our policy to establish between our Government and the governments of the states within whose dominions it lies. We can under no circumstances surrender our preponderance in the adjustment of all questions arising out of it.

Resolved, That in view of so commanding an interest the people of the United States can not but sympathize with the efforts which are being made by the people of Central America to regenerate that portion of the continent which covers the passage across the interoceanic isthmus.

That was Democratic doctrine in 1856.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman and ask him, what has this got to do with the methods by which Mr. Roosevelt obtained it?

Mr. HEPBURN. Why, from the declaration of the Democratic party that we have the right to determine the method, that we have the right to move out of the way anybody who attempts to interfere with the exercise of our preponderating interest.

Mr. KNAPP. Read the next clause.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for furnishing this historical proof on the point about which I was just proceeding to elaborate. I have no idea of opening up in my few remarks again the question relating to Panama, for I consider that that question has been very well thrashed out; but I do wish to defy anyone, and it has not been done yet, to show under international law any act of war that has been done by the United States toward Colombia, and unless you wish to deny the contents of every official document, and unless you wish to impugn the word of the officers of the United States Navy, you can not find a foundation for any such charge, and the only allusion to the canal that I wish to make, which, as I say, has just been emphasized by the quotation from the platform way back in the election of James Buchanan, where the doctrine was laid down even stronger than it was ever claimed by anybody on behalf of the Republican party, that the curious phase of the Democratic party is that in all the discussion that has taken place you have claimed that the President should have gone and taken the Nicaragua route, that the most of you prefer that route, and yet it shows up the same inconsistency of the record of your party, that the first official act of Grover Cleveland, almost, in his first term in the White House, was to withdraw the Frelinghuysen-Zavalla treaty for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal, which had been enacted and was in the Senate with a good chance of ratification. The first act of your President was to withdraw that treaty, for which he never stated a reason to the Senate of the United States, and thereby prevented the accomplishment of what you gentlemen have wanted so much, and which, in the lapse of time from then to now, would have been an accomplished fact. And had it not been for that act of your executive head no such situation as you object to now could possibly exist.

As I say, I have no desire to reargue the Panama question, because it has already been debated in this House, and in which I participated. Now, Mr. Chairman, the ex-Secretary, Mr. Olney, in closing his remarks nominating Mr. Cleveland as the candidate of the Democratic party and holding him up as a conservative man which the business interests of the country could trust, and for that reason he was the best man for his party to put forth, it at once recalled to my mind, as I read that suggestion, another act of the ex-President of the United States, and that, too, with the advice and guidance of his ex-Secretary of State, who in the same speech objected to our interfering in foreign affairs to the extent which they claimed we were doing, and saying that we should mind our own business.

Why, Mr. Chairman, of all the arbitrary acts that were ever done by an Executive of our country the greatest was that message President Cleveland sent overnight to the Senate on the Venezuelan boundary question, and submitted the argument contained therein for the position he was about to take, and that was that the United States would appoint a commission, that they should examine the question, and if the two disputing countries did not agree to the report of our commission, that he held himself responsible, and he knew what that involved, for all that might take place. No argument was ever reenforced by a threat, no situation was ever strengthened by a menace, and this alleged conservative candidate by that overnight message precipitated a panic in business circles throughout this country than which there has been none more severe or more far-reaching in its results.

This same ex-Secretary who says we should mind our own business I think must have forgotten an article that but a short time ago he had written for the Atlantic Monthly, where he proposes very different views from those contained in his post-prandial speech. But conditions change, Mr. Chairman, when a man is out of office and sits down calmly to write an article for a magazine; the frame of his mind is very different from when the Presidential bee may be buzzing in his bonnet, when he speaks for popular applause and to the prejudices of the people. All honor to Mr. Olney for the announcement of what I am about to read, and as a matter of history it is almost wonderful it should have

become a prophecy, and yet at the time of its utterance none could actually foresee what then might occur.

Suppose—

Writes he—

by some extraordinary accident that China is to be divided up among certain European states, but that they propose, and are likely, by all sorts of vexatious and discriminating duties and impositions to utterly ruin trade between China and this country. Does the rule of the Farewell Address apply to such a case? These questions can be answered but in one way, and nothing can be plainer than the right and duty of such resistance would be limited only by the want of power to make the resistance effectual and by its cost as compared with the cost of nonresistance.

Does a foreign question or controversy present itself, appealing however forcibly to our sympathies or sense of right, what happens the moment it is suggested that the United States should seriously participate in its settlement? A shiver runs through all the ranks of capital lest the uninterrupted course of money making be interfered with. The cry of "jingo" comes up in various quarters. Advocates of peace at any price make themselves heard, while practical politicians invoke the doctrine of the Farewell Address as an absolute bar to all positive action. Is that a creditable part for a great nation to play in the affairs of the world?

For example, it can not be intermeddling with the current course of European politics to protect American citizens and American interests wherever in the world they may need such protection. It can not be intermeddling to guard our trade and commerce and to see to it that its natural development is not fraudulently or forcibly or unfairly arrested. Take, for instance, the case of American missions and missionaries in Turkey and assume for present purposes that missionaries have been maltreated and their property destroyed under circumstances which call upon Turkey to make reparation.

Why, sir, instead of his undertaking to hold the doctrine there of minding our own business, the ex-Secretary almost points out the course that was followed by this country when, in 1900, that contingency arose. Furthermore, in another part of the same article, the Secretary advocates even a stronger doctrine, and it is one of the most patriotic utterances I ever had the pleasure of reading:

The mission of this country, if it has one, as I verily believe it has, is not merely to pose, but to act, and, while always governing itself by the rules of prudence and common sense and making its own special interests the first and paramount objects of its care, to forego no fitting opportunity to further the progress of civilization, practically as well as theoretically, by timely deeds as well as by eloquent words.

Mr. Chairman, that has been the course of the Republican party, upon which now the Secretary finds reason to criticize. That was our course and conduct in regard to Cuba. That is our course relating to China and now in our new possessions that have passed from the control of a foreign country to our own control. Surely history does not and can not show, among a practically uneducated people outside of Manila, such progress as has been made in the development, education, and civilization, introducing to the people the example of what good government should be, as has taken place in the few years we have had control of the Philippine Islands.

It is a very curious fact, but President Cleveland seems to have had a penchant for undoing everything that had been accomplished before he came into office. In a few remarks that I made on Colombia I expressed my regret that, unfortunately, the foreign relations in our country are hampered by changes in domestic politics. It is unfortunate for any country that a change of political power will change its doctrine in regard to foreign affairs. It prevents that perpetuity of contract which every nation should be in a position to maintain. It makes other nations hesitate to make treaties with us because they may be abrogated by changes in domestic politics. It is a most unfortunate feature of our democratic government, but we can not help it.

I am about to illustrate this feature in a very strong case, brought about by the act of President Cleveland. He was hardly in office—in office but a few days, for the second term—when he at once withdrew the treaty for the annexation of Hawaii from the Senate of the United States, where it was pending for ratification, and he did not deign to state any reason why he did so. We all know what took place. A long delay, the utter confusion in these islands between the conflicting interests of those who had established the republican form of government and those who clung to the royal house and wished the restoration of the King. We all know that the extraordinary episode that took place by the appointment of a minister to the new Republic of Panama, which has been questioned by the Democrats in the Senate, is without foundation, falls into insignificance by the act of Grover Cleveland in appointing the "paramount" commissioner, Mr. Blount, who went to Hawaii accredited to nobody, arrived on the islands, examined everybody who did not know anything, and absolutely refused to send for the officers of the provisional government, those who were acquainted with the facts and what had taken place.

And so the delay took place. There was utter confusion in the business interests and development of those islands as a result. It was not until under the wise action of the Republican party and by an act of Congress that these islands were received into the fold of our country, with all the benefits that were to accrue therefrom, and now those that visit them can see the different conditions that prevail.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored in a few words to reply to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman, the ex-Secretary of State. Coming from him, they were worthy of notice, even from the standpoint of postprandial effort. But, sir, I think I have shown that his criticisms and the attack of the Republican Administration in its foreign affairs are without foundation. On the contrary, I could draft the differences between what has been done by our great Secretary of State in the Far East. I could point out the doors about to be opened in China; I could show that the canal is to be an accomplished fact; I could show that we have cast our protecting hand over the people that have been threatened with oppression; I could show that the United States has assumed such a position among the nations of the earth that no country dares to take a step now or make any move on the chess-board of diplomacy without first asking what are the views of the United States on that question.

The political party and the Administration that can bring the country to such a position of power among the nations of the earth and to such a place in the guiding of the events which go to help the progress of the world's course toward a higher civilization is one of which any Secretary of State may well be proud and which any Administration may place upon its records, and when we go to the country and appeal for the support of the people it will be found that the Administration of the Republican party will receive the indorsements and not the cavil of the electors, who by their votes will say that what was done under William McKinley and what is now being done under Theodore Roosevelt shows that wisdom which comes from the experience of years, and the people who have intrusted with power this party for so many years will continue to do so so long as we act in the wise and justifiable way we have done. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BINGHAM rose.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I wish the gentleman would permit me five minutes before he goes on with any speakers upon his side.

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] did not confine his discussion to questions of great national importance of which he speaks with much fluency and equal inaccuracy. The opening statement of his speech, that the recent municipal campaign in the city of New York was won by the Democratic party by appealing to those who favored "free rum and free immorality," was a gross and infamous slander upon the decent people of the great metropolis of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is unworthy of any man who occupies a seat upon the floor of this House; it is unworthy of any man whose heart is animated by the inspirations of decency to so asperse the motives of his late colleague, George B. McClellan, a man of unimpeachable integrity, one against whose public career and whose character nothing could be said in a very bitter campaign, a man who has the greatest respect for and who lives in the greatest fear of bringing discredit upon the name of an illustrious parent whom he reveres above all things else, by asserting that he desired to obtain public office in such a way. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

No one who had the faintest spark of decency in his composition would have said that such a man would appeal for the suffrages of his fellow-citizens because he desired to hold office through the support of those who favored "free rum and free immorality." Mr. Chairman, it was not my purpose to enter into a discussion—

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman permit me one moment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No, sir.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I did not mention Mr. McClellan's name or anything of the kind.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No, sir; I will not permit an interruption. The gentleman refused to allow me to interrupt him, although he had lots of opportunity. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] I desire to resent this infamous slander upon the decent people of New York; it should not have been uttered in this House.

This is not the place to discuss the reasons for the recent success of the Democratic party in New York City. It might be sufficient to say that the city is naturally Democratic and that therefore a Democrat was elected to office. It would be "carrying coals to Newcastle" to suggest that in the gentleman's own city (Philadelphia) those who favored "free rum and free immorality" are those who have made possible and have maintained the most corrupt government in this country by putting into office officials who catered to that class of people. The recent election in New York City was won by the Democrats, first, because they presented a man against whom not a single word could be said, either as to his public career or his character; second,

because the people had confidence in the integrity and the determination of the Democracy to give such an administration as was desired by the people, and which would be honest and upright and free from some of the infamous abuses for which the last fusion administration was noted.

The Low administration came into power in a campaign in which it was charged that the Democracy during the Van Wyck administration, through its annual budget, had stolen from ten to fifteen millions of dollars a year—had unnecessarily expended that sum and, in fact, had stolen it. In the fall of 1901, prior to the election of Mr. Low, the board of estimate made up a budget for the then coming year. The Low administration came into power as a result of the election that year, and in January, 1902, despite this oft-repeated charge that the Democratic administration had deliberately stolen and had unnecessarily in its budget from ten to fifteen millions of dollars every year, the Low board of estimate, in making up its first budget, was unable to bring it within \$2,000,000 of the amount fixed by the previous Democratic administration.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask the gentleman from Georgia for five minutes more.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have not the time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to have five minutes—

Mr. BINGHAM. I shall have to object to an extension of the limitation which was fixed by the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield me five minutes of his time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BINGHAM. I refer the gentleman from New York to the courtesy of the gentleman from Georgia. I do not think that I have the right to take the time allotted to this side.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (to Mr. FITZGERALD). Go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Five minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, there was another reason for the success of the Democratic party, and it is well that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should know it. The decent people of the city of New York were enraged by some of the infamous practices of the Low administration, which did something unheard of in the history of this country. Those officials took the public money of the city of New York and gave it to their police officers and sent them out searching for the poor unfortunate prostitutes on the streets of the city; and they used the public money to debauch those women, and then brought them into court and prosecuted them for the violation of the statutes. The decent people of New York resented that infamous practice. And yet the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. ADAMS] has the courage to stand up in this House and say that those who favored "free rum and free immorality" put the present Democratic administration of New York City into power.

I suggest that the gentleman might well ask unanimous consent to withdraw his remarks, because I know that upon reflection he will realize that he has said that which he will ever regret.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose the gentleman assumes that in a discussion of great international questions (which I have already said he discusses with much fluency and equal inaccuracy) he might inject this nasty, mean, contemptible, unworthy reflection upon more than 200,000 people and not be called to account for it. Does he know that a relative of the President of the United States—a very distinguished gentleman, Robert Roosevelt—was one of the most active supporters of Mr. McClellan in the last campaign? Does he know that such men as August Belmont, John D. Crimmins, and men of their standing—

A MEMBER on the Republican side. Is that all?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; that is not all. There are 60,000 majority of them—but I do not wish to burden the RECORD with their names—who supported the Democratic party. Does the gentleman remember that the senior Senator from the State of New York [Mr. PLATT], in discussing the recent election, attributed Mr. Low's defeat to the fact that he was the most egotistical and selfish man that he had ever known in his public career?

Just let the gentleman read the New York Press for a few days, or let him search its files, and he will obtain sufficient information regarding the recent election to convince him that the utterance which he has made on this floor is unworthy of him.

A distinguished clergyman of the city of New York stated a few days after the election that "the lid of hell would be taken off now that Tammany had come into power." What a sore disappointment undoubtedly it is to some of my Republican friends that not only has "the lid of hell" not been taken off, but it has been nailed down more firmly than the Low administration ever dared to fasten it; and it will remain that way during the continuance of this Democratic administration in the city of New York. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DALZELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM W. SKILES, late a Representative from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators be appointed by the presiding officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives—

and that in compliance with the foregoing resolutions the President pro tempore had appointed as a committee on the part of the Senate Mr. HANNA, Mr. FORAKER, Mr. FAIRBANKS, Mr. MCCREARY, and Mr. CULLOM.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield five minutes of the time on this side of the House to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCleary].

Mr. MCCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, it seems probable that in the campaign of this year one of the prominent questions to be discussed will be that of the tariff. A great many people will come up to this question with a sincere desire to get real information thereon. Later in the session I expect to discuss this question quite fully. At this time I ask permission of the House to insert in the RECORD an article, candid in character, judicial in temper, and lucid in expression, prepared by the distinguished economist, Mr. John P. Young, of San Francisco.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to inserting in the RECORD a document referred to by the gentleman from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

WHY FIRST VOTERS SHOULD BE PROTECTIONISTS—WHAT IS FREE TRADE?

When the Cobdenites gave the name "free trade" to their fiscal policy they thought they were acting shrewdly. There is something about the word "free" that is very alluring. It appeals to most men in a way that no other word can. It is not astonishing, therefore, that it "caught on" at once.

In a very short time after the term had been coined hosts of writers began to sound its praises. They accepted the cue furnished by the impressionists of the Manchester school of economists, and began to laud a system which they said would bring peace to the earth and produce good will among men.

Doubtless many who gave expression to these ideas believed all they said, and some of them took pains to point out that "free trade" did not mean exactly what the two words implied; but the most of them obscured the fact that there must be taxation of some kind, and that therefore it would be impossible to devise any plan by which production could escape its share of the burden of government.

In short, the glamour of the words managed to conceal from the people most interested—the British masses—that the purpose of free trade was to shift the incidence of taxation in such a manner that the people best able to pay should be called upon for the smallest contributions.

Many years before the abrogation of the corn laws, Adam Smith, in his *Wealth of Nations*, had pointed out that taxes on the necessities of life did not work an injury to the toilers. He said with exceeding plainness:

"The advanced price (caused by taxation) of such manufactures as are real necessities of life and are destined for the consumption of the poor * * * must be compensated to the poor by a further advancement of their wages."

No one has seriously attempted to dispute this assertion of Doctor Smith. It would be useless to do so, especially in England, where the theory of "the living wage" is maintained. When the working classes in a country deliberately and persistently advocate "a living wage," they give expression to Smith's idea that they must be recompensed with increased wages for any tax placed upon the necessities consumed by them.

Not only have the toilers of Great Britain recognized the axiomatic force of Smith's assertion, the class to which he spoke directly also took it to heart and put his suggestion into execution. The learned doctor said:

"The middling and superior ranks of people, if they understood their own interest, ought always to oppose all taxes on the necessities of life, as well as all direct taxes upon the wages of labor. The final payment of both one and the other falls altogether upon themselves, and always with a considerable overcharge."

Here we find the mainspring of those who framed the fiscal policy of the United Kingdom. They knew that taxes on necessities could not be made to stick to the workingmen, so "the middling and superior ranks of people," under the disingenuous pretext of helping the poor, abolished taxes which the foremost economist had explicitly declared could not affect that class.

They went a step further, for Adam Smith's suggestions were well rounded out. He did not confine himself to describing the kind of taxes which could not affect the workingman; he indicated those which could be made to stick. He said:

"Taxes upon luxuries have no tendency to raise the price of any other commodities except that of the commodities taxed."

Here was a pointer. It was one that appealed to "the middling and superior ranks of people," because it indicated a mode by which the heaviest part of the burden of taxation could be placed on the masses.

It was swiftly acted upon. As rapidly as possible the incidence of taxation was shifted. The taxes on necessities were removed, because they could not be made to stick to the worker, for the reason mentioned by Smith, and a careful system of taxing luxuries was devised, which had for its object the imposition of the major part of the burden of taxation upon the toiling masses.

The term "careful" is used advisedly. In adopting the system of taxing luxuries the British statesmen kept in mind the advice of Adam Smith and singled out those of the workingman and deliberately excluded those of "the superior and middling ranks" of the inhabitants of Great Britain. Tobacco, tea, rum, spirits, and beer, which are chiefly consumed by the workers of the United Kingdom, were made dutiable or subjected to excise, while kid gloves, silks, and all the other articles used by the rich were exempted from taxation.

In 1802 the total sum derived from taxation in the United Kingdom was £122,549,000. Of this amount, £31,047,000 was from customs, £31,598,000 from

excise, £14,251,000 from estates and duties, £7,772,000 from stamps, £2,502,000 from land tax and house duty, and \$35,379,000 from incomes.

If this enumeration of the sources of British revenue is carefully scrutinized the ingenuity of the framers of the tax will at once be realized. It will be seen that more than one-half of the total revenues of Great Britain is derived from those persons least able to pay.

The £10,567,706 from tobacco, the £5,792,967 from tea, the £2,211,811 from rum, the £3,399,227 from sugar and glucose, the £17,647,421 from the spirit excise, and the £13,276,073 from beer are almost wholly taken from the working classes. A large part of the land tax and house duty amounting to £2,502,000 is passed on to tenants who are often toilers, and while the income tax is supposed to bear directly upon those from whom it is derived, it may reasonably be assumed that men whose revenues are gained from industrial or trading operations practice methods which enable them to place a good deal of this tax on the shoulders of the poor.

When it is stated that more than half of the taxes are drawn from the toilers of the United Kingdom the claim that free trade works in the interest of the masses is at once dissipated, and when to this statement is added the fact that in the United Kingdom less than 2 per cent of its families hold about three times as much private property as all the remainder, and that 93 per cent of the people hold less than 8 per cent of the accumulated wealth, it is at once seen that the entire system of taxation is so arranged that it relieves the rich and oppresses the poor.

In this inequitable distribution of the burden of taxation we find the real motive for the change in the incidence, and in the fact that the United Kingdom collects £31,047,000 from customs duties we have a refutation of the claim that trade is free.

With what truth can the assertion be made that a country has free trade while it is collecting £5,792,967 annually from tea? Will the Chinese who export tea to England regard the placing of a heavy import on their particular product as conclusive evidence on that point? Can Americans who send a large part of the tobacco, from which a duty of £10,567,706 is annually collected, regard the ports of the United Kingdom as freely opened to them? Can the other foreigners who help to make up the aggregate of £31,047,000 collected from them by Great Britain in the form of customs duties see where the utility of such freedom comes in?

The more the question is investigated the more thoroughly convinced must the impartial investigator of the British fiscal system become that its prime object is to shift the chief burden of taxation onto the shoulders least able to bear it, and that the result is proving disastrous.

THE CHEAP LOAF.

The Cobdenite will doubtless scorn the imputation that the policy he advocates has any other purpose in view than the freedom of trade, but the evidence is indisputable that the practice in Great Britain is to make it fit the fiscal plans of those who guide the destiny of the nation.

I have shown that the British collect the vast sum of over \$150,000,000 annually in the form of duties on commodities imported from foreign countries into the United Kingdom. It is a misnomer to call a system producing such results free trade.

The fact that some articles are admitted without paying duty does not constitute freedom of trade. If it did, the United States would have to be regarded as a free-trade country, because it imports annually between four and five hundred million dollars' worth of foreign merchandise upon which no duties are paid.

As I showed in my first talk, ulterior motives prompted the adoption of the British fiscal system. Whether we consider the purpose of Cobden, which was to secure cheap food for manufacturing operatives in the United Kingdom, so that their employers might be able to reduce wages, or that of the statesmen who acted on the hint of Adam Smith and adjusted taxes so that the "superior and middling classes" were relieved of the greatest part of the burden of supporting the Government, we can not fail to note an absence of candor in dealing with the question which amounts to positive duplicity.

In future talks several phases of the disingenuousness of the adherents of Cobden will be dealt with. In this I will endeavor to confine myself as closely as possible to demonstrating that the campaign for a cheap loaf during the agitation over the repeal of the corn laws was not honest, and that the acceptance of the advice of Cobden and Bright has proved disastrous to the British people.

It is an admitted fact that during the repeal agitation orators in the cities told the British workingmen that the abolition of the corn duties would give them cheap bread. In the country they told a different story. They tried to reassure the farmer by pointing out that he had a natural protection in the distance of foreign competitors which would assure him against being undersold, and they even added that the increased business which would result from the change in fiscal policy would redound to the advantage of British agriculture.

If my reader has any doubt regarding the accuracy of this statement, he may consult Trumbull's *Free Trade Struggle* in England, in which the inconsistent attitude of the Cobdenites is described with charming naïveté; or he may turn to J. Thorold Rogers's article on "Free trade" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, where the writer, as late as 1876, declared British agriculture was safe from the assault of foreigners. The pages of Mill's *Principles of Political Economy* also contain testimony which establishes the truth of the assertion that it was the common belief in the United Kingdom that its agricultural interests would benefit rather than suffer from freedom of trade.

It was long after the battle had been won and not until the British agriculturist had begun to feel the evil effects of the practice of foreign countries dumping their surpluses of foodstuffs on the markets of the United Kingdom that the cold-blooded doctrine was preached that if a man was ruined and driven out of one industry he could turn his attention to some other mode of gaining a livelihood.

But the British are beginning to realize the heartlessness underlying the easy assumption that men driven out of one pursuit may easily adapt themselves to something else, and they are now rapidly coming to understand the hideous humbug contained in the promise of the cheap loaf.

What a mockery it is to speak of the cheap loaf in the same breath that the admission is made that millions are starving for bread in the United Kingdom. How can that be regarded as cheap which is unattainable by 30 per cent of the population of Great Britain?

This is not a protectionist accusation. It is evidence furnished by Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman in a speech made by him at Perth on the 5th of June, 1903, in which he denounced Colonial Secretary Chamberlain's preferential plan of treating the colonies. Sir Henry said:

"In this country we know, thanks to the investigations of Mr. Seeböhm Rowntree and Mr. Charles Booth, that there is about 30 per cent of our population underfed and on the verge of hunger. Thirty per cent of forty-one millions comes to something over twelve millions."

Bear in mind that this is not a protectionist attempt to emphasize the failure of the "cheap-loaf" policy, but that it is the deliberate admission of a leading British free trader, and that it was backed up by the formation of "antistarvation" clubs throughout the United Kingdom.

In short, the net result of over half a century of free trade in Great Britain has been to bring to the verge of starvation twelve millions or more of its population, and the only defense that can now be urged in favor of the retention of the policy is that it must be adhered to in order to prevent other millions from starving.

This outcome will be compared later on with the fruits of the protective policy, but before leaving the subject of the "cheap loaf," it is desirable to get a firm grip upon the fact that the free-trade policy of the United Kingdom did not procure that boon for the British people.

As a matter of fact, the abrogation of the British corn laws has had no serious effect on the cost of bread in the United Kingdom. This is proved by the indisputable evidence of price lists. Here are the averages of the selling price of wheat per quarter, taken from Whitaker's Almanac, and covering a period of twenty-two years—that is, ten years before and ten years after repeal:

Wheat prices per quarter before and after repeal of corn laws.

	s.		s.
1835.....	39	1846.....	54
1836.....	48	1847.....	63
1837.....	55	1848.....	50
1838.....	64	1849.....	44
1839.....	70	1850.....	40
1840.....	66	1851.....	38
1841.....	66	1852.....	40
1842.....	57	1853.....	53
1843.....	50	1854.....	72
1844.....	51	1855.....	74
1845.....	50	1856.....	69

Note that eight years after repeal the British were paying 2s. a quarter more for wheat than the highest average price during the ten years preceding the abrogation of the corn laws. Also fix in mind the uncontroverted fact that times were better in the United Kingdom in 1854, 1855, and 1856, when the average price of corn was 72s., 74s., and 69s., respectively, than during the three years preceding, when it was 38s., 40s., and 53s. a quarter.

Is it possible to draw any other inference from a presentation of this kind than that of Colonial Secretary Chamberlain, who asserts that the main thing is not the cost of bread, but the ability to get it?

The masses in the United Kingdom, and, for that matter, in all parts of the world, must work to get bread. The chief thing, then, is to get work. If that is to be obtained, the bread getting becomes a comparatively easy matter.

Cheapness is a delusion. The countries in which it is the most striking feature are the most degraded on God's footstool.

The basis of cheapness is the degradation of the manual worker. In the lands in which the toiler puts a just estimate on the value of his labor there is always comparative dearth.

Dearness and cheapness are meaningless terms when interpreted by price lists. True cheapness can only be measured satisfactorily by ascertaining the standard of living of peoples.

If they have plenty to eat, and plenty to wear, and may gratify their æsthetic desires, people are living cheaply, no matter what the nominal cost of things may be.

British free-traders say that the United States is a dear country. So it is, and it is so because the standard of living of the masses is high. And the standard is high because higher wages are demanded in this country. But the American worker attains real cheapness; he gets things. That is the touchstone.

Great Britain has the claim made for it by the free-traders that it is a cheap country, but it is a dear land for the toiler to live in. Twelve million out of 41,000,000 Britons are on the verge of starvation.

China is a cheap country also; so is India. Human labor is held very cheaply in both those lands, and the result is that the masses are constantly steeped in poverty and menaced by starvation. In spite of the so-called "cheapness" the people don't get things.

We repeat it is only in the so-called "dear" countries that the masses get things, and the degree of attainableness is about in the ratio of the "dear-ness."

THE STANDARD OF LIVING.

Time devoted to the study of the question of the standard of living can not be wasted. It is the most important problem mankind is called upon to solve. If a blunder is made in laying the foundation the result may be the destruction of society.

The Cobdenites went about the solution of this important problem in a manner repugnant to the sense of consistency. Professing to be working for the amelioration of the masses, they formulated a policy which could have no other outcome than that graphically described in the assertion of free-trade leaders—that at least 30 per cent of the population of Great Britain go hungry.

The "cheap-loaf" theorists practically accepted as an economic basis the horrid assumption that it is right, proper, and unavoidable that the toiling masses should compete with each other, and by their competition determine the wage which would mark the limit of subsistence.

The Cobdenites said: "Let us so arrange matters that by competition foreigners will be forced to sell us foodstuffs and raw materials cheaply, and then, being able to feed our employees cheaply, we can lower their wages."

There is no doubt that the scheme would have worked effectively if two obstacles had not arisen to spoil the calculations of the Cobdenites. Both of these were distinctly protective, and they both operated to prevent the working of the inexorable law of pressing the toiler to the limit of subsistence.

In Great Britain the rise and growth of trades unionism interposed an imperfect barrier to the working of the Cobdenite scheme. Trades unionism is as distinctly protective in its workings as a high tariff. It has precisely the same object—interference with the operation of unrestrained competition.

The followers of Cobden saw this plainly and bitterly antagonized trades unionism. John Bright, in all other respects a most liberal man, was extremely intolerant of all proposals of workingmen to cooperate. He wrote a letter to L. M. Reavis, of St. Louis, Mo., February 6, 1888, in which he said:

"Whilst your tariff is in force you need not expect your workmen to be wise. Protection, which means robbing somebody, will not content itself with enriching manufacturers, but will be called in to give higher wages and shorter hours of labor to your workmen."

This attitude was merely a replica of that of Cobden, who is quoted by John Morley, his biographer, as saying:

"Depend upon it, nothing can be got by fraternizing with trades unions. They are founded on principles of brutal tyranny and monopoly. I would rather live under a Dey of Algiers than a trades committee."

These quotations are introduced to show that these eminent free traders regarded all efforts to interfere with unrestrained competition as the worst economic crime conceivable. John Bright was a bitter opponent of the factories acts on that account. He preferred the abuses of child labor to regulation which might impede the operation of a law which had the effect of keeping the wages of labor down to the limit of subsistence.

There is little room for wonder that, breathing in such an atmosphere, the British workingman, although able to effect a thorough organization for protection, never formulated a higher demand than that embodied in the assertion that the toiler has a right to earn enough to live.

The demand for "a living wage" is as far as the British worker has dared to push his rights. If you will take the arguments of the trades-unionists of the United Kingdom and their advocates and analyze them you will find that underlying them all is the assumption that a man should receive enough wages to keep body and soul together.

"A living wage" is the highest concept of the British worker. His mind has never taken such daring flights as that of his fellow-workers in the United States, who, untrammelled by the fetters of a false economic system, which subordinates everything to the fancied necessity of unrestrained competition, have boldly set up the doctrine of "a standard of living."

In one case the worker asserts that if he toils he has at least the right to keep body and soul together; in the other the workingman boldly plants himself on the proposition that he not only has the right to live, but that he has the right to such things as are necessary to enable him to live in comfort and enjoy himself.

To illustrate the wholly different attitude of the American worker and that of his fellow in Great Britain, who simply contends for a wage that will permit him to live, we quote from the objection made by the advocate of a San Francisco trades union in a formal arbitration trial held in the presence of one of the superior court judges of that city:

"We urge that conditions generally in America forbid the free play of the law of supply and demand in the labor market; and that the higher demands of American civilization will require that this arbitration commission should do nothing tending to substitute the law of supply and demand for the law invoked by our union."

This law is best interpreted by the testimony of witnesses called by the commission, whose evidence has the dual force of a relation of facts and an expressed opinion. One testified thus:

"They are required to dress neatly, comport themselves as gentlemen, marry, and become the best of citizens and family men. Hence the wages should be computed on such a scale as to provide for reasonable house rent; wife and children, these to be well clothed and well fed; children at school until 15 years, costumed and furnished with books similar to the majority of the other children at public schools * * * and during school vacation he should be enabled to take his wife and family for a week or so to some one of our numerous resorts of easy access, without his pay being docked."

Another witness, a Jewish rabbi, testified:

"The workmen of this country are, as a rule, educated men, and therefore capable of judging. Naturally they can not content themselves with a mere existence and are impelled to acquire the means to provide those things which are deemed luxuries to them, but necessities of life to certain other classes. If wages were fixed according to supply and demand, our own workers, having social obligations, would be crowded out, while the foreign element, that would feel in no sense called upon to do more than exist, would be enabled to undermine the American workmen. There would result nothing but moral degradation from following so insensate a policy, and true Americanism would disappear."

Scores of men of various shades of political opinion—men in no wise identified with trades unionism—took the stand in this arbitration case and expressed opinions similar to those quoted above. One and all recognized that the worker had established a higher standard of living for himself in this country than had been attained by toilers in any other land on the globe, and they all agreed that it was his duty to maintain it, and that it would be good policy for the industrial world to concede the demand.

The point sought to be made here is that in a free-trade country such aspirations are entirely out of the question—even the demand for a living wage can not be conceded, because the British worker is called upon to meet the unfair competition involved in the dumping process.

When the British worker meets his employer to adjust difficulties he does not speak of his social aspirations or talk of sending his children to school until they are 15 years of age; seaside vacations are far from his thoughts. They are all concentrated on one point: "Can I get enough to eat?"

Often the reply to the demand for a living wage is a showing that rivals in other countries will undersell if wages are put up or kept up, and the worker in the free-trade country is coerced by circumstances into terms the acceptance of which he can only justify to himself on the ground that "a half loaf is better than no loaf at all."

There can be no doubt that it is the tariff wall which enables the American worker to avoid this dire contingency and permits him to plant himself on the proposition that he has a right to enjoy his share of the things produced, and it is the same policy which makes Americans of all degrees of opulence tolerant of the idea that it is the business of the worker to get all he can.

PROTECTION AND PRODUCTION.

You have doubtless heard it urged that the admittedly superior condition of the worker in the United States is due to the fact that there is an abundance of land and that the resources of the country are greater than those of most other countries.

There is some truth in this; but, like most half truths, the assumption that the comforts of the American workingman are solely due to these causes is misleading.

It is inconceivable, of course, that a great many millions of people could force a generous living from a restricted area of unfertile soil, destitute of minerals; but, on the other hand, it is indisputable that peoples inhabiting lands of natural riches and abounding in the useful metals are often found living in wretchedness.

The economic history of the United States contains an unanswerable rejoinder to the free-trade explanation of American prosperity. A moderate familiarity with conditions as they existed at various periods teaches that at the time when land was most abundant in this country the toiling masses found it as difficult to eke out a precarious existence as those of the densely populated quarters of the globe.

The historian McMaster was at great pains to gather data on this subject, and he furnishes evidence which shows that during the early years of the nineteenth century the workingman generally in the United States earned "such a pittance it was only by the strictest economy that a mechanic kept his children from starvation and himself from jail."

Later, when the population of the United States was little more than one-fourth as great as at present, and when the quantity of land which the Government could offer freely to all who would settle upon it was twenty times what it is now, the soup house was a not unfamiliar spectacle in the land, and pauperism threatened to become a national evil.

Under the circumstances it is idle to seek for the cause of the higher standard of living enjoyed by the American workingmen in natural resources. The true explanation of his prosperity is to be found in the fact that he has had framed for him a policy which has permitted him to develop his resources along lines which have made him an equitable sharer in the things produced.

He could have accomplished this result in but one way, and that is the one to which he resorted. The American worker created for himself a condition

entirely different from that existing in other countries. He aimed at a higher standard of living than that reached by his fellows elsewhere on the globe, and attained it with comparative ease.

It would have been impossible for him to have done so had he accepted the theory of the free trader that unrestricted trade is conducive to cheapness, for that would have reduced him to the necessity of competing with workers whose highest aim is "a living wage."

The resolve to create and maintain special conditions which lies back of the protectionist policy may appear selfish, but the result has proved that the resort to it by many peoples has augmented the comfort of the human race and promoted progress in the arts and sciences.

It is to the policy of protection that the conversion of the Western World into one great workshop is mainly due; and because the whole Western World has become a workshop there is an immensely greater production of consumable things which the workers who have the sagacity to demand their share and the means to enforce their demands are able to consume.

Such an outcome would have been impossible under the system of Cobden, which proceeded on the absurd assumption that mankind would be benefited by making one country the world's workshop. Had his idea prevailed not only would there have been a repression of production, but the comparatively small product would have been wastefully produced.

Had the world believed that because England in the fifties could produce iron and steel more cheaply than other countries she must always be able to do so, we should have witnessed the extraordinary spectacle of the ironmasters of the United Kingdom consuming the supply of British ores and then in, in turn, working up those of other countries.

It is obvious that such a course would have proceeded unchecked. A people confining itself to the production of raw materials never learns to compete successfully. Spain illustrates the truth of this assertion. For a considerable period the United Kingdom has been drawing four or five million tons of ore annually from the Spanish mines, and meantime the Spaniards neglect manufacturing and depend upon the British for their supplies of manufactures of iron and steel.

As a consequence, iron is dearer in Spain to-day than in most other European countries and in the United States. It makes no difference what the price lists may say. They may show that British iron and steel and the manufactures of iron and steel are cheaper in Spain than in the United States and Germany, but the fact remains that the Spaniards are unable to consume them; therefore they are dearer.

Had your own country consented to follow the example of Spain, had the American people heeded the professional economists who told them that they would profit by buying the cheaper iron of England, the result must have been the same. In that event Great Britain would to-day be drawing iron ores from us as she is now doing from Spain, and we should be using comparatively little iron and steel.

Never forget the wise remark of Adam Smith, who told his readers that the country which devotes itself to the production of the ruder things, such as food stuffs and raw materials, is always at a disadvantage, because it is obliged to exchange a great quantity of its peculiar products for a very small quantity of manufactured articles.

But this is only half wisdom, and does not go to the crux of the subject, as did another observation of the learned Doctor, who pointed out that the most prosperous countries were those which wedded farm and factory.

The bringing of the two together does more to increase production than anything else possibly could. It is responsible for the enormous and many-sided development of industry in western countries. Whenever the two are wedded, there we find increased wants and the capacity to respond to them. When they are separated, desire becomes atrophied. Had the United States devoted itself, as the Cobdenites hoped it would, to the production of raw materials and food stuffs, the wants of its inhabitants must have remained as primitive as they were at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

There would have been rude plenty in spots, and on the fringe of the country there would have been an approximation to modern progress. But throughout the land, which would have been sparsely settled, as all regions devoted to the production of the ruder products invariably are, there would have been an absence of a myriad things that we now deem essential.

Protection has performed the great work of thoroughly integrating the land. It has knit it so close together that the many enjoy what only the few could under the barbaric system of nondiversification of industry. Bringing farm and factory together has made it possible for the tiller of the soil to readily obtain things which under other circumstances would have been as inaccessible to him as if they were solely produced on the planet Mars.

Most of the more than 200,000 miles of railway this country possesses is the direct product of the system of bringing farm and factory together. They would not have been called into existence to meet the scanty wants of mere agricultural populations. Their chief profit is derived from the rapid interchange of products which goes on between people who pursue diverse occupations.

The census of 1900 showed that the number of inhabitants of cities in the United States with over 25,000 population was 19,718,312, an increase of 32.5 per cent over 1880. This vast urban growth tends to ameliorate the conditions of farm life. These cities are scattered all over the land, and they are nearly all nuclei of manufacturing industry. They are at the farmer's door. Their people buy his products, and they make it possible for him to obtain things he would not have dreamed of had he been compelled to live in the comparative isolation which is the lot of strictly agricultural peoples.

To have achieved this result is a distinct triumph for protection. To have artificially created the conditions which have caused the center of manufacturing to march steadily westward into the interior of our continent, continually bringing the consumer and the producer closer together, proves that in the main the destinies of the country have been guided by men with the true economic instinct—men who realize that the essential thing to secure prosperity is to do—to produce things, and to accomplish that result in the least wasteful manner possible.

That they have succeeded by artificial methods in promoting production is universally conceded. The British statesman Mulhall, who found it difficult to keep track of our rate of progress, gave some idea of the rate when he used these words:

"The United States produce alone one-third of the manufacturing total of nations, as they do also of grain and wheat, while their population is less than one-sixth."

This measure of our stature was taken in 1894. We have done much since, and may well claim that we are in the van in every field of production. This should be glory enough for a system; but it may justly lay claim to a still greater merit, and that is its effectiveness as an eliminator of waste, thus economizing for the benefit of consumers.

THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE.

In order to consume men must produce. It is true some creatures having the semblance of man try to subsist by depending on the offerings of nature, but they are few in number, and even they are often obliged to resort to artificial means to keep body and soul together. But mankind generally realizes the necessity of production and appreciates the fact that comfort and progress are dependent upon the degree of intelligence and energy put into the work of producing.

It is unfortunate that with this realization of the necessity of production there does not go a thorough comprehension of the importance of producing and distributing what is produced with as little waste as possible. In a salutary way mankind practices economies, but society at large disregards the utility of saving and manages its affairs in a manner which suggests that there is a prevalent conviction that waste is profitable. That this is no idle charge will at once be admitted by those who will take the trouble to ask themselves how much of the world's energy is uselessly expended and how commonly the fruitless expenditure is condoned and even applauded because it furnishes an opportunity to men to "earn" a livelihood.

The opening of a new railroad is regarded as a meritorious performance, even though its purpose is to parallel another set of tracks which already easily suffice to do the business of the country they traverse. The addition to the transportation facilities is pronounced desirable by the unthinking because it gives men an opportunity to work while it is in process of construction and will open fresh avenues of employment to other men when it is under way.

Few regard the matter from the standpoint of strict utility. The subject has become so complicated by other considerations, such as the desirability of competition and the necessity of distributing the fruits of production, that men have actually come to think that the main purpose is to keep men doing things. Whether they are done to a good purpose is at most times beside the inquiry.

It is true that the professional economists distinguish between different kinds of doing, but their analysis of human performances is, as a rule, not a very thorough one. It concerns itself with broad divisions, which leave it to be inferred that all who pretend to be working really do so.

If they were disposed to investigate the matter more closely, facts would be disclosed to the economists which would convince them that the undue importance attached to free and universal interchange of products has caused them to overlook a source of enormous waste directly attributable to the atrophy of the industrial energies of peoples too easily served by facile carriers.

The waste from this cause is on so vast a scale it would be impossible to measure it. No more can be done than to show that it is all pervasive, and that it operates directly to defeat the very purpose which complete freedom of commercial intercourse is supposed to effect—namely, the cheapening of products.

At first sight a highly developed system of moving products seems to invariably operate beneficially, and the assumption is that it really accomplishes what it aims at. It unquestionably, for a time, makes accessible to certain peoples things which they had not hitherto enjoyed, or if they already had it increases their ability to enjoy them.

But no account is taken in a consideration of this kind of the paralyzing effect upon communities thus easily served. The wheat from the fields of Dakota is rapidly and cheaply moved by rail and ocean carriers to England. The price of bread is thus reduced, but the competition strikes at the root of British agriculture. The farmer is driven from the land, the cities are filled with an unemployed and degenerating proletariat, and 12,000,000 Britons go a-hungering.

Nor is the case of Dakota much better. While its farmers are dependent upon the markets of peoples in remote lands they receive meager and insufficient returns for their labors, because the price which they obtain for their products is the insignificant amount left after the payment of the charges of the carriers and various middlemen who convey the wheat to the distant consumer. In addition they are despoiling themselves by deporting the elements of fertility from the country.

The evils of the system of land stripping, which have made themselves manifest in the reduced yield of American acres through sending vast quantities of food and raw products without making returns to the soil, are fully matched by those experienced by the British in forcing out their own greatest products, coal and iron.

For many years the people of the United Kingdom have been extracting coal from their mines with feverish eagerness and sending a large portion of the output to countries with an infinitely better supply. The exports in late years have exceeded 40,000,000 tons annually. In addition a large proportion of the mineral fuel domestically consumed is used to generate power to manufacture goods, also shipped to peoples who might have produced them for themselves.

Obviously there is an enormous waste in sending coal from England to a country like China, either in the form of the raw material, fuel, or the energy represented in the consumption of coal in manufacturing goods which might with equal facility be manufactured in China, which produces the raw materials and food and has an abundant supply of labor.

But this wasteful course has been steadily pursued under the forcing-out system, which is the direct product of the uneconomic teaching of the Cobdenites, who have elevated present cheapness to the first place in the thoughts of men, thus obscuring the fact that the imprudent use of nature's resources, although it may be attended by what appear to be benefits, must inevitably result in disadvantage and disaster.

Great Britain has already begun to experience the evils of her improvident course of forcing out her main industrial resources. The price of coal in the United Kingdom has been steadily advancing of late years, having risen from 4s. 10d. at the pit's mouth to 10s. 9d. in less than half a century.

Consider the fact that the course which has resulted in the doubling of the price of coal in Great Britain in less than fifty years was pursued for the purpose of procuring food, a large part of which might have been raised on British soil, and ask yourself what economic defense can be urged in favor of a policy which approves the eager exchange of irreplaceable commodities, like coal and iron, for those which, like wheat and meat, may be produced practically at will.

The net result of the British policy of forcing out has been waste and consequent dearth. No matter what may be the apparent gains of the United Kingdom, she has been making a steady economic loss by impairing her future industrial possibilities. True economy demands the conservation of her coal and iron; pseudoeconomists have taught her to believe that the shortest road to prosperity is to get rid of them as rapidly as possible.

Protection has interposed a barrier to the self-destruction of the British. Had high tariffs not served the purpose of stimulating the production of coal and iron in other countries, Great Britain would have been much nearer to the end of her resources than she is at present. She now imports millions of tons of iron ores annually to eke out her constantly diminishing supply; her mines would have probably become entirely barren by this time had Cobdenism prevailed, unless, indeed, the effect of the failure of lands now supplying themselves with iron to utilize their own resources would have diminished its use to such an extent that Britain could have continued to indefinitely dole out small quantities to the rest of the world.

These are some of the evil consequences of the wastefulness attendant upon a system which disregards the fact that true economy demands the bringing together of farm and factory. The full extent of the waste can be realized, however, only by attentively studying the evidence, which shows that the major part of the cost of products to consumers is that which is added by the carrier and middlemen in their efforts to undo the ill effects of injudicious concentration of populations in parts of the world remote from the sources of food supply and raw materials.

In dealing with the subject of transportation the British statistician, Mulhall, developed some interesting facts which show conclusively that the world is wasting more energy in carrying things to and fro than it is devoting to the work of production. After presenting his data, he sums up with these words:

"It appears, therefore, that 40 per cent of the working power of the world is used for production, and 60 per cent for transport or distribution, which is exactly the reverse of the ratios in 1840."

It needs little imagination to picture the better results which would follow if the world should use 60 per cent of its energy in production and 40 in transportation and distribution. The latter processes add value to things produced, but it must always be kept in mind that they do not add anything to the quantity of things produced.

According to Mulhall, the number of persons engaged in transportation in the United Kingdom, the European continent, the United States, and the British colonies in 1894 was 8,640,000. Whatever proportion of the earnings of this vast army represents the unnecessary movement of products is economic waste. So, too, are the fuel and iron expended in the process, and also whatever is exacted by the unnecessary middleman.

The cost to the consumer is increased by the amount of this waste. That much of it can be dispensed with ought to be clearly apparent to all familiar with the fact that the world seems disposed to make its industrial systems fit in with the tendency of populations to congest.

Protection is counteracting this tendency, and by attracting people to the sources of supply it tends to eliminate waste. The bringing of farm and factory together is doing more to make things accessible to mankind than any other cause. It directs the energies of mankind into the field of productivity instead of frittering it away in wasteful carriage, thus producing that genuine cheapness whose test is increased ability to consume.

THE BALANCE OF TRADE.

If anyone should tell you that the right way to save and get rich is to run into debt and to consume more than you produce you would doubtless think him crazy. You would be justified in holding such an opinion, for it is impossible to prosper except by thrift and the expenditure of energy.

Nevertheless you will be seriously told by free traders that nations may prosper by practices which bring disaster to individuals. And if you are incredulous you will be reminded that Great Britain annually imports \$850,000,000 worth more of commodities than she exports.

That this is not a misrepresentation of the Cobdenite position will be conceded if you take the trouble to examine the free-trade arguments concerning the balance of trade. I have an article before me now in which the writer says:

"In the United Kingdom the value of the imports exceeds that of the exports by nearly 2 to 1; and it is out of this difference that the wages of the country are paid and the enormous profits of the British factors are accumulated."

In short, according to this writer, who voices the once currently entertained Cobden view, the British are able to pay great sums in wages and to make great profits in merchandising because they buy more than they sell.

The puerile character of this assumption is exposed by a single question: If great Britain profits so greatly by buying more than she sells, why does she not buy still more and further augment her profits?

There is one obstacle in the way of buying, and that is the necessity of paying for what is bought. If it were not for this obstacle other nations might have attempted to follow the Cobdenite plan of getting rich by taking more from foreigners than they were ready to give in return.

It will be found on investigation, however, that whenever peoples who have not already established the right to draw from foreigners more than they give in return buy more than they sell they run into debt. This process may be continued for a time, but the ultimate result must be greater exports than imports, for there is always a day of reckoning for the debtor.

It is only by investing in foreign countries that the people of a nation can for any considerable period import more than they export. It was through the exercise of skill and the practice of thrift that the British put themselves in the position of being able to draw upon foreigners, and not by importing more than they export.

The present ability of the British to import on so large a scale is directly traceable to excess exports in former days. During a considerable period Great Britain drew upon her natural resources, coal and iron, to establish herself in the position of a creditor nation. She temporarily profited by parting with these resources and invested the proceeds in other lands whose resources her capital is now helping to exploit.

It would have been impossible for her to have attained her present position by following the Cobden formula, and she can not retain it by any such device. Great Britain does not profit or add to her wealth by buying more than she sells. She is simply taking what is due to her, and in the nature of things her capital must shrink, unless she can find means to augment her export trade or extend her investments abroad.

The curious illusion of the Cobdenites, that the modern protectionist is under the delusion that a country must export more than it imports in order to obtain gold is disappearing, and erstwhile free-trade editors are beginning to rationally discuss the question of "the balance of trade," and now approach it from the true standpoint—that of debt and credit. Thus we find the London Statist, in an article recently published, discussing as follows:

"Thirty years ago or so a very large part of the Government debt of the United States was held in Europe. Now the amount of the debt so held is hardly worth talking of. Ten years ago the amount of industrial securities held in Europe was enormous. Ten years hence the amount that will still be held by Europe will in all probability be quite trifling. The United States in another ten years will be a great ship-owning country, will own its own securities, and send its goods on board its own ships, and we shall not only have to pay freight, but insurance and commission likewise. When our imports from the United States exceed our exports to the United States by \$100,000,000 or more, what will become of our money market, and how shall we make the payments which somehow or other will have to be made?"

No Cobdenite has attempted to answer the question propounded by the London Statist. Any attempt on the part of a free trader to do so would expose the utter folly of the assumption that excess of imports indicate a healthy industrial condition. The free-trader's response, if he tried to make his theory fit with the condition which the Statist says confronts England, would be: "Go on increasing your imports."

But the London Times told why this can not be done when it recently said:

"The workingman's occupation is going, and occupation is income. Capital is also going. It has been lost altogether to a large amount by the falling off in our industries, and it is further scared into seeking abroad the investments which business ceases to offer at home."

If the workingman's occupation is going; if capital is going and is being lost by the falling off in British industries, how can the people of Great Britain hope to increase their imports? The Times has evidently lost faith in the efficacy of the Cobdenite panacea, for it adds:

"That is a serious condition of affairs for all of us, and most of all for the workingman. We can not meet it by cheapening food, we can not even pre-

vent food from becoming dearer, and the country is asked to consider whether there are no means of getting more money to buy food with."

The young voter who has any doubts about the soundness of the balance-of-trade theory as interpreted by protectionists is asked to note that the London Statist and the London Times, both hitherto regarded as exponents of the free-trade idea, unconsciously use the terms which would make them obnoxious to the charge that "gold and silver are the only real wealth." The Statist wishes to know what will happen to the British "money" market when Americans cease to be indebted to Britons and the latter are compelled to continue importing more from the United States than they export, and the Times says the country will be asked to consider "whether there are no means of getting more money to buy food with."

These queries disclose the true state of affairs. They make it perfectly clear that the Cobdenite assumption that free trade is to be credited with British ability to annually import several hundred million dollars more than she exports is erroneous, and they expose the fact that the real reason why Great Britain can now do so is because she is receiving returns from investments made in other countries by her people in former years.

When the returns from these diminish or entirely cease, British imports must inevitably decline. That is as plain as a pikestaff, and all the theories in the world will fail to prevent that result. Some nations may grow rich by trading when other nations consent to be exploited for their sake, but when a determination manifests itself in every country for the people to make the best of their resources, then trade becomes what it should be—an auxiliary to the work of production—and not a parasitic growth which threatens to smother the producer, as it is under conditions in which the middleman is of more consequence than the one who devotes himself to producing things.

The development of a manufacturing industry in the United States and in other protectionist countries is rapidly clearing up the obscurities in which the question of the balance of trade has been shrouded. That is proved by the admissions of the Times and the Statist. Very soon even the free trader may be able to grasp the idea that production is the prime thing and that the nation which fails to do its share in the work of producing things must go backward.

Then the absurdity of the Cobdenite contention that a country can grow rich by letting other countries produce for it will be fully exposed, and even American free traders will be forced to admit that the protectionist policy of keeping out of debt is a sound one.

The statistical tables which show whether the balance is on the right or wrong side of the ledger merely furnish the information whether a country is doing its share in the work of producing. If the people in a country are able to consume on a liberal scale, and manage to do so without drawing upon foreigners for more than they give to them in return, the assumption is that the work of production for the time being is proceeding favorably, and vice versa.

And that is all there is to the balance-of-trade question.

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN TRADE.

The persistent misrepresentation of the protectionist view of the balance-of-trade question by free traders has been dwelt upon. It has been shown that the advocates of protection are not so silly as to imagine that a country gets rich by selling more than it buys, and that what protectionists really set store by is the fact that under present conditions so-called favorable trade balances represent a clearing off of indebtedness and an approach to a possibility of making even exchanges.

There is also a keen appreciation of the importance of establishing a credit upon which the country may hereafter draw at need. This advantage is enjoyed at present by Great Britain. It is because the British have placed the peoples of other countries under obligations to them that they are now enabled to import several hundred million dollars' worth more of merchandise annually than they export. When the United States has squared its obligations to the outside world it will continue to export more than it imports, provided it can find peoples to take its surpluses. In this respect it will be following, not the example of a country, but of the thrifty man who invests his accumulations so that he may have something to fall back upon when rainy days come.

This is the protectionist balance-of-trade theory in a nutshell; no other view of the subject has ever been advanced by advocates of the protective system in this country; no sensible believer in the promotion of American industry has labored under the delusion that the chief function of a favorable trade balance is to draw gold to a country, although protectionists are not indifferent to the danger which results from putting a nation in a position to be depleted of its stock of money metal, nor to the advantage possessed by those who through the ownership of credits can command needed supplies.

The attitude of protectionists toward foreign trade has been an equally favorite object of misrepresentation. The assertion has been repeatedly made that advocates of a protective tariff are hostile to external commerce; that they desire to build a Chinese wall about the country and exclude themselves from the comity of nations. The rank absurdity of the charge is at once made manifest by an examination of the tariff schedules prepared by protectionists, which provide for the free admission of all classes of articles which we are incapable of profitably producing for ourselves.

American protectionists are not opposed to foreign trade; they earnestly encourage its growth, but they expect it to develop along lines that will not interfere with the development of American industry. They seek to promote the free interchange of noncompeting products. They believe that "by sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production we shall extend the outlet for our increasing surplus."

The country, under protectionist auspices, has for years been acting upon this sensible plan. When those who have framed protective schedules have found that tariffs were no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, they have been removed. That is the consistent history of Republican tariff legislation, and the results are visible in a constantly increasing volume of imports and exports.

The imputation of motives to protectionists which they never entertained has tended to cloud the minds of professional economists, but it has never for a moment interfered with the tendency of the system to refute their assertions. While free traders have amused themselves talking about the protection wall reared about the United States the external commerce of the country has grown at a rate which makes the growth of British trade seem snail-like.

In 1870 imports into the United States were valued at \$436,000,000; in 1902 they had increased to \$903,000,000. During the same period the exports increased from \$376,000,000 to \$1,355,000,000. British imports, which were \$1,259,000,000 in 1870, were valued at \$2,210,000,000 in 1902, while the exports rose from \$971,000,000 to \$1,863,000,000. The total value of the external trade of the United States was \$212,000,000 in 1870, and in 1902 it was \$2,258,000,000. In the same period British external trade increased from \$2,230,000,000 to \$3,573,000,000. The foreign trade of the United States increased \$1,446,000,000, while that of the United Kingdom showed an enlargement of only \$1,243,000,000.

These comparisons will serve to emphasize the denial that protection tends to exclusiveness, for they show that the United States, which has the reputation of being a nearly self-sufficing nation, has actually increased its dealings, both absolutely and relatively, with the outside world more rapidly

than Great Britain—a notoriously dependent country, compelled by lack of raw materials and a deficient food supply to draw upon foreigners or go out of the business of manufacturing for export.

Having thus disposed of the stupid assumption that it is the purpose of protectionists to make a hermit nation of the United States, it may be judicious to explain that while they do not desire to discourage a rational external trade, they believe that the swiftest mode of promoting foreign commerce is through the development of internal production and trade.

Experience has demonstrated that whenever the latter is made the objective of statesmen foreign commerce expands more rapidly than under laws designed to tempt that result. The record of American exports and imports shows that every attempt to promote them by an approach to freedom of trade has caused them to shrink. Tariff legislation "for revenue only" has almost invariably been followed by a diminution of our foreign trade; devotion to the extension of domestic industry has produced the opposite result.

No one will attempt to dispute this assertion after examining the American Economist's graphic presentation of the "Effects of the free-trade eclipse," published in 1900, which brought out the fact I am dwelling upon more markedly than any other.

It showed that under a tariff levied for the prime purpose of promoting domestic industry our foreign trade rose from \$1,647,139,063 in 1890 to \$1,857,690,610 in 1892; that under the menace of an interference with protection it fell off to \$1,662,331,612 in 1896, and that after that date, owing to the stimulating influence of the Dingley Act, it steadily increased, reaching \$2,244,193,543 in 1900. And when the presentation is continued, as it doubtless will be next year, the total will probably exceed \$2,500,000,000—it was \$2,445,889,652 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

It is not extraordinary that our external trade should act as described. Its fluctuations are easily explained. When the energies of the nation are stimulated by a protective tariff production in every line of industry is enlarged and surpluses are created, for which an outlet is sought in foreign countries. At the same time the growing wealth of the country, due to increased production and the feeling which prosperity induces, results in a greater demand for those products of foreigners which we are not yet able to produce and of those we are wholly incapable of producing owing to climatic causes. On the other hand, when domestic producers are discouraged by fears of foreign competition production shrinks. The needs of the domestic consumer are accurately gauged and no surpluses are created for shipment abroad. Contraction of production breeds depression, and its effect is to curtail the importation of luxuries and necessities.

In the light of the evidence presented no student of the question will be deceived for a moment by the charge that protectionists oppose the extension of foreign trade or that the effect of the policy has been to restrict its growth. The more the young voter investigates the subject the more thoroughly he will be convinced that it is only by strict attention to the development of our resources that we can hope to attain a position in the commercial world analogous to that once held by Great Britain.

The more we vary our productivity the greater our wealth and our ability to buy the things we desire. Had we devoted ourselves to the prosecution of a single industry our wants would have been as simple as our industrial system. No strictly agricultural nation as ever developed a great commerce or commercial class to carry on trade. It is only the peoples who have the sagacity to cultivate many-sidedness who become conspicuous traders and accumulators of wealth.

It is undoubtedly true that history furnishes a few examples of peoples flourishing through placing their chief dependence on trade, but even in such cases productivity was the basic element of prosperity. The fame of the carriers of Tyre was more than rivaled by that of the manufacturers of brass and the makers of Tyrian dyes. Great Britain, the sails of whose ships whiten the seas of the world, owes her present supremacy on the ocean to the position she once occupied as a manufacturing nation. Had she failed to develop her enormous resources of iron and coal it would have been impossible for her to have created her unequalled ocean marine.

It can not be repeated too often nor emphasized too strongly that the true way to promote trade, both foreign and domestic, is that which protectionist statesmen have adopted. By stimulating the development of resources of all kinds and by employing the energies of the population in every practicable form of industry there is production on an enormous scale, and it is impossible for that to happen without there being a correspondingly large trade. Things when produced in abundance are exchanged. It is the sum of these exchanges that constitutes trade, and this fact should suggest to the most obtuse that the only solid foundation upon which a great commerce can be erected and maintained is domestic productivity. That assured, the rest and prosperity follow as a matter of course.

BUYING IN ORDER TO SELL.

A phrase once the especial property of free traders, but recently appropriated by the advocates of what are called "reciprocity treaties," is frequently heard nowadays. It runs something like this: "You must buy in order to sell."

At first blush this assertion sounds all right. It will doubtless appeal to the young voter until he puts on his thinking cap and asks what the assertion means.

As soon as he does this he has forced upon his attention the fact that in that part of the business world in which he moves there is no attempt to live up to such a rule. On the contrary, no one asks the question when making a purchase whether the person he buys from ever bought anything from him or is likely to do so in the future.

Men buy as their convenience dictates, or because they believe that the places they patronize sell the things they desire cheaply.

Reciprocal buying and selling only survives in primitive communities. It may be possible to find some places in the United States where the shoemaker patronizes the tailor because the latter buys his footwear from him, but they must be very small villages and off the beaten line of travel. In cities absolutely no regard is paid to reciprocal assumptions. When the urban shoemaker desires a suit of clothes, the chances are ninety-nine in a hundred that he will seek them in the shop of a man he has no direct business relations with other than that involved in the purchase.

It is the same in international commercial relations. In the stage of barter when ships sailed to the coasts of countries inhabited by barbarous peoples they carried cargoes of goods with which they effected direct exchanges. That sort of trade necessitated buying in order to sell.

But there is little of that kind of trading done in these days. In some parts of the world the reciprocity idea is acted upon, and it is true in such cases that men buy in order to sell. The adventurers who penetrate Africa in quest of ivory still act up to the theory. They know they must buy elephant tusks from natives in order to sell them Brummagen ware.

But in the highly complex development known as "commerce" things are managed differently. Not one in a thousand of the vast number of transactions that go to make up the volume of exchanges between different countries even remotely resembles direct barter. In the aggregate and in detail this trade is precisely like that which you see carried on in our cities. The buyers in every instance are men who want things and the sellers are those who have things for sale. In no case do the dealings between these classes have senti-

ment obtruded into them. Buyers and sellers alike would laugh at the suggestion that such a consideration should or does govern.

The combined external trade of the world in 1901-2 amounted to nearly \$13,000,000,000. In a table prepared by the Treasury Bureau of Statistics this trade—the imports and exports of merchandise of the principal countries—did not balance. The exports in round figures amounted to \$6,000,000,000 and the imports to \$6,864,000,000. If the figures are at all dependable, this would indicate that through some means or other some countries sell to foreigners more than they buy from them, or, to put it in a more intelligible way, there are nations able to buy more merchandise than they sell.

So, viewing the trade of the world as a whole, we see that there is no foundation for the assumption of those who contend that reciprocity in commercial dealings is essential to continued intercourse between nations. If the necessity for balancing imports and exports existed it would have manifested itself long ago. It ought to be accepted as proof conclusive that there is no such necessity when we find that year after year the total of the world's exchanges of merchandise do not balance by hundreds of millions of dollars.

When we look into the details of the world's trade we find still more significant evidence that no such consideration as that urged by reciprocity mongers influences international dealings. We find on examining the tables of imports and exports of the list of thirty nations, embracing the principal countries of the globe, that in not a single instance is there an approach to a balance.

There are countries which, like England, have adverse balances against them, and there are others, like the United States, with favorable balances. In 1901-2 the United Kingdom imported merchandise to the value of \$764,351,071 more than she exported; in the same year the United States exported \$283,152,624 more than she imported. India had a favorable balance of \$82,253,726; Brazil had an excess of exports over imports amounting to \$31,297,955, and Canada is credited with \$20,535,654 more exports than imports. Germany and the Netherlands are conspicuous, like the United Kingdom, as excess importers, the former having an adverse balance of \$157,979,000 and the latter of \$119,679,182.

A moment's reflection will suffice to assure anyone that these enormous disparities could be avoided only by imitating the simple process of barter. These figures testify to the complexity of trade and demonstrate that the latter is not based on comity, but is essentially selfish. It disregards courtesy, friendship, and everything of that kind and seeks nothing but profit.

If this were not true, is it conceivable for a single moment that Great Britain would continue to buy hundreds of millions of dollars' worth more of merchandise annually from the people of the United States than the latter buy from them? In 1901 the United Kingdom imported merchandise from the United States to the value of £141,015,465, and we in return took from that country £18,393,883 worth.

Although the British purchases from the United States exceeded the American purchases of British products nearly eightfold, no one will be silly enough to assume that the people of Great Britain were injured by this apparently inequitable trading. They bought eight times as much from us as we did from them because they needed and could profitably use the things we offered for sale.

It would be absolutely impossible for us to trade with them reciprocally, because they do not produce the things we need to buy. The imports of the United States are gaining rapidly. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, they exceeded a billion dollars, but our takings from Great Britain have relatively declined. The explanation is simple. Although we are supposed to be on a more friendly footing with the British than formerly, we buy less from them, because most of their productions parallel ours. Like them we buy only the things we need, and like them we seek them in the markets which offer the most favorable terms.

The attempt to bring about reciprocal trading is responsible for all sorts of absurdities. Its counts for the unreasonable supposition to which British Colonial Secretary Chamberlain gave expression recently, that if Great Britain had been in a position to menace our wheat and other products with a tariff we should have consented to continue receiving British tin plate. He did not see that we are simply working out our destiny when we enlarge the field of our industrial activities, and that under no circumstances would the American people submit to any agreement which would set a limit to the development of the resources of the country.

The theory that it is necessary to buy in order to sell received its death blow when the Cobdenite idea that some nations are better fitted by nature than others to carry on the highly profitable manufacturing business was exploded. So long as economists could succeed in making people believe that the world was a sort of industrial checkerboard on which some nations are allotted black squares and others white, the assertion that nations must buy from each other in order to sell to each other sounded plausible; but when it was demonstrated that enterprising peoples may move into any industrial square they please, and that nature has not placed some nations on the unprofitable white agricultural squares and others on the rich black manufacturing squares, the theory went to pot.

It is no longer possible to delude the American people into believing that they must abandon any occupation they find profitable in order that an outlet may be furnished for the products of another industry. At one time it was assumed that disaster would overtake our cotton growers if we should insist upon creating a manufacturing industry which would interfere with foreigners marketing their manufactures in this country. The argument was the same as the recently revived one about buying in order to sell.

It was said to us if we do not buy English manufactures we can not hope to sell our cotton and other products of the soil to the people of England. But we persisted in creating new industries, and now we sell more of cotton and other products to Great Britain than those who bid us beware dreamed possible.

Not alone England but other countries continue to buy from us in increasing quantities, and our consumption of cotton and other products of the soil grows year by year. And it is this fact which justifies the policy of the protectionists who hold that it is the business of statesmen to legislate so that national production will be promoted and to not concern themselves about trade, because the latter will be sure to take care of itself if the former is not hampered.

THE BREAKDOWN OF FREE TRADE.

The importance of fostering domestic industry has been made apparent to the world by the experience of Great Britain. It is not likely that we shall hear much in the future from the economists of that country, who once taught that the safest course for a nation to pursue is to throw its markets wide open to foreigners. They can not further contend that their theory is sound in the face of the breakdown of the English free-trade system.

If there had been any virtue in the assumption that buying liberally from foreigners would tempt them to buy in return, the manufacturing industries of the United Kingdom, instead of contracting their operations as they have been compelled to do, would be expanding them. The British people have bought freely. They have drawn upon the food stuffs and raw products of this and other countries, and have sought to induce them to accept their manufactured products in exchange. But progressive nations have insisted on providing themselves with the facilities for manufacturing instead of depending upon the workshops of Great Britain for their supplies.

The result is overproduction. The hair-splitting economist may proclaim as loudly as he pleases that such a thing as overproducing is impossible, but the stubborn fact remains that the machinery of the world and the skilled men who operate it manage to turn out at times more manufactured articles of all kinds than the world can profitably consume.

It is because this is the case that the twaddle about the markets of the world being of more consequence than the domestic market is no longer heard. Even in England it is now beginning to be seen that it is essential to the maintenance of the industries of that country that the domestic producer should be protected against the encroachments of the foreigner.

If the plans advocated by Colonial Secretary Chamberlain and Premier Balfour are carefully examined, it will be found that they carry the admission that the free entrance of foreign-manufactured goods into the United Kingdom has seriously affected the domestic producer, and that unless a tariff which will render impossible the dumping process is resorted to the British manufacturer will have to go out of business.

It is noteworthy in this connection that Britons who advocate a tariff to prevent the evils of dumping persist in the belief that under a competitive system, conducted upon what they are pleased to call fair lines, they could hold their own against all competitors. They have not lost confidence in the enterprise of their manufacturers and the skill of their workmen; they simply contend that they are the victims of an unfair competition, which takes the form of selling goods manufactured in the United States and Germany more cheaply in Great Britain than in the country of their production.

But it is idle to assume that competition of this kind is new or unfair. It has been resorted to by British manufacturers in the past and is still practiced by them. It will be persisted in so long as opportunity offers. There is only one way of putting a period to the vice, so far as it affects international commerce. The United States discovered the method long ago, and has made it serve as an effectual barrier to the encroachments of foreigners, and Great Britain is now considering the propriety of copying it to save her domestic producers from ruin.

It is contended by Cobdenites that the dumping evil is due to the protective system. They assume that had the world adopted free trade, the evil of overproduction would not have manifested itself. But when the idea back of this assumption is examined, it is seen that it rests upon the absurdity that the world would have been better off had it remained dependent upon the United Kingdom for its supplies of manufactured goods.

In that event it may be conceded that there would have been no overproduction, but it is hardly conceivable that anyone will now assent to the proposition that the United States and several other countries that were in a notoriously backward state a half century ago are not as well fitted to-day to manufacture articles of all kinds as Great Britain.

Being so fitted, it is proper that the people of those once backward countries should develop their resources as energetically as possible. They are doing so, and the result is periodical overproduction, due to the inability of consumers to make their demands keep pace with the ability to produce.

This ability to produce in excess of the ability to consume is by no means an absolute evil. It indicates abundance of resources. If the opposite were the case—if mankind were constantly demanding more than could be produced—there would be want instead of plenty.

Overproduction can never prove a serious evil so long as the excess products are kept within the countries of their origin or are shipped to countries which need them. In the first case the producer soon receives the warning which compels him to curtail his output, and in the latter the export of the surplus proves beneficial by filling a want.

Overproduction becomes a genuine evil only when the surplus is sent to countries abundantly able to provide themselves with the articles dumped on their shores. In such cases the unloading is invariably affected by selling the surplus goods at less than cost of production, or, at least, at prices lower than those which the manufacturers of the invaded countries can afford to sell at.

It was once the fashion of free traders to assert that even such an invasion could do no harm, and the belief was persisted in until it was seen that imports under such circumstances would sap the foundations of all industry. Now, even in Great Britain it is beginning to be recognized that the domestic producers' interests must receive the first consideration. In other words, the British are having it borne in upon them that men must produce to consume, and that in order to do the latter they must be afforded an opportunity to produce.

It is only by the intervention of a protective tariff that this opportunity can be guaranteed. A properly framed set of schedules can be relied upon to effectually prevent interference with domestic production. Back of the barrier which well-adjusted duties present to the unfair encroachments of foreigners the domestic producer may toil in security, untroubled by the fear that he may be made the victim of the deliberate purpose of a foreign competitor to undo him or of his rival's incapacity to measure demand.

That has become the prime function of protection. At one stage in the development of a protective system the first consideration is the promotion of industry. Its work, then, is to ward off the attacks of established rivals whose experience and accumulated capital, if permitted to be freely measured against the inexperience and feeble resources of the beginners, would prove fatal to the creation of manufacturing industries in new countries.

But the utility of protection does not cease when it has assisted in placing the industries of a nation on a firm basis. It is still the bulwark back of which the working classes of a country may maintain a high standard of living and hope to further elevate it.

Not only does it prevent dumping; it also interposes obstacles to the introduction of competing products produced by workers who do not share the aspirations of workers in protected countries. So long as the principle of protection is adhered to the menace of fluid capital need have no terrors for the worker. The toilers in free-trade England may be disturbed by the spectacle of British capitalists operating factories on the Continent, where cheaper labor may be obtained, but the workmen of the United States fear no such result. So long as protection prevails factories will never be reared by American capital in foreign countries to supply the consumers of the United States.

A system which affords securities of this kind can not be compared with one which puts the producing classes of a country at the disadvantage of attempting to compete with peoples whose wants are restricted and who have no desire to enlarge them. It is incomparably superior to free trade, because it permits a nation to work out its destiny in its own way. It is desirable because its tendency is to elevate the standard of comfort. While protection endures in this country it will be possible for workmen to procure what the toilers in almost every other part of the world deem luxuries; if it is ever abandoned, the inevitable result will be to reduce the American worker to the common level.

The standard of living of the British worker was long superior to that of the rest of the workers of Europe, because Great Britain for a period had a practical monopoly of manufacturing; but the conversion of the Continent into one vast workshop, and the resulting rivalry, is rapidly bringing him to the same level as his continental fellows. It was inevitable that this should be the outcome. It would no more be possible for a nation to permanently maintain free trade and escape that fate than it would be to prevent water rising to its own level if left free to follow the natural law which governs it.

THE TRUSTS AND THE TARIFF.

It has been urged that international competition is absolutely essential to protect the people from the aggressions of what are popularly termed "trusts." Some go so far as to assert that these modern instances of the tendency to combine are directly traceable to the protective system.

This charge is made in absolute disregard of the fact that combinations are relatively as numerous in free-trade Great Britain as in this country and that their origin must be sought for in a remote antiquity. There is abundant evidence that the ancient Romans formed syndicates, and toward the close of the middle ages Germany produced an instance of organization more effective perhaps than any witnessed in these days.

The only thing which distinguishes the modern system of combination is the magnitude of some of the assembled interests. The American syndicates are on a greater scale than those of any other country because the wealth of the people of the United States surpasses that of all other people and because the resources yet to be developed surpass those of any other nation.

There is no evidence, however, that the colossal size of these combinations makes them a greater menace to consumers than they would be if competition were more general or if it were confined wholly to individuals. Indeed, there are conceivable circumstances under which the interests of consumers would be more thoroughly conserved by a far-reaching system of organizations whose securities are in the hands of a great number of people than they could possibly be under a competitive method, which has a tendency to restrict the volume of production. Theoretically the great combine can control output and prices, but practically it can do nothing of the kind. There has been much silly talk on this point during the period of prosperity recently enjoyed by the country which is already being refuted by the logic of events.

Among other things, it was charged that the creation of trusts was responsible for the general rise in prices witnessed since 1898; but there is no evidence whatever to prove that the rise would not have occurred had the tendency to combine not manifested itself.

There is abundant proof, on the other hand, that the phenomenon was attributable to precisely the same causes which operated to produce or compel advances in prices on former occasions, not only in this country but throughout the western world.

The price lists of the British Iron and Steel Institute reveal the fact that at various times in the history of the manufacture of iron and steel rails in the United Kingdom the price per ton has been more than doubled. This was notably the case in the years when we were dependent upon the British for rails. In 1862 rails were £7 11s. a ton; in 1885 they had gone up to £13 2s., and in 1872 they sold at £15 14s.

Other advances equally striking might be cited, and in every instance investigation will develop the fact that they were due to causes which exactly parallel those which produced the recent result erroneously attributed to trusts. In every case the advance was responsive to an urgent demand; and when prices were put down—they were cut in half more than once—that action was compelled by the cessation of demand.

Although there were understandings between the British rail makers, who were popularly supposed to fix prices, they merely served to register the decrees of supply and demand. They did not attempt to restrict the former and they took full advantage of the latter.

When American consumption decreased, the British rail makers, who charged £15 14s. a ton in 1872, cut the price, and in 1878 they were charging less than half that amount. Their combination did not avail to keep up rates in the face of a decreasing demand. What the British ironmasters found themselves unable to do the American manufacturers can not hope to accomplish.

If anyone doubts this let him investigate the causes that induced the leading steel and iron manufacturers of the United States, at a meeting held in New York on November 5, 1903, to reduce the price of steel billets from \$27 to \$24 a ton. A frank inquiry will develop the fact that the so-called trust is as powerless to keep up prices in the face of a diminishing demand as individuals assumedly in active competition with each other would be.

It is even doubtful whether a great concern organized on the lines of a modern trust is as potent in the premises as individuals were in the days before promotion became the fashion. An enormous stock company must meet its obligations, and can only do so by continuing to produce until the point of selling at a loss is reached; an individual may suspend operations when profits become too small to tempt him.

The great steel trust has acquired large bodies of iron ore, which, in the nature of things, must become more valuable as the population of the country and the world increases. If these mines were in the possession of private owners it is conceivable that they might be permitted to remain unproductive, but having been acquired by a company whose existence is dependent upon production, they must be worked.

In the course of the industrial inquiry made by the commission created by Congress Mr. Schwab, of the steel trust, expressed the view that the corporation of which he was a member was not overcapitalized, because it owned vast ore bodies which would become extremely valuable in the future. He argued that at the rate consumption was increasing the deposits of a certain class of ores would be exhausted in less than fifty years.

This condition of affairs, he assumed, would enable the United States Steel Company to anticipate the future by permitting it to make its charges commensurate with the approaching scarcity. There is little doubt that his opinion of the duration of the supply is sound, but he appears to have overlooked the fact that the passage of the ore bodies from the control of a few persons who, like speculators in real estate in a city, might have waited for the increased value which comes from a demand created by the expansion of population, has frustrated the opportunity to profit in the manner suggested by him.

The dispersal of the securities of the company has made the continuance of production imperative. The interest on the bonds issued must be paid, and an attempt will be made to earn dividends. To accomplish these results the ores of the corporation must be utilized, and the consuming public must be tempted to buy the products fashioned from them.

That this view is sound is attested by the fact above quoted—that at the first sign of cessation of demand the price of steel is reduced. If the reduction resolved upon does not effect its purpose it will have to be followed by another. This is precisely the process witnessed before the hubbub raised over the formation of trusts was heard, and it proves that combinations, no matter how strong, are subject to the same economic laws as individuals.

It is not because trusts can exact what they please from the consumer that they are undesirable. Experience shows that they have no such power. Their evil feature is their tendency to draw capital to themselves by fraudulent methods. But that may be overcome by acting upon the advice of the President, who has recommended the passage of laws which will compel publicity. If such laws are enacted trusts will soon be divested of their power for harm within the country in which they are operated; but the inhabitants of other countries will be compelled to guard against their encroachments, for the necessity under which they will find themselves of producing and selling will cause them to seek out the convenient spots of the earth in which to dump their products.

This is becoming thoroughly understood in Germany and other European

countries. In an article recently published in the *Reichsbote*, of Berlin, the statement was made that "if, contrary to expectation, the American trust, after flooding the British markets, should make renewed attempts to overflow the German tariff dike, it will be necessary to strengthen the defenses of the German market."

Compare this sensible attitude with the absurd position taken by American free traders, who recommend cutting the tariff dike as a remedy for the trust evil. When we add that this recommendation is made in full knowledge of the fact that "Germany was able to ease its market during the crisis of 1901 by dumping a million tons of iron and steel in Great Britain," some idea of the fatuousness of the free trader's advice may be formed.

The British people are beginning to realize that they are in a trap and are endeavoring to escape from it. They recognize their helplessness, and the desire to strike down the cause of it is growing rapidly. They know that while free trade lasts their ports will continue to be a dumping ground for the trusts, and the knowledge will speedily guide them to the remedy.

Shall we commit the blunder of adopting the system which is now menacing British industry, or shall we pursue the sensible course of leaving the trusts to the processes of our courts? If we embrace the error which Great Britain now seeks to retrieve, we shall be at the mercy of all trusts, including our own. If we conclude to abate the evils which attend the trust system by internal regulation, we will accomplish a real reform without menacing domestic production.

TRIUMPH OF PROTECTION AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE POLICY OF PROMOTING PRODUCTION.

On the night of November 4, 1903, Joseph Chamberlain made a speech in Birmingham to 2,000 of his fellow-townsmen, in which he quoted Cobden as saying that the United States would eventually abandon manufacturing, and that "the workingman would go back to the land and dig and delve for us." Mr. Chamberlain now says: "The Americans had not so conceived their national destiny, and did not believe that they were created by Providence to dig, delve, and plow for the benefit of Great Britain."

We may fairly assume that the view which the British ex-colonial secretary attributes to Cobden was once generally entertained by the people of Great Britain and was most closely adhered to by the learned men of that country, who, in defiance of their own experience and the dictates of reason, had constructed an economic theory the basic idea of which was the erroneous assumption that the manufacturing and commercial supremacy of the British was due to natural causes.

Holding this opinion, it is not strange that Cobden, John Bright, Gladstone, and a host of other free traders whose names and utterances might be recorded should have made the blunder of predicting that our efforts to establish a manufacturing industry would prove fruitless. Had their assumption been justified, their predictions must have been realized, for nothing is more certain than that it is impossible for a people to profitably carry on industries to which they can not adapt themselves or to which the country in which they are operating is not adapted.

But saying a thing does not make it so, and no matter how loudly Richard Cobden and his followers asserted that protection meant trying to raise pineapples under glass, it did not prove that such was the case. The only effect of the foolish charge was to deceive those who made it. It blinded them to what we were doing in this country so thoroughly that they did not wake to the real condition of affairs until they found us dumping the products of our factories into their open markets. Then they woke up, rubbed their eyes, and asked themselves, "What is the matter?"

Long after the output of manufactured articles in this country was greatly in excess of that of the United Kingdom, and even up to the time when it became equal in volume to the combined production of Great Britain and Germany, writers for the British press and authors of books published in England were accustomed to speaking of the United States as an agricultural nation. And when they used the term they were still under the domination of Cobden's idea that Americans "were created by Providence to dig, delve, and plow for the benefit of Great Britain."

They were confirmed in this remarkable belief by the vast quantity of American farm products annually dumped on their shores. They saw so many of the products of our soil that they unthinkingly concluded that we must be devoting ourselves wholly to agriculture. They had been taught by their master that it would be fatal, or at least highly injurious to our true interests as cultivators, to divert any of our capital from the soil, and it did not occur to them that it might be possible for us to have several irons in the fire at once and keep them all at a white heat.

But we did. We made good the protectionist claim that man succeeds best when he depends upon his own efforts. We showed that inexperience and unfitness are not synonymous terms, and we have conclusively proved that there is not a single industry prosecuted in England which we may not hope to carry on with equal or greater success than it is carried on in that country.

It is the glory and triumph of protectionism to have demonstrated that the whole world may be made a workshop, and that mankind need not be dependent upon a little corner of it. The greatest achievement of protectionism is the fact that it has practically taught the Western World that national progress receives its greatest impulse when the people of a country resolve to do for themselves.

It is because the Western World has learned this lesson that the consumptive ability of mankind has been so vastly increased. Had several nations which now occupy a foremost position in the industrial world been content to await the time when their resources would naturally develop themselves there would have been a different story to tell. Had the United States listened to the Cobdenites and depended upon agriculture as its main resource it would in all probability have occupied to-day as insignificant a position commercially as Turkey.

But it refused to accept counsel which virtually bid it fetter its energies. Animated by the spirit of Washington, who advocated industrial independence, Americans as a political expedient resorted to artificial means to accomplish their ends. What they began as a measure of political security they have since continued because it has brought economic gain.

The policy inaugurated by the First Congress has not been adhered to with religious fidelity. There have been several lapses from it, but only for periods long enough to emphasize the conviction which has taken possession of the American mind that it is essential to safeguard the home market for the domestic producer in order to assure to the producing and consuming masses the greatest degree of prosperity.

During the years in which protection has been most rigidly adhered to the country has made its greatest gains in productivity. In these years have been built up the enormous industries the existence of which refute the vain assumption of the free trader that protection proves a hindrance to advancement.

Within the past thirty years, while the free traders of Great Britain and the United States have been proclaiming that manufacturing could never succeed in a country hampered by protective duties, there has been developed an industry the volume of whose output exceeds that of Germany and Great Britain combined.

In 1870 the value of the manufactured products of the United States was

\$4,232,325,442; in 1900 the colossal total of \$13,039,279,566 was reached. Nor was this enormous production attained at the expense of agriculture. The free trader assured us that any artificial stimulus applied to the development of manufactures would impede the profitable use of our soil, but we have seen concurrently with the growth of our factories such an enlargement of farming operations within our borders as was never witnessed before in any country on the globe.

Had protection resulted in paralyzing agriculture in the United States as free trade did that industry in Great Britain, the American advocates of the promotion of production might have hesitated. But when they saw the predictions of the Cobdenites falsified by the event; when they saw American agriculture expanding year after year, the rate of increase impeded only by the inability of the world to consume the products of our farms at a price that would pay to raise them, protectionists were profoundly convinced that whatever might result from the policy of diversifying resources, it could not possibly be injury to agriculture.

That conviction can not be disturbed so long as the census discloses a continuous increase in the value of farm property and products as it has decade after decade since protection has been the nation's policy. In 1870 the farms of the United States were valued at \$3,944,857,749, in 1900 at \$20,514,001,838; in the same years the annual value of farm products increased from \$1,958,038,927 to \$3,764,177,706.

When we inquire into the details of the American farming industry we find a state of affairs the very reverse of that which the Cobdenites predicted and exactly the opposite of that produced by the free-trade policy in the United Kingdom. In the latter country the tiller is abandoning the soil; in the United States the number of farms and farmers increases steadily. In 1870 there were 2,650,985 farms in this country; in 1900 the number was 5,735,372. Thirty years ago the United Kingdom had six or seven million more sheep than it has now; the number of sheep in the United States increased from 40,853,000 to 62,069,091 during the same period.

In the thirty years during which our manufacturing industry has made such enormous progress as to astonish the world, agriculture, too, has kept pace. We have increased our output of pig iron from 1,665,179 tons in 1870 to over 17,000,000 tons in 1902; but while the men in the foundries and factories were accomplishing this result the farmers also made an equally astonishing record. In 1870 they had 25,484,100 cattle; in 1902 the number was 61,424,599. In 1870 the number of horses was 8,248,800; in 1902, despite the introduction of the trolley, the bicycle, and the automobile, the number of horses had increased to 16,531,224. We now raise enough swine to provide the world with bacon and hams, the number increasing from 26,751,400 in 1870 to 56,982,142 in 1901. Our production of wool during the period increased from 162,000,000 pounds to 316,341,032 pounds; of wheat, from 235,884,700 bushels to 670,063,008 bushels; of corn, from 1,094,255,000 bushels to 2,523,648,312 bushels, and of cotton, from 4,347,006 bales to 10,680,600 bales.

No other nation can make such a showing as this. Had we hearkened to the free trader, however, it would not have been made. Our agricultural development has been stimulated by the utilization of our manifold resources.

Had we not endeavored to make use of all the blessings of nature the American people would not have conquered their continental area in a little more than half a century. It is because we have devoted ourselves to the extraction of our coal, our iron and our copper ores, and to the work of fashioning them into finished products that we have been able to cover our immense land with a network of railways which have helped the farmer to bring his products to near-by markets.

Had we not diversified our industries, had we been content to raise agricultural products for peoples in distant lands, we should not to-day number our farms by the million. In 1900, as already stated, there were 5,735,372 farms in the United States. This tremendous increase from 2,650,985 in 1870 was made possible by the urban growth of the country. And that result is directly due to the creation of a manufacturing industry which has dotted the country with cities, towns, and villages, whose inhabitants form the nearby customers of the American farmer, and save to him the cost of transportation of his product to distant markets.

It is upon the development of its resources and the attendant results that the sensible lover of his country should concentrate his attention, and not upon the figures of external trade, although, as has already been shown, protectionists may challenge comparisons on that point. The volume of things we sell to foreigners and those we buy from them is insignificant when measured against what we produce for domestic consumption.

In every field of production the output is mainly for our own use. At most times we are so prosperous that we can afford to consume the bulk of our own products, although we produce on a scale undreamed of elsewhere.

Four-fifths of the products of our farms are used to feed Americans or provide them with raw materials for manufacturing purposes; only six or seven millions of the 251,673,675 tons of coal mined in 1902 were shipped abroad, and these exports were offset in large measure by imports of mineral fuel from nearby countries; we used sixteen-sevenths of our vast output of pig iron and the major part of the 268,000 tons of copper mined in 1902. Our mineral production in the last year was valued at \$1,086,529,321. Over a billion dollars' worth of this enormous output stayed at home to contribute to American comfort and add to American wealth.

There is no conceivable test to which protection can be subjected that will not make a triumphant showing for the policy. Even in the particular in which we were supposed to be most deficient—foreign commerce—we have made greater progress than the United Kingdom, the great exemplar of free trade.

Our external commerce has grown both relatively and absolutely more rapidly than that of Great Britain. We export more domestic produce than that country, and it may be confidently predicted that in less than ten years our external commerce will vastly exceed that of any other nation, although our imports, in the nature of things, are not likely to increase with the same rapidity as those of dependent nations.

Our exports of manufactured articles, despite the assertion of free traders that we could never hope to compete in manufacturing, have increased from \$22,678,814 in 1875 to \$406,641,401 in 1902, and our general exports, which were \$10.83 per capita in the first-named year, rose to \$17.16 per capita in the last. In 1875 our exports of all kinds aggregated \$559,237,638; in 1902, \$1,535,481,861.

But it is not exports or imports which tell the story of the well being and doing of the people of a country. That is to be searched for in other figures and in other testimony. Such facts as these, which are drawn from the Statistical Abstract, proclaim the truth in trumpet tones. In 1870 the per capita consumption of our products of raw cotton was 14.10 pounds; in 1902 it was 25.65 pounds. In 1870 we consumed 4.69 bushels of wheat per capita; in 1902 the domestic consumption was 6.50 bushels per capita. In 1870 we used 36.2 pounds of sugar per capita; in 1902 it required 72.8 pounds per capita to meet our wants. In 1870 our consumption of coffee was 7.91 pounds per capita; in 1902, 13.37 pounds. In 1870 it took 5.73 pounds of wool per capita to satisfy our requirements; in 1902 we needed 6.07 pounds per capita.

Thirty years ago the amount of money per capita in circulation was \$18.75; in 1902 it was \$32.45, every dollar of it good for its face. In 1870 our per capita debt was \$56.81; it was only \$12.27 per capita last year. The annual interest charge, which was \$2.83 in 1870, was only 35 cents per capita in 1902. In 1870 we spent \$6.62 per capita on our schools; in 1902 the expenditures reached \$10.32

per capita. The use of the post-office is a fair index of a people's progress and prosperity. The revenue from this source was 51 cents per capita in 1871 and \$1.54 in 1902. In 1870 the deposits of the people in savings banks aggregated \$650,745,442; in 1902 they footed up \$2,750,677,290.

And so the table may be made to run on indefinitely, and its tenor will always be the same. But why spin it out? What need is there to extol our exploits when the whole world is pointing the finger of admiration at them and conceding that they are due to protection? Why argue the case when free-trade England virtually confesses her error by agitating for a change of her fiscal system? Why think it necessary to warn Americans against a course which has produced this state of affairs in Great Britain, testified to by the London Chronicle, which printed the facts related to impress its readers that English workingmen are hovering so close to the borderland of starvation that a slight rise in the price of foodstuffs would produce that awful result? Here is the testimony furnished by the London Chronicle in its issue of October 10, 1903:

"In the present controversy concrete instances are more valuable than any number of theories. Here is a London workingman's budget, supplied by Mr. Percy Alden, who has known the man for fourteen years, as a teetotaler, a friendly society man, and a trades-unionist. He has a wife and four children. His average earnings are 18s. a week, and out of these he pays—rent, 4s. 3d.; bread, 2s. 6d.; meat, 1s. 6d.; vegetables, 1s. 5d.; coal, 1s. 6d. Every farthing is of importance to this man, and to hundreds of thousands of laborers in London whose earnings are not more than 18s. a week on the average. The dock laborers average only 12s. a week. Even an addition of 1 penny a day to the food bill would put a strain on these workmen."

Compare this statement and the condition of affairs it reveals with that disclosed by a bulletin issued by the United States Bureau of Labor on November 13, 1903, on the cost of living of workingmen's families in this country, in which it was shown that of 2,500 workingmen's families in thirty-three States from which data were obtained the average income per family was \$27.19, of which \$26.90 was expended for food, the average size of the family being 5.31 persons. In a country in which food of all kinds is much cheaper than in the United Kingdom the American workingman spends more money upon his table alone than the bulk of British workers earn. This means that the American worker does not deny himself luxuries utterly unknown to his fellows across the sea, and that, after he has satisfied the disposition to live in comfort, he is still able to save a tidy little sum annually, a fact eloquently testified to by the swelling deposits of American savings banks.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN].

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I heartily indorse what the gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. FITZGERALD] has so ably and forcibly stated regarding the accusations made against the fair name of the city of New York by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS].

The infamous slanders uttered by the gentleman that the municipal campaign ending in the triumphant election of the Democratic ticket in November last was waged on the platform of "free rum and free immorality" are maliciously false.

The statements are unworthy of a Member of this House or of any respectable man.

It makes a native of the State of Pennsylvania, of which I am proud, blush for his fellow-citizens of that great Commonwealth.

I indorse the refutation of the charges made by the gentleman from New York.

The matter under consideration is one of importance to the nation. Full and free discussion of the subject must tend to a satisfactory solution of the questions. I desire to occupy the time of the House for a brief space on the Panama Canal matter.

There is no doubt of the feelings of the great majority of the American people on this proposition. That a canal should be constructed where it can be done the cheapest and quickest goes without saying. The masses of the people demand it, and the Democratic party would welcome its speedy accomplishment, but let that result be brought about in a manner befitting the dignity of this great and powerful nation and through methods consistent with a due observance of the rules of international law as they should be applied by one country to another in this age of enlightenment and civilization.

The consensus of opinion everywhere favors canals as the cheapest method of transporting freight and as competitors of the railroads of the country. In my own State the people, in November last, by a majority of a quarter of a million, decided to expend \$101,000,000 in the improvement and betterment of the canals. In my own district the Government is slowly but surely constructing the Harlem River Ship Canal, connecting the Hudson River and Long Island Sound, two great waterways. When completed, as it should be within five years, it will be one of the most important canals in the country. Many of you now within the sound of my voice will live to see a great ship canal built from New York City to the Lakes. This will become an absolute necessity if this nation is to successfully compete with the Canadian water transportation.

New York State is preparing the way in this matter by improving her system of canals. Other States should follow her example, and a revival of interest in nature's methods of carrying freight cheaply may be confidently expected.

The Panama question is one of the signs of the times of such a revival.

The agitation will tend to kindle anew the interest of the people in the matter of water communication, by restoring the canals of the country that have been so long neglected, perhaps through

other corporate influences. In many cases these corporations have secured control of canals only to abandon or to use them as tenders in their carrying trade. The people of the State of New York have decided that this kind of business must cease. Hence the immense vote in favor of the improvement of the canals.

A few words about the Panama Canal, which is now a leading question before the people of this country and will form one of the principal planks in the platforms of the great political parties in the coming national conventions. As a Democrat, with a majority of my party, I am heartily in favor of building a canal to connect the oceans. The commerce and business interests demand that it be constructed as speedily as possible. The shorter distance and lesser cost makes the Panama Canal seemingly the favorite route for the great waterway to be built.

In my judgment, however, the manner in which the new Republic of Panama was recognized in order to carry out certain premature plans was a monumental mistake. Why so much haste and apparent secrecy? Why was not the law-making power of the country consulted? Nothing certainly would have been lost by a little diplomacy being practiced toward a sister republic. I am loath to believe that the Chief Executive, whom I esteem as a man and a citizen, based upon a personal acquaintance with him for many years, would be guilty of what on the face appears to be a violation of the laws of nations, of right, and of justice.

Not only as Democrats, but especially as citizens, do we deplore the methods adopted to bring about the results achieved. The principle laid down in 1861, and which cost this country so much blood and treasure to maintain, should not have been so ruthlessly and hastily cast aside. If the principle of secession was wrong then, it is equally wrong now.

The question of environment and of the exigencies of the case has nothing to do with the right or wrong of the matter, because no wrong can make a right.

Is it right to claim that this is a case where the end justifies the means?

The unparalleled and unprecedented display of unexampled methods is open to the sharpest criticism, and the thinking American people, regardless of party affiliation, are discussing this matter. Most seriously in this connection I predict that it will be longer than the present or any hasty canal builder can calculate for the permanent completion of the canal to admit the passage of ocean shipping. Why, then, such unseemly haste? Why imperil the good name of the Republic that in its entire history has stood for justice and fair play? Is it not a mistake anyway to attempt to build the canal of such magnitude on the lock system?

Many engineers predict failure for the canal as contemplated and urge the sea-level plan, doing away with all artificial means.

To prove that I am not speaking as a partisan, I quote from that stalwart, conservative Republican paper, the New York Tribune, under date of December 28, 1903.

The Clerk read as follows:

PANAMA REVOLUTION—EFFECTED BY A MUNICIPAL COUNCIL—PEOPLE TOOK NO PART.

PANAMA, R. P., December 16, 1903.

The territory known to the Colombian Federation as the Department of Panama, and now embraced by the Republic, is a long, narrow strip of land extending in a generally easterly and westerly direction. It is about 475 miles long, measured in a straight line, and varies in width from about 47 miles, between Colon and Panama, to something more than a hundred miles at its eastern extremity and along the eighty-first parallel of longitude. On the west it is bounded by Costa Rica, with which nation there is a long-standing boundary dispute, while on the east the Gulf of Darien and the Atrato River mark its separation from the South American mainland and the great body of the Colombian Republic.

The coast line, considerably more than 1,000 miles in length, is rough and broken. The surface of the country is generally mountainous, although immense swamps and stretches of treeless upland are frequent. Except along the coast, the country is almost entirely uninhabited, all of the towns and cities of any consequence being located next the sea or very near to it. In the interior are bands of Indians, two or three of the more important tribes of which have rarely been communicated with. Vast areas in the extreme eastern and western portion of the country remain wholly unexplored, and the knowledge of what the interior holds is most limited. In this territory there are supposed to live, including Indians, about 300,000 persons. No attempt has ever been made to take a census of the population, so the figure named can only be taken as a more or less accurate estimate.

This territory while it stood in the Colombian Federation as the Department of Panama, and at the time of the secession, was divided into seven provinces, Chiriqui, Los Santos, Varaguas, Panama, Colon, Bocas del Toro, and Cocola. Each of these provinces was governed by a governor, subordinate to the departmental governor. Each had its council, and each was entitled to representation—by senators and representatives—in the two branches of the Colombian Congress, which sat at Bogota. It will be seen from this explanation that, no matter how corrupt, inefficient, and oppressive the old order of things may have been, the fabric of the State was complete in all of its details, the governmental structure having been carried down as perfectly in theory as it is in our own Union.

It follows from this, as a natural presumption, that in the secessionist movement all of these provinces should have had a voice. It happens, however, that, natural as that presumption may be, it is wholly groundless in this instance. The natural corollary of the last statement is that the Republic as it stands does not represent the people of Panama—speaking now of the entire

Department—and such is actually the case. It may represent them in the sense that the sentiment of all the people concurs in what has been done; but it is an indisputable fact that outside of the city of Panama the people of the new Republic had no voice whatever in the establishment of the Republic.

PEOPLE NOT IN THE SECRET.

The secessionist movement began with three men and was executed under the supervision of those three and four others, the seven working under the advice and counsel of four Americans. Before the coup d'état others were, perforce, taken into the secret, but so closely were the plans guarded that those who were really in the secret and knew definitely the details might be counted on the fingers of the two hands. This brings us to the revolution itself and introduces the strangest of all the contradictions discoverable in connection with the birth of this national infant. The uprising took place on the 3d day of November, being initiated by the arrest of Generals Tovar and Amaya and Governor Obaldia, which took place in the city of Panama. That city knew, of course, what had occurred the moment the arrests were effected, but Colon was kept in ignorance of the secession until the following day. It was on the 4th of the month that the public meeting was held in the Cathedral Plaza, Panama, the independence of the Republic proclaimed, and the declaration of independence—or manifestation, as they call it here—was signed.

Bearing in mind the fact that seven men, aided by the soldiers and others whose support for the movement had been purchased with dollars, were alone responsible for the sudden revolution in the political status of Panama, one may wander away down a stretch of not uninteresting inquiries. Were the people of the other provinces consulted as to what it was proposed by the secessionists to do? They were not. Were the people, speaking in general terms, of the provinces of Colon and Panama let into the secret? They were not. They knew, by general rumor, that a revolution was on the tapis; but they had not been consulted nor their advice asked as to the wisdom or unwisdom of what was contemplated. Was a provisional congress, composed of delegates from the several provinces, held for the purpose of debating the project and framing a bill of separation? Nothing of the kind was ever thought of. How, then, was the affair carried through? In this simple and unique manner:

The little band of secessionists let the members of the city council of Panama into their secret late in October, when it became evident that a blow would have to be struck very soon or forever withheld. These city councilmen—eleven in number—were willing to further the project, so that when the public meeting was held in the cathedral plaza, Panama, on November 4, they were all in attendance. They, too, were the first to sign the declaration of independence, and immediately after that formality they adjourned across the street to the municipal building and went into session behind closed doors. Their first act then was to pass the declaration, which had already been engrossed in a book of record, and to append their names to the engrossed copy. This done, the city council appointed the three members of the provisional governing junta, authorizing them to take charge of the affairs of the new Republic. The junta assembled at once and named the members of the provisional cabinet, and the new Republic became a fact. On the same day Porfirio Mollendes had taken charge of affairs at Colon as provisional governor appointed by the junta; but outside of the cities of Panama and Colon, and along the line of the Panama Railroad, the people of the new Republic were in entire ignorance of the fact that they were no longer subjects of Colombia.

DONE BY A MUNICIPAL COUNCIL.

It seems almost incredible that the municipal council of a city of fewer than 25,000 people should take unto themselves the right to create a republic out of a territory equal in area to the State of Indiana; but that was what was actually done in this case. Instead of a provincial congress, the city council of Panama passed the act of independence. Every legislative formality incident to the creation of this Republic was performed by these city councilmen, no portion of the new Republic except the city of Panama having a voice, by representation, in what was done. Nor has any other portion of the new Republic had such a voice to this day.

No congress had been called to ratify the secession, nor has any one of the seven provinces been requested to assemble, in council or by mass meeting, to pass an act of ratification. There might be a parallel for this procedure if the municipal council of one of our own cities—Indianapolis, for instance, since the area of Indiana is about the same as that of Panama—should pass an ordinance declaring the State of Indiana a free and independent nation; but the average American imagination is impotent to summon such a spectacle as that into being. But it was that very thing which was done here when the municipal council of Panama legislated for the 300,000 inhabitants of this territory in severing all their obligations of fealty to Colombia, making them free and independent, and doing these things without consulting any of those 300,000 inhabitants, save an insignificant minority, restricted in numbers practically to the original band of secessionists.

It is not intended by the foregoing to impeach or to compromise the existence of the new Republic. Such an attempt would be fatuous, for the new Republic is actual. The purpose is merely to show the incongruity of the procedure, although no Panamanian can be brought to see that there is anything irrational, incongruous, or contradictory in the fact that a Republic has been created by an ordinance passed by a city council. The inability of the Panamanians to realize what impresses Americans as little short of ludicrous is doubtless due to the fact that measures have been taken, though not by legislative steps, to bring the whole territory to accept the new form of government. Immediately after the creation of the Republic and the appointment of the junta by the city council of Panama the junta took steps to this end.

Emissaries were sent into the different provinces to proclaim the establishment of the Republic. These emissaries were effective orators, as are nearly all the people of these southern countries. They toured along both coasts, east and west, and stopped at the principal cities. Their coming was unannounced in these cities, which, until the arrival of the emissaries, were without knowledge of the fact that Panama had seceded from Colombia. David, Chiriqui, Santiago, and other cities and towns along and adjacent to the Pacific coast, Bocas del Toro, Nombre de Dios, Porto Bello, etc., on the Caribbean shores, were visited in this way, and reports have been received from all the emissaries, although some of them have not yet returned to Panama.

PROCESS OF PROCLAMATION.

In each of these cities the emissary would, upon his arrival, employ the local band of musicians. Taking a stand in the principal plaza, he would draw his crowd by the band's efforts, and when a number sufficient for his purpose had assembled he would read the declaration of independence. Following the reading would come his harangue, the burden of which was that the establishment of the Republic meant the construction of the ship canal by the United States across the Isthmus, and that the construction of this canal meant that the United States would have to pay to the Republic a sum of money sufficient to make all of the people rich and prosperous. This was done in every instance, and the orator's argument, being addressed to a people among whom poverty in its most abject form prevails, never failed to elicit enthusiastic responses in approval of what had been done. The busi-

ness of the emissary was then to report to the junta that the people of that town accepted the Republic and gloried in its creation.

This procedure has been followed in treating with all of the people of the Isthmus. In a more formal manner some of the provinces have communicated with the junta through their governors. Support has been tendered in this way of men and arms to support the Republic's independence, and while it is not pretended that anything like all of the people of the Republic have been communicated with, the assurances through the emissaries and the governors have been sufficient in number to carry the conviction that the people of Panama generally approve the severance of their relations with Colombia. If they lack patriotism of their own, they certainly have no love for Colombia and are glad to escape her dominion, their willingness extending to ready acceptance after the event of all that was done by the city council of Panama, which enjoys the unique distinction of having by a simple ordinance created a republic, so far as the formal structure of this Republic is concerned. From this it will appear, and this is the indisputable fact, that the Republic of Panama exists to-day, in its governmental features, because it is unopposed. The junta is governing without opposition, and while the allegiance of none of the people, except the soldiers and sailors, has been pledged to the new Republic, the junta constitutes a governing body de jure because there is no dispute as to its authority.

Into the situation created under and by these contradictory conditions and methods there enter several elements of danger. The first and most important of these is delay in giving to the Government the form of more certain acceptability to the people. The people are acquiescent now, because the condition is new and novel; but how long they will remain so is problematical. The conviction is universal among them that the United States will begin actual canal operations at once. Everybody is expecting money to flow freely within the next few days, because they have been encouraged to believe that the establishment of the Republic means the immediate beginning of work on the canal. This is seen in divers ways. Hotels whose bars have been closed since the cessation of canal work by the French—fourteen years ago—are preparing to open them within a few weeks.

Owners of renting property in Panama and Colon, who have accepted nominal rents from the natives and nondescripts, are turning these people out of their premises in the expectation that within a few days there will be such an influx of Americans as to send rents booming. Speculation of every sort is rife, based upon this belief, and upon every tongue is the slogan, "The canal is coming." To Panamanians who saw and participated in the riot of French extravagance and corruption the fact that "the canal is coming" means flush times; and Panama can hardly restrain itself until the moment of actual operations arrives.

REACTION WILL COME.

From this condition there is certain to be a reaction. The United States will not begin canal operations for months, for if the advice of men like Admiral Walker, Col. William Henry Black, the army sanitary expert, and other Americans now here is accepted, months must elapse, even after the ratification of the treaty by the United States Senate, before sanitary conditions can be so improved as to permit the work of canal construction to begin. This means that a season of dire disappointment, inviting to dissatisfaction with the Government, is certain to prevail; and facing this prospect the Government lacks proper recognition by the people.

All thought of creating a government by the formal adoption of a constitution and the election of administrative officials waits upon Dr. Manuel Amador's return from the States; but the wiser heads believe a serious mistake is being made in thus delaying. The demand that a constitutional convention, with representatives from all the provinces, be called is becoming insistent, the more far-seeing among the Panamanians believing that it is essential that the republican government be given a more substantial foundation and something upon which it can more certainly claim the adherence of the people than is possible through the mere fact that it exists now, because it is without opposition.

Another disturbing factor, and one bound to assert itself sooner or later, is the conflict over the relations between church and state. The policy of the Conservatives—who for years governed the country—was that the state should support the church. The Liberals opposed this, and the sentiment among the leaders of the new Republic is that, while there should be no interference with the established religion—the Roman Catholic—the church must look to its communicants and not to the state for support. Among a people so poverty stricken as are the Panamanians the support of the church would mean the imposition of a serious burden, and, as the padres are sure to encourage the people, when the new policy shall have been actually instituted, that they are being imposed upon, the religious unrest will assuredly provoke problems with which the Government will have to deal.

Already there are rumors of dissatisfaction. Jealousies are beginning to crop out among those who stood shoulder to shoulder in the creation of the Republic. The sentiment prevalent a few days ago that Dr. Amador should be the unopposed choice of the people for the first President of the Republic is beginning to modify, and an Arango party, fostered by powerful influences, is coming into existence; and when it is remembered that here political campaigns are carried on in the form of revolutions, there is every necessity for the United States to insist upon immediate action toward the formation of a suitable government chosen by the people and to which all the people will give their allegiance.

The Republic of Panama being nonexistent so far as the people are concerned, and existing only because the provisional junta's authority has not been disputed, it is required, to correct this contradictory condition and to enable the serious problems which will shortly arise through disappointment and religious unrest to be properly and effectively handled, that a government be quickly established upon the consent and free participation of the people. Until that is done the Republic of Panama will continue as an anomaly, secure only in the fact that the interests of the United States are such that that Government will not permit this one to be destroyed, either by invasion from without or by disturbances within.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, from this it would seem that the whole scheme was revolutionary and without justification. Does the fact that there is a goodly portion of \$40,000,000 to be divided among the schemers in the city of Panama have any bearing on the matter? No one for a moment would connect the Chief Executive of this country with even a suspicion of having anything to do with this monetary part of the scheme. But the manner in which the Chief Magistrate endeavored to secure the canal is one that would set a dangerous precedent, violate the golden rule that ought to obtain among the nations of the earth, and subject us to the charge that in our desire to acquire territory from foreign nations we have departed from the wholesome law of honesty and fair dealing only to resort to the dangerous and unholy doctrine that "might makes right."

It would seem unnecessary to employ a large naval force not to maintain treaty rights, but to force a sister republic to yield one of its important Commonwealths. Other canals of great magnitude, notably the Suez, were built without dishonor, and why not the one on the Western Hemisphere? Would this action have been taken had the territory been under the jurisdiction of England, France, or Germany? If not, then why was it done to a weak nation, entitled to all the rights and courtesies of those named? [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GROSVENOR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, several messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I avail myself of the latitude allowed in the debate upon this bill to call the attention of the Members of Congress, and especially the attention of the members of the Committee on the Library, to the bill which I introduced in the Fifty-seventh Congress, and which I have again introduced in this Congress, appropriating \$10,000 to inclose and beautify the grounds and repair the monument on the Moores Creek battlefield, North Carolina. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to expend the sum of \$10,000, through the governor of the State of North Carolina and the Moores Creek Monumental Association, for the purpose of repairing the monument erected on Moores Creek battlefield, North Carolina, and for inclosing and beautifying the grounds around the same. The Committee on the Library made a favorable report upon this bill during the last Congress, reducing the appropriation, however, from the sum of \$10,000 to the sum of \$5,000.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which we are debating, which is known as the great salary bill of the Government, carries the sum total of appropriations of more than \$28,000,000. While we are making these large appropriations for the salaries of Government officials and the expenses of our Government, it seems to me that it would be well for us not to forget the memory of great men and great events in our country's history, and that some small share at least of the large appropriations made by our Government annually should be given and used for the purpose of commemorating the distinguished patriots, soldiers, and statesmen of our country, and great battles and historical events. The lives of noble patriots and the memory of decisive battles and events are incentives to higher aspirations in our individual and national life.

Plutarch says it was a custom of the Romans to erect monuments to the most celebrated and distinguished of Romans, and to carve upon each monument the record of the illustrious achievements of him in whose honor a monument was erected. These monuments were set upon a hill and the Roman youth were bidden by their parents to study the lives of their distinguished ancestors as they saw them carved in enduring marble, and they were told that they, too, would have a life monument erected to them and the record of their life work carved upon it if they emulated the virtues and practiced the examples of those who had gone before.

All the nations of the world, I think, commemorate by statues and monuments those events in their history which have led to independence or marked epochs in their national life. And the United States of America, the greatest nation upon earth, in resources, in wealth, in population, and in everything which goes to make a great and free people, should not neglect to honor the great men and great events in its history, because, forsooth, it may add some little to the sum total of the appropriations of the Government. We are expending millions of dollars for other purposes, some of them not half so meritorious as the erection of monuments and the marking and preservation of battle grounds.

North Carolina has always been a modest State. Her motto is, "Esse quam videri," "To be, rather than to seem." Nevertheless, within the borders of this great State—which I have the honor to represent in part in Congress—have been reared some of the nation's most distinguished men, and there have occurred some of the greatest events in our country's history. I shall enter upon no encomium upon North Carolina. In the language of the immortal Webster, speaking of his State, Massachusetts, "She needs none." The history of my State, while not so well known as the history of New England, is inseparable from the early settlement of our country and the history of the war of the Revolution.

It is needless for me to recall to your minds that the first settlement of the Anglo-Saxon upon the shores of the Western Continent was in North Carolina, upon Roanoke Island, in the year

1584, under Sir Walter Raleigh, after whom the capital of our State is named; and there occurred the first Christian baptism in the United States. Although one of the last of the colonies to ratify the Constitution, not doing so until the first ten amendments thereto, known as the "Bill of Rights," had been adopted, North Carolina was one of the foremost and staunchest of the colonies in the Revolutionary struggle and furnished more than her quota of fighting men and eminent commanders, not only in that war but in all subsequent wars in which this country has been involved. During the Revolution North Carolina was frequently overrun by British invaders, who, however, were repelled with great slaughter whenever an engagement took place. The battles of Alamance, Moores Creek, Guilford Court House, and Kings Mountain attest the fighting qualities of "Tarheels" in the Revolution.

During the Mexican war the contribution of North Carolina to the National Army was largely in excess of the average, both in numbers and quality. In the war with Spain one of her sons, Worth Bagley, was the first officer killed, giving up his young life as a sacrifice to the nation, falling at Cardenas, wrapped in the folds of Old Glory. And North Carolina gave also to the nation that gallant soldier, William E. Shipp, who in that same war fought gallantly side by side with your Republican President at San Juan Hill. [Applause.] Upon the battlefield in every war the record of North Carolina is among the foremost. But I rose, Mr. Chairman, not for the purpose of eulogizing North Carolina—she needs no eulogy; her deeds, her worthy deeds alone, and the name and fame of her sons have rendered her immortal—but I rose, in the limited time allotted me, to call especial attention to the battle of Moores Creek, fought during the Revolution upon North Carolina soil, and I must not be diverted from this purpose. All true-hearted Americans take a just pride in the glorious achievements of New England and the great battles fought upon her soil, and the memory of Concord, Bunker Hill, and Lexington—

Where once the embattled farmers stood
And fired the shot heard round the world—

are a part of the glorious heritage of the whole country. What the battle of Lexington was to the northern colonies the battle of Moores Creek was to the southern colonies. The British were preparing to invade the province of North Carolina and suppress the spirit of independence, which was more forward in this province than in her sisters. The Tory Highland Scotchmen living at Cross Creek, under General MacDonald, were endeavoring to reach the Cape Fear for a junction with Sir Henry Clinton and Lord William Campbell with a large force, who, with Lord Cornwallis, expected every hour, were to begin the subjugation of the province, when, on the 27th of February, 1776, the Tories encountered at Moores Creek, about 18 miles from Wilmington, the American forces, under Colonel Caswell and Colonel Lillington. A battle ensued, the Americans being intrenched south of the bridge, and the first glorious victory was won in the South.

General MacDonald was the husband of the celebrated Flora MacDonald, a noble and beautiful girl, who saved the life of Charles Edward Stuart, "Bonnie Prince Charlie," after the defeat at Culloden.

Lossing, in his Pictorial Field Book of the Revolution, says that General MacDonald, who lived at Cross Creek, now Fayetteville, N. C., on commission of the royal governor, had gathered around the British ensign an army of Tories 1,800 strong. Col. James Moore, of New Hanover, being apprised of this gathering of Royalists, marched toward Cross Creek and encamped about 12 miles south of MacDonald's headquarters. MacDonald, being informed of the expected arrival of Sir Henry Clinton and Lord William Campbell at Cape Fear River, resolved to avoid an engagement that might prove disastrous and attempted to join Governor Martin and his friends at Wilmington.

At midnight he decamped with his followers, crossed the Cape Fear River, and pushed on at a rapid pace over swollen streams, rough hills, and deep morasses, hotly pursued by Colonel Moore. On the third day of his march he approached Moores Creek, a tributary of South River, one of the principal tributaries of the Cape Fear River, and came to the camp of Colonels Caswell and Lillington, who, with the minutemen of Dobbs, Craven, Johnston, and Wake counties, N. C., and battalions from Newbern and Wilmington, in all about 1,000 strong, were out in search of the Tory army. Says Lossing:

The minutemen of the Neuse region—the officers wearing silver crescents upon their hats inscribed with the stirring words "Liberty or death"—were in front, and Colonel Moore, with his regulars, were close upon his rear. To fly was impossible; to fight was his only alternative. The patriots laid upon their arms all night, ready at a signal to meet the foe. At early dawn the Scottish bagpipes were heard, and the notes of a bugle ringing upon the frosty air called the 1,800 Tories to arms. General MacDonald being too ill to leave his tent, Captain McLeod led the Tory forces. He was killed at the beginning of the battle, and Capt. John Campbell soon fell, mortally wounded. Lieutenant Slocum, of the patriot army, with a small detachment, forded the stream and fell with vigor upon the rear of the Tories, and the Scotchmen were routed and many prisoners taken. Among the latter was General

MacDonald. That evening the united forces of the patriots slept soundly upon the field of victory. Soon after the battle the royal governor, Martin, abdicated and took refuge on board a British ship, and royal government in North Carolina ceased forever. The effect of the victory was to give the American soldiers boldness and to frustrate the schemes to subjugate the southern colonies. It stemmed the tide of British invasion in the colonies in the South, gave renewed confidence to the American soldiers, and compelled their oppressors to respect their skill and prowess.

At the battle of Alamance, in advance of all other colonies, North Carolina called upon the nation to resist to the bitter end British tyranny, and lighted the fires of patriotism which resulted in the independence of the country. At the battle of Moores Creek North Carolina stemmed the tide of British invasion in the southern colonies and gave fresh hope to the patriots in the North.

Mr. Chairman, this historic spot should be properly preserved. The report says the monument was erected by private subscription in the year 1857 by citizens of Wilmington and vicinity. The land is owned by the Moores Creek Monumental Association, incorporated under the laws of North Carolina, which has undertaken the task entirely as a labor of love and patriotism to rescue from decay the monument, which is crumbling, and clear and beautify the grounds, which have grown up in trees and shrubbery, that the scene of the battle may be preserved and that the monument may be an altar of freedom, where we may reenkindle the fires of patriotism should they ever begin to expire.

And I hope, Mr. Chairman, it will be the policy of Congress and of the Committee on the Library of this House, in accordance with the traditions of our great nation, to preserve the history not only of this important battle, but also of all similar great historical events. [Applause.]

By permission of the House, I will incorporate in my remarks a copy of my bill, with the report of the Committee thereon made at the last Congress.

A bill (H. R. 2509) to appropriate \$10,000 to inclose and beautify the grounds and repair the monument on the Moores Creek battlefield, North Carolina.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to pay to the governor of the State of North Carolina the sum of \$10,000, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be by him transferred to the Moores Creek Monumental Association, incorporated under the laws of North Carolina, for the purpose of repairing the monument already erected on said battlefield and for inclosing and beautifying the same.

The Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8731) to appropriate \$10,000 to inclose and beautify the grounds and repair the monument on the Moores Creek battlefield, North Carolina, beg leave to submit the following report and recommend that said bill do pass with an amendment:

Strike out in line 5 the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "five."

This bill as amended is to appropriate \$5,000 for the repair of the Moores Creek Monument and to improve its grounds. This monument was erected by private subscription in the year 1857 by the citizens of Wilmington, N. C., and the vicinity. The land is owned by the Moores Creek Monumental Association, incorporated under the laws of North Carolina, which has undertaken the task entirely as a labor of love and patriotism to rescue from decay the monument, which is crumbling, and clear and beautify the grounds, which have grown up in trees and shrubbery, that the scene of the battle may be preserved, and that the monument may be an altar of freedom where we may reenkindle the fires of patriotism should they ever begin to expire.

What the battle of Lexington was to the northern colonies the battle of Moores Creek was to the southern colonies. The British were preparing to invade the province of North Carolina and to suppress the spirit of independence, which was more forward in this province than in her sisters.

The Tory Highland Scotchmen, living at Cross Creek, under General MacDonald, were endeavoring to reach the Cape Fear for a junction with Sir Henry Clinton and Lord William Campbell with a large force, who, with Lord Cornwallis, expected every hour, were to begin the subjugation of the province; when, on the 27th of February, 1776, the Tories encountered at Moores Creek bridge, about 18 miles from Wilmington, the American forces under Colonels Caswell and Lillington. A battle ensued, the Americans being intrenched south of the bridge, and the first glorious victory was won in the South. The Americans lost but one man, the slain of the enemy being computed at 50; 850 prisoners captured, and the trophies of the day being 1,500 excellent rifles, 350 guns, 150 swords and dirks, 2 medicine chests, 13 wagons, horses, and harness, and a box of English guineas worth \$75,000.

The effect of the victory was to give to the American soldiers to enter upon a seven years' war military experience and an intelligent confidence in themselves. It compelled the haughty oppressors to respect their skill and prowess. It frustrated the great scheme to subjugate North Carolina, and emboldened the people of this province, who already in Mecklenburg had declared their independence in mass meeting, to meet in a provincial congress on the 12th of April, 1776, and pass a unanimous resolution appointing delegates to the Continental Congress and instructing them "to concur with the delegates of the other colonies in declaring independence and forming foreign alliances," thus in advance of all other colonies calling upon the nation—the United Provinces—to sanction by their united voice what had already been so nobly done by a portion of her citizens.

Your committee, therefore, believing that this historic spot should be properly preserved, respectfully recommend the passage of the bill as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the bill and report of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to print in connection therewith the bill and report referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, four weeks ago, in a few remarks I then made, I inserted a letter which had been published in a Youngstown, Ohio, paper, in which the writer complained that prosperity, of which we had heard so much, seemed to have flown away from that section of Ohio. I will not again inflict the letter upon the House. He said, in concluding this letter:

If you do not do something soon there will be soup houses in this valley.

This was addressed to the "Creator and preserver of prosperity"—the leader of the Republican party in Ohio—and was prompted undoubtedly by a speech delivered by Senator HANNA at Piqua, Ohio, on October 13, 1903, in which he said:

I want to go on record on this proposition. If by your votes next month you serve notice upon the country that you favor casting aside the safe business principles that have brought the present prosperous conditions, by and by, and it will not be very long, you will be eating at the soup houses again.

I now wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that although but four weeks have elapsed, yet, according to the Cincinnati Times-Star (owned in part, as I am informed, by Governor Taft, the new Secretary of War) of January 5, soup houses have already been established in that city—the second largest city in Ohio. That the situation among the unemployed in Cincinnati is heartrending is evidenced in the headlines which the Times-Star uses. That paper used billboard type across the whole width of the page to announce the fact. It says:

Hundreds on the river front driven by the pangs of hunger to steal bread and meat by wholesale to save their lives—Testimony heartrending to the last word was given by a veteran police officer in court in pleading for the men he had been compelled to arrest, and the judge and prosecutor alike were moved to pity.

We were told upon this floor only a few weeks ago that there is labor in every part of this country for every man who wants a place to work, and there is a compensating wage for everyone who is willing to perform a day's labor, and yet, according to the Cincinnati Times-Star, which has been copied into many of the papers of the country, the judge of the police court there allows criminals to escape because they are starving, and he will not sentence them for stealing bread.

As though this were not distressing enough, the Times-Star two days later printed on its front page four pictures of what they describe as "Pitiful scenes among the destitute." These pictures are labeled: "Interior of the Silver Moon," "At the Mullen Soup House," "At the Hammond Street Station," "One of the worst cases."

It then says:

The old cry for "bread" that has been heard in many places, but rarely in Cincinnati until this present winter, is no longer sounding out in its weird and distressing pathos along the river front. There was bread enough and some to spare on Wednesday after several hundred applicants had been relieved, and the work of distribution was continued on Thursday under conditions that made the case-hardened police officers turn their heads away. The applicants were confined to no particular class or kind. There were women and children, strong men and weak men, and the story they nearly all told was monotonous in its dire want.

Mark what the Times-Star says:

The applicants were confined to no particular class.

We may rest assured, though, that one class was not represented among these applicants for bread—the monopolistic class.

Occasionally the police officers asked the applicants why they did not save up so as to have something for a rainy day, and in nearly every instance they got a reply that left them speechless for want of further logical argument. The average colored roustabout can earn about \$5.50 a week by working hard. With the present price of provisions it is next to impossible for him to keep soul and body together, if he happens to have a family, on that sum, and any idea of "saving up," as suggested, is, of course, out of the question.

Is this the prosperity that exists in the State of Ohio and city of Cincinnati? The report goes on to state that one of the leading politicians of Cincinnati, Michael Mullen, a councilman, one of the supporters of George B. Cox, upon whom the latter relies to see that the requisite number of votes are "found" in his ward, whether they are there or not, has opened a soup house. Just think, in the Republican city of Cincinnati, a councilman, because of stress of conditions, feels compelled to open a soup house. The Democratic candidate was not elected governor of Ohio last year, more's the pity. We were told before the election that if the Republicans were successful prosperity would continue, but soup houses would be our portion if Democrats were victorious—if that great Democrat, Tom L. Johnson, was elected governor of that State. One report says:

Councilman Michael Mullen, of the Eighth Ward, Wednesday morning established a free soup house at 435 East Front street. It was instantly crowded by poverty-stricken people with baskets, broken-spout coffee pots, bottles, and tin cans to carry away solid provisions, soup, and coffee.

Prosperity! Prosperity where men will come with broken soup bowls [laughter] and broken coffee pots to get a little food because they are starving! And what does the judge say? A man was arrested for stealing a loaf of bread. The policeman who had arrested this man was called, and, in addressing the judge, said, according to the Times-Star:

Judge, there are nearly 200 people down there who are starving.

Starving in the great city of Cincinnati, where prosperity should exist if anywhere in this country! This is a Republican official, because everyone knows there is not a Democratic official in that whole city of Cincinnati, unless he is a personal henchman of George B. Cox and therefore more dangerous to real Democracy than if he were a Republican. This official says:

This man Jones is a workingman and not a thief. He was going to share what he stole with the others.

He was going to share this loaf of bread, which prosperity compelled him to steal, with others who were also ready to steal food in order to keep their bodies and souls together.

The policeman says:

We must arrest these people. A loin of pork was stolen Monday morning and the grocer told us not to look for it. "Lord knows they need it," he told us.

This in spite of this boasted universal prosperity!

What is the judge's reply to this policeman's plea for mercy?

The stealing of bread under such circumstances is no offense—

said the judge.

Charles Stevens, a white man, the night before had gone to the jail and begged to be locked up. The judge says:

You may go to jail, and when the sun begins to shine warm enough go to the jailor and tell him you wish to be released. I will docket you as committed for \$50 and costs at your own request.

Later the judge addressed a body of city officials before whom he defended these strange decisions.

Why—

Said he—

nearly every morning at 1 or 2 o'clock policemen on their beats find the men picking potato peelings out of ash barrels. Why, gentlemen, even I would not hesitate to fracture one of the ten commandments if placed in this position.

Remember this is taking place in Ohio, in that State which the special-privilege corporations flooded with money with which to defeat a democratic Democrat, Tom L. Johnson. The voters of Ohio were assured by the leader of the Republican party there that prosperity would continue if they would but bury Johnson politically.

But somehow Tom L. Johnson does not seem to know when he is defeated. Like Banquo's ghost, he will not down, for I read in to-day's Johnstown Democrat that "Tom L. wins battle for lower fares."

It says:

The Cleveland city council has passed the following ordinances:

Making the rate of fare within the city limits on the Cleveland Electric Railway Company's lines 3 cents. Beyond the city line the fare is to be 5 cents. The 3-cent fare does not include a transfer; 5 cents does.

Granting the Woodland avenue and Central avenue franchises to the Forest City Street Railway Company, a 3-cent line.

These franchises, according to the city authorities, expire in September and March, 1904 and 1905. The Cleveland Electric Railway Company controls the city's car lines now in operation.

It is expected that the Cleveland Electric Railway Company will test the legality of to-night's ordinances before they can be put into effect.

Of course the Cleveland Electric Railway Company will fight. Who ever heard of a monopolistic corporation submitting to the will of the people from whom it obtains its monopolistic privileges? Certainly the gentleman who is the largest stockholder, the dominating force of the Cleveland Electric Railway Company, the senior Senator from the State of Ohio, is not going to submit to this "outrage." He has publicly declared that "his business is his politics." If this means anything, it means that he is in politics to advance his business interests, and how successful he has been anyone who has watched Ohio politics and national politics during the past eight years must know.

Perhaps as clear an illustration of his methods and of his entire success in making "his business his politics" was shown when, upon Tom L. Johnson being elected mayor of the city of Cleveland and appointing officials to investigate what, if any, disparity existed in the assessment of property there, and these officials having discovered that the homes of 3,000 of the toilers of that city were worth in the aggregate \$10,000,000 and were on the tax duplicate at an average of 60 per cent, or \$6,000,000, while the street railroad which the senior Senator from Ohio then in large part owned was also worth \$10,000,000, in fact somewhat more, but they found that the assessing authorities in Cleveland had kindly permitted this \$10,000,000 worth of street-railway property to be put upon the tax duplicate not at 60 per cent of its value, nor 80 per cent, nor even 10 per cent, but at \$600,000—6 per cent of its value.

As Tom L. Johnson is an unfaltering supporter of Democratic principles in government, having for years, when it was even more unpopular than it is now to do so, boldly asserted that the Jeffersonian principle of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none" should be carried out in governmental affairs in city, State, and nation. Naturally enough, officials appointed by him, being in harmony with that principle, did their duty, placing the \$10,000,000 street-railway property upon the tax duplicate at

the same ratio of value as that of the 3,000 small home owners, many of whom were employed by this very railroad company.

What happened? Did the Cleveland Street Railway Company, through its officers or through its then president, the senior Senator from Ohio, express contrition for having represented their \$10,000,000 worth of property as only worth \$600,000? Did they offer to recompense the city of Cleveland for the taxes which they had so long evaded? Did they do anything which honorable men would do under such circumstances? Did they make any effort to do anything to even up their past failure to pay their proportion of taxes to the city of Cleveland? Oh, no! That would not be making your business your politics. Only men having the common, ordinary conception of their duty to their fellow-men would be guilty of such foolishness as that. The "creator and preserver of prosperity" acted upon the theory that "charity begins at home," so he rushed down to Columbus, has a law passed legislating out of office the officials who had been so rude as to assess his street-railroad property at \$5,800,000 (less, you will note, than the average on the small home owners), and secures the enactment of a law creating a State board of appraisement, made up, as I remember, of the governor, the secretary of state, and the State auditor, upon whom was conferred the power to appoint for the city of Cleveland officials to take the place of those legislated out of office.

Almost the first act of this newly created board (made up of men who could not have been elected to any office by the votes of the people of Cleveland) was to change the assessment levied against the street-railroad property, reducing it, as I remember, to \$1,000,000. In graciously consenting to this increase of assessment from \$600,000 to \$1,000,000 upon a \$10,000,000 property, was not the Senator violating his maxim of making "his business his politics?" Surely had his "business" interests occupied the first place in his mind he would have directed his appointees, these men who owed their official positions to him, and who were appointed to do his will, he would, I say, have directed them to restore the original assessment—\$600,000, i. e., 6 per cent.

So much has been said from time to time about Tom L. Johnson's administration of municipal affairs as mayor of Cleveland, comparisons having been drawn between the cost of government there as against that of Cincinnati, and having some personal knowledge of the condition of the streets in the business sections of the two cities, and, in order to show the falsity of the claim that the cost of municipal government is less in Cincinnati than in Cleveland—although I admit the direct tax levy is lower—I will insert in the appendix, as a portion of my remarks, an open letter of a public accountant, well known in Ohio, analyzing the expenditures in the two cities, which proves that the per capita expenditures for municipal purposes in Cincinnati are 50 per cent greater than in Cleveland.

BYRON W. HOLT.

I want to insert here as a part of my remarks a statement prepared by one of the clearest-headed and best-informed economists in the country, Byron W. Holt, on this very subject of the lack of "a compensating wage" to the toilers of this country, while the trusts are reveling in high prices and consequent enormous profits. These weekly letters of Mr. Holt's are worthy of the widest circulation, and I trust that my friends on this side at least will do what they can to aid in circulating them, so that they may be read not only by workingmen in our large cities, but by the millions of farmers throughout the United States:

Prosperity unmasked—The American Economist makes a confession—1903 was not a prosperous year—This high-tariff organ much afraid that the Dingley bill will be blamed for hard times—It blames labor, but has not a word of censure for the protected trusts and their high prices.

Throughout the entire year of 1903 the American Economist, the organ of the Protective Tariff League (which is composed of 1,000 protected manufacturers, who pay \$100 each in dues), was boasting about the wonderful prosperity then existing. In its columns everybody was constantly employed at the highest wages ever known. There was no let up in prosperity at any time. In the index which runs from July to December, 1903, seventeen lines are devoted to the word "prosperity" and two more to "prosperous." Here are some of these index lines:

Prosperity, evidence of.
Prosperity, the facts of.
Prosperity, general, untouched.
Prosperity, greatest, ever known.
Prosperity, our unyielding.
Prosperity rampant.
Prosperity, solid.
Prosperity stalks abroad.
Prosperity, the wave.
Prosperous Uncle Sam.
Prosperous year, bright future.

During the last two months of 1903 the industrial conditions got so bad that nearly all the leading Republican newspapers had admitted that we were in the midst of a depression. Some estimated that by the end of the year 1,000,000 would be out of work

and that wages of most of those still employed would be greatly reduced. All the trade papers contained long lists of closed mills and of wage reductions. Only the Economist remained to assert that prosperity was still rampant.

But now that 1903 is past and gone it is admitted, even by this protective-tariff organ, that it was a year of closed mills, unemployed labor, adversity, and disaster. Its leading editorial of January 1, 1904, devotes four columns to explaining why the Dingley bill was not to blame for the hard times of 1903. It is entitled "Causes for the commercial conditions and results of 1903." Here are some of the extracts:

The free-trade orators and editors of this year will point to the adversities of 1903 and attempt to prove that they were due to the Dingley tariff. The echoes of these assertions will be found reverberating down through ages for half a century; hence the voters of those times will be told that protection was a failure because of the calamities of 1903.

During the year more than 100,000 men have been idle a considerable portion of the time. * * *

Fully half a million men have lost time and wages, running from a few days to several months, and it is quite likely that the earning capacity and purchasing power of the people at large have been lessened fully \$1,000,000,000 during the last twelve months, solely because of these so-called labor troubles.

That the failures should increase to some extent under the circumstances enumerated is not surprising.

Just think of it, a billion dollars of unearned wages! A billion and a half dollars, I suppose; this means of wealth not produced. The American Economist, being the organ of so many multi-millionaires, protective-tariff barons, is naturally accustomed to dealing with big figures, and it is possible that a billion dollars may not seem so large a sum to the high-priced editors of that paper as it undoubtedly will seem (if the Economist's statement is ever spread abroad) to the farmers and workingmen of the United States. If the Economist's statement is correct, then the wealth which we must assume from its statement would have been produced had it not been for the closed mills and wage reductions of which it speaks would have amounted to nearly \$100 for every family in the country.

The Economist blames the labor unions, the inflated stocks, and high price of cotton, and declares that but for the protective tariff—the blessed Dingley law—times would certainly have been much worse. It says not a word about the steel and other protected trusts, whose excessive greed and high monopoly prices have sapped the lifeblood of the people and exhausted their buying power. It reserves its censure for labor—greedy, foolish labor—utterly ignoring the fact that when the trusts had put prices up 40 per cent labor was entitled to a similar advance in wages and that wages have not advanced one-third as much as has the cost of living.

DEFYING CORTLEYOU—HUNDREDS OF ILLEGAL TRUSTS LAUGH AT THE NEW BUREAU—FLAUNT THEMSELVES IN ITS FACE—BUREAU OF INDUSTRIES HAS SLEPT ONE YEAR—NO SIGN OF LIFE YET—PLENTY OF TRUSTS BUT NO PUBLICITY IN SIGHT—WHERE TO FIND THE TRUSTS—IRON AGE FULL OF THEM.

The Bureau of Industries of the new Department of Commerce, which was formed last year by the Republicans to demolish the trusts by publishing the facts about them, has slept nearly one year, and there are no surface indications that its Rip Van Winkle slumbers are nearing an end. The little information about this Bureau, published in the annual report of the Department of Commerce, indicates that there will be no publicity of trust transactions until after the Presidential election.

But the trusts are not asleep. They are having a riotous time around this sleeping, dozing Bureau. Hundreds of them are openly and daily plundering the public in defiance of all law. Pick up almost any trade paper and you will find the details of trusts that clearly are illegal both in the eyes of the Sherman antitrust act and of the common law. The steel, coal, tobacco, and scores of other great trusts are most certainly illegal, but the trusts' Attorney-General refuses to act upon the facts put into his hands more than a year ago about these great criminals, although eminent lawyers declare that these facts establish the illegality of these trusts. Perhaps the Bureau of Industries recognizes that it is useless to obtain facts that the Attorney-General does not want and would not use if he had them. To show how easy it is to find trusts, unless you are blind as a bat at midday, the following extracts are quoted from an article in the Iron Age of January 7, entitled "The Pittsburgh iron trade in 1903:"

PRICE AGREEMENTS.

In 1903 there were in existence price agreements of four of the principal fixed lines of iron and steel, these being plates, structural material, steel bars, and shafting. In addition the rail pool was maintained all through the year and the billet pool was revived in July. During the entire year the price of beams was maintained steadily on the basis of 1.60 cents up to 15-inch, and plates were the same price.

The price of steel bars was maintained steadily at \$1.60, Pittsburgh, until November, when, owing to the lower prices on pig iron and steel and a very light demand, it was deemed advisable by the Steel Bar Association to reduce prices, and accordingly a cut of \$4 was made, the price being reduced from \$1.60 to \$1.50. At the same time and for practically the same reasons the Shafting Association made a reduction in price of shafting of about 10 per cent.

These price agreements have been renewed for 1904, and will continue in force all through the year unless some unexpected conditions come up which would make it advisable to terminate them, but this is hardly likely.

The Steel Rail Association has maintained the price of standard sections all through the year at \$28 at mill, and in spite of general expectations of a reduction we understand that the mills have again renewed the price of \$28 for 1904 delivery.

Owing to the depressions in the steel trade which started in the summer months the price of steel billets steadily declined and the trade became somewhat demoralized, some large sales having been made to leading consumers at very low figures. Owing to these conditions the billets deemed it advisable to revive the billet pool for the purpose of steadying the market, and this was done in July. The price of Bessemer billets was fixed at \$27 and open hearth at \$28. It was very soon demonstrated, and at a meeting of the billet pool in November a cut of \$4 was made in Bessemer and \$5 in open hearth, the price of Bessemer and open-hearth billets being put at \$23, Pittsburgh. On December 18 a meeting of the billet pool was held in New York, and this price was renewed for all of 1904.

Mr. Holt continues:

What fun the trusts are having. What a picnic the people would have if the Bureau of Industries would wake up and "get busy." Will it and the Attorney-General's Office ever be run in the interest of the people and against the trusts?

COST OF LIVING STILL GOING UP.

It may be well to call the attention of hundreds of thousands of steel workers, cotton-mill operatives, miners, and others who have humbly accepted reductions in their wages running from 10 to 40 per cent or who are now idle because many mills are closed, to the fact that while wages are going down the cost of living is going up.

Dun's index number was \$100.142 on January 1, 1904, compared with \$98.223 a month ago, and is the highest since last March. It is within about 2 per cent of the highest known in recent years, which was \$102.289 on May 1, 1902. It is now about 39 per cent above the lowest point, which was on July 1, 1897.

This means that the trusts have not yet loosened their grip, and that they are counting on lower wages to decrease their cost of production and increase their monopoly profits. It is possible that they have buncoed their employees into accepting lower wages. Are wages now 40 per cent higher than six or seven years ago? Are they 10 per cent higher? If not, is there now or has there been at any time prosperity for the wage-earners? And now, when wages are reduced an average of 15 or 20 per cent, while the cost of living still goes up, shall we call this prosperity?

There has been no lowering of our tariff taxes, The Dingley bill is still claimed to "adequately secure American industrial products against the competition of foreign labor," but the old machine shows signs of wear, and rasps and groans where the labor cogs need filing. Where protection is highest there seems to be the most friction, as in the iron and steel industries.

The latest to show signs of demoralization is the lumber and logging business, in which wages have declined about 25 per cent. A dispatch from Ontonagon, Mich., to the Boston Transcript, says:

During the past few weeks there has been a notable change in the labor situation in logging circles in northern Michigan. At the opening of the season men were so scarce that lumbering concerns could only get a small portion of the help needed. High wages were no inducement. Now, however, more men are applying for work than can be employed, and wages have dropped from \$30 and \$35 per month, including board, to \$20 and \$26. Some employers are said to be securing green hands for as low as \$18 per month.

The wood and lumber schedule of the Dingley bill is still protecting the lumber trusts and combines and allowing them to continue the exorbitant profits on lumber and shingles, but the men in the woods and who run the sawmills are not partaking of this prosperity.

Will my Republican friends please explain this breakdown of the protective theory, which, while evidently protecting the trusts, the combines, and the manufacturers, does not protect the workmen, the farmers, and the great majority of the people? With the cost of living at the top notch, the many are obliged to economize to make both ends meet, while the few are amassing fortunes. I ask my Republican friends is their programme a fair one—to "stand pat" under these conditions? The trusts of course indorse the plan of "letting well enough alone," and the promise of the Republicans that "sometime in the future" they will revise the tariff pleases the trusts, for the promise is mere words—no deeds will follow it.

BOUNTIES VS. PROTECTION.

Over in Canada the government is having trouble with some of the protected steel plants about the amount of bounty due them. It says the manufacturers are not entitled to all they claim. This shows what a coarse, clumsy system they have there in comparison with our smooth-working tariff system. The Canadian manufacturers are only asking for a few millions a year in bounties, while one of our steel-manufacturing organizations last year, by means of the tariff system, took \$70,000,000 from the people, and there was no dispute with the Government as to the amount and only now and then a few trifling kicks from the plundered victims. A small sum like \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 looks big when taken openly from the Government Treasury and turned over to the trusts, but \$70,000,000 can be taken secretly and given to the trusts and not a word will be said. The bounty system is not "in it" with protection.

CARNEGIE'S "PHILANTHROPY"—LYNCH'S CYNICISM.

The New York Times of December 30 states the assets of the Carnegie Institution amounts to \$10,010,500 and recites the uses the income is to be devoted to. By a singular coincidence the same issue under date of Pittsburgh, December 29, reports:

Thomas Lynch, president of the H. C. Frick Coke Company—

I will ask the House to note that this is one of the subsidiary corporations of the United States Steel Corporation taken over by it as a part of the Carnegie Steel Company—

was summoned to New York to consult with the officers of the United States Steel Corporation.

The dispatch says "a representative of the company" (I presume it refers to Mr. Lynch) said:

The Frick Company owns about 17,000 ovens and employs fully 17,000 men, as a fair estimate of the number of employees is one for each oven. This includes the coal miners. Of this number but 7,000 are at work, owing to the heavy decrease in the demand due to the closing of fully 60 per cent of the blast furnaces since October 1.

This in spite of the assertion of the gentleman from Iowa that "there is labor in every part of this country for every man who wants a place to work, and there is a 'compensating' wage for every man who will perform a day's labor."

The men accepted the reduction of 17 per cent in wages and all are anxious to work.

Note what he says: "All are anxious to work"—at a reduction of 17 per cent.

The talk of a strike is nonsense. If the 7,000 men now at work should quit, there are 10,000 idle coke workers ready and willing to take their places.

He says, "The talk of a strike is nonsense."

Again I ask the gentleman from Iowa which, in his opinion, is the "compensating wage" in this case? Was it the price paid prior to October 1 or that which 7,000 of them now receive: namely, a reduction of 17 per cent? Kindly note that this official of the United States Steel Corporation says "that there are 10,000 idle coke workers," but 7,000 are at work while 10,000 are idle, and these, we can believe (despite the assertion of the gentleman from Iowa), "are ready and willing to take their places." For myself, I fear that they are ready and willing to take the places of the 7,000 at a good deal less than a "compensating" wage.

It appears, though, that the coke workers are not the only men employed by the United States Steel Corporation who are affected by its "economies," for we now hear: "Dissatisfied steel workers find that their wages have been reduced 40 instead of 20 per cent."

In the statements given to the press by the officials of the corporation as to the proposed reductions of wages to be made on January 1 in their mills it was stated that the reductions ranged from 5 to 20 per cent and would average about 10 per cent. Thus, on December 15, the newspapers of the country printed the following dispatch:

NEW YORK, December 14.

The statement was made to-day by a leading official of the United States Steel Corporation that, beginning January 1, 1904, about 90 per cent of the employees of the corporation will suffer wage reductions ranging from 5 to 20 per cent. This reduction will affect about 150,000 workmen in the various grades of the subsidiary companies. The remaining 10 per cent of employees are members of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, whose wage schedule runs to July 1, 1904.

On December 21 a dispatch from Pittsburgh said:

Semi-official information was given out to-day that a general reduction in wages is to be made at all nonunion iron and steel plants in the country that will average about 10 per cent.

On January 5 it was reported from Pittsburgh that the steel workers had returned to work after a long idleness, and that, though they were willing to accept a reduction, they thought that their wages had been cut too much.

We are told that the men are dissatisfied with the new scale the company has put into effect and that they propose a compromise scale. If the reductions here shown are fair samples of those made in other mills, as they probably are, it is not surprising that the workers are dissatisfied. These reductions will average more nearly 40 than 10 per cent. The least reduction appears to be 12 per cent and the largest to exceed 49 per cent. Here are the rates for the skilled employees of the Homestead Works. The scales show the rate of wage per 100 tons of output:

	Old rates.	Company's scale.	Workers' scale.
Heaters	\$2.72	\$1.74	\$2.00
Rollers	2.72	1.74	2.00
Manipulators	1.97	1.35	1.35
Cranemen	1.44	.87	1.23
Back table men	1.07	.97	.97
Greasers84	.65	.84
Bottom makers	1.76	1.16	1.50
Bottom makers' helpers	1.45	.87	1.23
Pit and tong men	1.44	.73	1.22
Pit and tong helpers	1.20	.65	1.07
Buggy men97	.80	.90
Recorders80	.65	.80

The above rates appear to apply to the 40-inch mill. Those for the 48-inch mill are in part as follows:

	Old rates.	Company's scale.	Workers' scale.
Rollers	\$5.50	\$2.94	\$3.87
Heaters	4.00	2.20	(7) 2.20
Shearmen	2.00	1.10	1.60
Heater helpers	1.63	1.28	1.40
Ingot-yard crane men	1.25	.83	1.10
Ingot-yard foremen	1.55	1.10	1.35
Pullups90	.52	.81
Guidesmen	2.25	1.38	1.85
Greasers	1.45	.93	1.25
Scrapers	1.14	1.01	1.10
Shear helpers	1.56	1.01	1.30
Weighmaster	1.50	1.01	1.30

In the 30-inch and 35-inch mills, as well as in the others, dissatisfaction exists and compromise scales are being prepared.

The publication of these scales indicates how misleading and false were the statements given out by the officials of the steel trust a few weeks ago. We can believe nothing that comes from trust headquarters. Deception and fraud are a part of the capital of the protected trusts.

MORE STEEL-TRUST GOLD BRICKS FOR EMPLOYEES.

Now that the employees of this trust have begun to work with many murmurs, but as yet no strikes, at wages about 35 per cent lower than those received last year, instead of only 10 per cent as announced last month, this great benevolent institution begins to talk of improved conditions and to mark up the prices of its products.

On January 11 the leading producer advanced the price on wire products \$1 per ton beyond former quotations, including wire nails, barb wire, and smooth fence wire. This represents an advance of 5 cents per keg on wire nails. The advance was made because of the very heavy tonnage which has been booked during the past three weeks, and because of the low stocks in manufacturers' hands and their inability to increase them during the month of December. The stronger position which other steel products have reached within the past week or ten days was also taken into consideration. The manufacturers are advising the trade to send in specifications as soon as possible on account of the prospective shortage of nails for spring delivery.

This is gold brick No. 1 for this year, the trust having worked a big bluff on its employees and frightened them into accepting great reductions in wages.

Gold brick No. 2 was exhibited when the trust announced that its profit-sharing scheme of last year would be continued this year, the only change being that the employees may now obtain preferred stock at \$55 a share instead of \$52.50, as last year. This is exactly two-thirds of last year's price. As the 28,000 employees who went in last year have lost about one-third of their investments, and therefore have shared losses rather than profits, it is not likely that they will this year become customers for another supply of "profit-sharing" gold bricks. If they are wise and judge the future by the past, they will consider that next year they may be able to buy stock at one-third of last year's price.

It is evident, however, that the trust officials do not this year expect to find a market for their gold bricks with their employees. It is the ever gullible public that is to furnish customers for the shining goods again.

It is reported that an average of one "sucker" a minute is born in some part of the world. The steel trust has merely changed its bait; that's all.

"JUG-HANDLED" PROSPERITY.

Perhaps the best characterization of this much vaunted prosperity, the best in the sense of showing its unequal and one-sided diffusion is that of Louis F. Post, of Chicago, who dubs it "jug-handled" prosperity.

If my Republican friends are really sincere in their contention that the past four or five years have been years of unexampled prosperity—if they really believe that, like the dew of heaven, its benefits have been shared in by all—by the just as well as the unjust—then I can not too strongly urge that they read Mr. Post's comments, week by week, in the columns of his paper—the Public—assuring them that if they will only do so they will get light on the great problem of the age, why it is that the tremendous increases in the power of labor to produce wealth do not result in increasing the amount of wealth which labor receives, but, on the contrary, seem to make the lot of the mere toiler ever harder.

I do not believe it is possible even for the gentlemen on the other side of the House to read Mr. Post's weekly editorials on current events without finding, as I frequently have, that things which heretofore appeared complex, if not inscrutable and mystifying, have, by reason of his lucid method of discussing them,

become clear and readily understandable. He shows that so far from the dew of this so-called era of prosperity having fallen on all alike, upon the just and the unjust, it has fallen almost entirely upon the gardens of the unjust; that the result has been not to fructify the soil of the farmer, the workingman, and the merchant, to gladden the heart of all who toil in the production of wealth, whether by hand or brain; but in ways of which the average man (certainly not the gentlemen on the other side) has no comprehension and but little suspicion this dew has been deflected in its descent, so that it has fallen not upon wealth producers, but upon the monopolizers of nature's storehouse, the land in its various forms, and has been largely absorbed by the trusts.

If my Republican friends really wish to learn the cause of this apparently inexplicable phenomena, aye, if the gentlemen on this side of the Chamber wish to know more of the causes which create monopoly, of the causes which, as Carlyle said, enables the perfumed seigneur to extract the honey from the thistle which the peasant woman is picking, without her being conscious of the theft, then I can not too highly commend them to invest a dollar in a half year's subscription, or even 10 cents for a four weeks' subscription to the Public, Unity Building, Chicago.

For Republicans to do this is to be enlightened as they are not likely to be enlightened in any other way; for Democrats to do it is to be fortified with convincing arguments—effective ammunition—for their assault upon that modern form of monopoly, the trust.

I shall not weary the House by reading a tenth of the extracts from this paper which I should like to read, although in my humble judgment it could not be more profitably employed, but will content myself with extracts from only a few of these thought-clarifying editorials:

GERMANS EMULATE THE TRICKS OF AMERICAN TARIFF BARONS.

Having got a monopoly on glass manufacture in Germany, through the German protective tariff, the Cologne glass trust has borrowed a trick from the American tariff barons. It breaks into foreign markets, where it has no protection, with cutthroat prices, and it even up in the German market, where it is protected with balloon prices. The Germans, being patriotic, probably rejoice at this opportunity to supply foreigners with German glass at enormously lower prices than they can buy it at themselves. If so, they must import their patriotism from the United States, where this kind is over-produced.

ADMIT THEM! WAIT! EMPLOYERS OR EMPLOYEES, WHICH?

A great strike of textile workers is in progress in Philadelphia. Hosts of the strikers are ill-paid women and little children. They sent a small committee to Oyster Bay to confer with President Roosevelt. The committee made respectful application at the President's business office for an interview, but, according to the Chicago Inter-Ocean, an Administration paper, they were politely "turned down." To this in itself no criticism would be proper. It is not the President's duty to adjust strikes, even though in a spectacular instance he did once assume that function. But suppose this committee, instead of coming from the poor strikers, had come from their employers. Does anyone imagine that a committee of employers, representing "the great textile industries of Philadelphia," would have been "turned down" without an interview had such a committee sought one with the President? That supposition would indeed be something new under the sun, and its realization something newer. Yet "we must never forget, dear children and fellow-citizens, that in this country there are no classes!"

HOW TRUSTS ARE FORTIFIED.

The steel trust is getting its feet more firmly than ever upon the ground. It was reported on the 20th from New York as having purchased the last large single block of ore property on the Mesaba range in Minnesota which is for sale. It is in this way that trusts are fortified. Mere combinations of capital without land monopoly are impotent. Capital can be multiplied; but natural resources, including rights of way over land, give to trusts a resistless power.

TAX RIGHTS OF WAY, NOT LOCOMOTIVES.

Consider what it is that makes railroad stock so valuable. Two things—railroad land and railroad improvements. The improvements would be exempt under the single tax. Would farmers have them taxed? Such taxes rebound upon the farmers themselves. Tax locomotive values, and you force up freight charges; but tax right-of-way values, and you do not force up freight charges. In other words, while taxes on railroad improvements are not borne by stockholders, taxes on railroad rights of way are borne by stockholders.

We find the Ohio State Journal saying that the inevitable result of the single tax in operation "would be to lighten the burdens of the rich and to increase those of the poor." This is the reason, probably, why the rich oppose it. They are not slow to lighten their own burdens and increase those of the poor in other ways, but it seems that they draw the line at the single tax.

There are three classes of mind, the conservative, the radical, and the lickspittle. The latter usually antagonizes the radical; not because it is conservative, but because radicalism offers few prizes and no comforts to its devotees.

Senator HANNA is a protectionist, yet he is working with might and main for ship subsidies. He says he wants more American ships. But why should a consistent protectionist want any ships?

AN IMPRUDENT FRIEND.

While Senator HANNA was in Chicago in attendance upon the conference of the National Civic Federation, he learned of the ominous closing down of factories that had already begun in Ohio. One of the closers down, an Ohio manufacturing friend of his, unfolded the news to him. Naturally enough, Mr. HANNA was indignant. Had he not been telling the working people of Ohio that industrial disaster would not come so long as he and his party friends are kept in office? And here were Ohio captains of industry recklessly bringing on industrial disaster in the very middle of an Ohio campaign, where so much depended upon fooling enough of the people yet a little longer. In his indignation Mr. HANNA turned upon his friend, and, not without some bitterness of tone, pungently asked him: "Why couldn't you have waited until after election? Don't you realize that I have some interest in Ohio myself

just now?" Mr. HANNA is evidently a good deal of a confidence man in politics. But he was not discreet enough on this occasion to speak easy.

The result of this campaign in Ohio will determine absolutely whether the present condition of prosperity is to continue or not. Did MARK HANNA say that? Are you sure? Will he guarantee that the conditions under which our prosperity labors are to be abolished if he is beaten? For the prosperity was all the trusts said it was, and more. The half was never told. The land wallowed in prosperity. Then the trusts put their conditions on it. HANNA has a condition, for instance, that every one who rides on a street car in Cleveland must pay him toll for use of the streets. Now, that is a condition that will be removed when Johnson wins. But the trusts have imposed conditions of the tariff and other devices by which they get a quarter of the prosperity the country makes. Will that be eliminated when Johnson wins? Glory hallelujah! HANNA is like the fellow who proposed to a girl, "I'll buy you a washboard," he said, "and you can have half what you make." HANNA's condition of prosperity is that the people shall have all they make after the trusts have had their rake-off. Boundless, except a limit of \$2 a day. The amount the workers may earn is boundless; the amount they may get is the condition. And if he catches them murmuring, he is going to take the washboard away.

"CHRISTIAN" PLUTOCRACY.

It is reported of the younger Mr. Rockefeller that when some of his bible-class members recently suggested that certain modern methods of getting great fortunes could not be consistently practiced by Christians, he asked if the manner in which these men disposed of their wealth did not count for something to their advantage. This is the new doctrine of Christian plutocracy. Most of the velvety clergymen are preaching it. Not how you get your wealth, but what you do with it, is the test they are fond of applying. The doctrine is not new. It was practiced long ago by Jonathan Wild, Sixteen-String Jack, and Jack Sheppard. Perhaps the excellent Mr. Rockefeller doesn't know who these worthies were, being unfamiliar with low-bred literature. Let him understand, then, that they were highwaymen, who soothed their consciences for their un-Christian modes of getting wealth from its owners by their Christian habits of bestowing it upon others.

[Editorial in Chicago Public, December 5, 1903.]

PROSPERITY? YES; FOR MONOPOLISTS.

This country is at the present moment in the midst of an industrial depression. It has, in fact, never escaped that condition since McKinley's first election. Monopolists have been prosperous, and bunco steers on the plane of high finance have been prosperous, but the average man has not been prosperous. If an independent business man, he may have done more business, but with little or no more profit, or maybe less. If a hired man, he may have had more work, but at little better or no better or even less wages. And, independent business man or hired man, his living expenses have so much increased that his net income has in most instances been reduced. This, to be sure, is a kind of prosperity, but it is not a very healthy kind. But even this malarial kind of prosperity has been receding for months. Bankers have long been aware of it. Workingmen are finding it out. Farmers, those "easy marks" of the "confidence" man—whether he runs the Republican party or a three-card monte game—will not be long in ignorance of it. They may feel it before their newspapers tell them of it, but some way or other they too will know.

Last summer the dividends of life-insurance companies had fallen off significantly. For instance, we have before us the history of a policy of the Berkshire, on which the maturity value of the dividends was \$18 in 1892 and 1893, rising to \$19 in 1894 and 1895, and to \$20 (the highest point) in 1901, but falling to \$17 in 1902, and down to \$14 in 1903. The explanation of the company was that the decrease you have noted for 1902 and the present year is principally on account of lower interest rates obtainable on investments. All companies have during the past ten years been compelled to reduce dividends. The Berkshire was the last to do so, the character of its investments not being affected until very recently by the depression in interest rates. Yet the "confidence" operators were all this time entertaining their hopeful dupes with "a song and dance" about good times "everywhere" and for "everybody," and "if you are not getting the benefit it must be your own fault." Good times with "depression in interest rates" is a phenomenon not unlike "water, water everywhere, but not a drop to drink." Its absurdity is only intensified by the explanation of the harder times now upon us which is made by the Engineering News of October 15. "The real key to the situation," it sagely explains, "is that in the market for capital demand has outrun supply." Think of it! "Depression in interest rates" caused by excessive demand for capital! The next thing we know these "confidence" men will be accounting for low wages with assurances that labor is scarce.

Two other editorials of Mr. Post, from the Public, those of January 2 and January 9, I will append to my remarks as an appendix.

MODERN METHODS OF FLEECING THE PEOPLE.

One of the modern methods by which the few are enriched at the expense of the many, a method which has been wonderfully effective during the last four or five years, is the capitalization of the great natural ore deposits and the flotation of companies whose stock in very large part, by far the larger part, simply represents the monopolization of these natural opportunities and the foisting of this stock upon a credulous and excited public, who were enamored by the glamour of the eminent respectability of the men who so kindly permitted the public to take these "securities" off their hands. Mr. Henry George, jr., who is a most worthy son of the century's greatest philosopher (the philosopher who would not rest content until he had discovered the cause of the persistence of poverty amid advancing wealth), has, in the December and January issues of Pearson's Magazine, clearly portrayed the method by which these modern financial magicians turn "water" into gold, and also shows how when the bubble is pricked it is found that the "kings of finance" who at the time the company was formed through their accredited mouthpieces declared that for a long period of years the business which they had "combined" and which they then offered to a gullible public was assured of an uninterrupted and increasing harvest of profits for many years, but having an inner knowledge, in fact the only knowledge, for neither the poor deluded stockholders nor the public ever received any information as to the real possessions of the company, these financial magnates, controlling all the avenues of

information, so soon as they had unloaded their "securities" upon the public permitted so much of the real facts to come out that that public which had previously been so anxious to acquire the securities were now frantic to get rid of them at any price. This entirely suited these eminent gentlemen, as they could then buy in the open market these "securities" for a mere song.

In the December Pearson's, Mr. George presents some figures which would indicate that these "kings of finance" had cleared up the tidy sum of \$37,000,000 on an investment of probably nothing! He says:

It should not be supposed that the little band of promoters arranged that the Amalgamated Company should buy control of Anaconda at this figure. They arranged themselves to forestall the Amalgamated Company and to buy at this price. But they planned to buy in order to sell to the Amalgamated Company, which they did at a handsome advance, presumably at \$40,000,000.

The "band of promoters" whom Mr. George here refers to were John D. and William Rockefeller, Henry H. Rogers, James Stillman (president of the National City Bank, the Rockefeller bank), Robert Bacon (then a partner of the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co.), Roswell P. Flower, F. P. Olcott, etc. These constituted the "themselves."

That is to say, the 51 per cent of the Anaconda stock which, as promoters, they arranged to acquire at about \$29,000,000, or something more than \$45 a share, they arranged to sell to the Amalgamated Company for about \$40,000,000, or \$82 a share. The price of \$82 a share for Anaconda stock might have looked to some like a "watering," and might have given the whole Amalgamated project a suspicious aspect had not Anaconda stock, immediately after this transfer was completed, suddenly shot up in the open market to \$70 a share. There seemed to be no substantial cause for this rise, and it proved to be transitory, sinking rapidly back again. Cynical spectators summed up the matter in the single word, "manipulation."

And what was to be the net result of this Anaconda deal? Obviously, if the promoters, as promoters, should buy control of that company for \$29,000,000 and then should sell it to themselves, as the Amalgamated Company, for \$40,000,000, they would clear, as promoters, \$11,000,000 by the operation.

After arranging for this Anaconda purchase, the promoters arranged to buy the majority of the stock of the Parrot Silver and Copper Company and of the Hennessy Mercantile Company, both of Butte, and the entire stock of the Colorado Smelting and Mining Company and of the Washoe Copper Company, of Butte; of the Big Black Foot Milling Company, of Bonner, Mont., and of the Diamond Coal and Coke Company, of Diamondville, Wyo.

The Amalgamated Company was to expend the remaining \$20,000,000 in its treasury for these companies, and, doubtless, the promoters received that sum for them. But the promoters had by previous arrangement bought them for much less. Indeed, the sum of their individual capitalizations was only \$13,238,500, and their market value was far below par. It is doubtful if, following Wall street usages, the Amalgamated promoters paid for these six companies much more than half the sum at which they were capitalized. So, therefore, if the promoters bought these companies for \$7,000,000 and sold them to the Amalgamated Company for \$20,000,000, they cleared \$13,000,000 on the transaction.

The supposed return to the promoters up to this point for "putting through" the Amalgamated consolidation would stand this way:

On Anaconda stock, about	\$11,000,000
On other stock, about	13,000,000
On "inner-circle" profit	15,000,000

Total

39,000,000

But as it was deemed necessary for the appearance of regularity and security to have a public "syndicate" finally underwrite the Amalgamated stock at \$95 a share, the "inner circle" probably arranged to give to outsiders an interest amounting perhaps to

2,000,000

Leaving as net profit to the "inner circle"

37,000,000

It is the custom of promoters to work all these profits out on paper before they take a public step in a promotion project. The Standard Oil people are careful financiers, so that they saw by this process a way to buy at public subscription more than half the stock of the Amalgamated Company at par with money they were to obtain by "promoting" the consolidation.

In other words, they were to get control of a \$75,000,000 copper consolidation for not a penny of cost to themselves.

No Dick Turpin or Captain Kidd ever succeeded in transferring from the pockets of others to their own so large a proportion of their victims' wealth with so little squealing from their victims. This is called "haute finance." If the masters of this modern method of fleecing the public will only graciously give a million to found a university out of the \$37,000,000 which this one little operation nets them, then their newspapers call upon us all to vigorously applaud their "generosity." I regret that space will not permit me to insert the entire article on these "Modern methods of finance." It will no doubt be a revelation to the victims, who perhaps deserve little sympathy, but is more important as showing the public the evils which always flow from the conferring of "special privileges;" for were it not for the special privileges which these companies possess and which under our present system bear almost no part of the burden of taxation it would not be possible for the Rockefellers, Stillmans, Rogers, et al. to scoop \$37,000,000 or any other sum out of the public by such means. It is not alone that investors—speculators, if you will—are thus fleeced; but the whole eighty millions of people pay tribute to these men in the enhanced price which they are thus enabled to exact for this useful raw material—copper—which the Creator of the universe placed in the hills of Montana for the use of mankind, but which a few individuals are allowed to monopolize, with the result I have indicated.

GENERAL DICK AND JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN.

The gentleman who represents the Nineteenth Ohio district, General DICK, who was the chairman of the State committee in the campaign in that State last year, occupied some sixty pages of the RECORD a week ago to-day chiefly in extolling Joseph Chamberlain, who is endeavoring to make protection the twentieth-century policy of Great Britain. How extensive is the propaganda that the protectionists in England are carrying on under Mr. Chamberlain's leadership is shown in the fact that, if we are to credit the RECORD of January 5, the London Daily Telegraph of December 10 must have been a bulky document indeed, as immediately beneath the headline "Protection is for the benefit of the laboring men" it states that this remarkable document is "by the author of Imperial Reciprocity, and that it is condensed from the Daily Telegraph of December 10, 1903." As it occupies over thirty-two pages of the RECORD, all in small type, it probably amounts to 90,000 words. How many, I wonder, before it was "condensed?"

For fear that this regular magazine of ammunition should not be sufficient to convince us that "protection" is making great headway in England, I find three other speeches of Mr. Chamberlain copied from the London Daily Telegraph of October 6, 27, and 28. Each of the first two occupy about six pages of the RECORD; the third, however, being, I assume, a condensed speech, occupies but three and a quarter pages of the RECORD, or some 10,000 words.

But even this did not seem to be sufficient to satisfy the omnivorous appetite for protection literature of the gentleman from the Nineteenth Ohio district, as he has also incorporated another speech of Mr. Chamberlain's which appeared in the Scotsman, of Edinburgh, under date of November 5, this occupying a little over three pages of the RECORD. We also find what purports to be the views of the Scottish woolen trade, which appeared, as we learn, in the Glasgow Herald of September 2. This occupies but two pages of the RECORD. In order to enable us to digest so many pages of closely printed matter, General DICK has kindly added ten pages of his own, so that we may assume that the demonstration for "protection" is now complete.

In answer to these 60 pages (about 150,000 words, I assume) I merely offer in rebuttal two brief editorial paragraphs written by Louis F. Post, editor of the Public, Chicago, whose wonderful power of lucid dissection of the protection humbug, as well as all other frauds and humbugs, I commend to my Republican friends.

PROTECTIONISTS' WHIRLIGIG LOGIC.

[Editorial in the Public, January 2, 1904.]

Protectionist logic is of the whirligig order. Don't we all remember how the free-trade gold of Great Britain used to flood our shores in the interest of free-trade politics? So said protectionists. It is the other way now in England. Protectionists are claiming that British free trade is being encouraged by protection gold from Germany. "Now you see it and now you don't," is characteristic of protection logic and protection prosperity, as well as of the more vulgar thimblerie.

CHAMBERLAIN'S STRENGTH.

[From the Public.]

The protection movement in Great Britain, which Chamberlain is leading and Balfour is following, draws its strength from the fact that free importing alone is not free trade. Importing into England has been practically free for two generations, but exporting out of England is met in all directions with tariff walls. Thus while British producers are obstructed in foreign markets, foreign producers freely enter British markets and undersell British producers there. The British producers so affected thereupon appeal loudly to the patriotic spirit, and forthwith those millions of Great Britain, whom Carlyle denominated as "mostly fools," rush to the rescue of British industries.

Even one-sided free trade is better for the country that maintains it than retaliatory tariffs can possibly be.

This has been proved by the experience of Great Britain herself. London is the market of the world. London is the clearing house of the world. London is the capital of the world. It is toward London that the wealth of the world flows. All this is because the English policy of free trade has thrown down the bars to the commerce of the world. Considered as a whole—as a unit—the people of England have been enriched by free trade, one-sided though it has been. Only when we come to investigate individual conditions do we disclose British poverty—the poverty of England's working classes. Awful, indeed, it is, though no worse than individual poverty in our own highly-protected country. But the poverty of England is not attributable to free trade.

WHY ENGLAND'S WORKERS ARE NOT ENRICHED.

[From the Public.]

If free trade, which has enriched England as a nation, has failed to enrich her working people, it is not because free trade is prejudicial to labor; nor is it because the free trade of England is one sided, protection prevailing everywhere else. It is because the principle of free trade in England stops at the seaports. Internal free trade is unknown in England. Instead of the blessings of internal free trade she is cursed with the blight of landlordism, which is a phase of protectionism. This is the reason the riches that free trade has brought so lavishly into England have not enriched her working classes. They are grabbed by her protected leisure classes.

While on this subject I merely wish to add an interview from the New York Evening Post of three days ago in which I analyzed the result of two recent by-elections in London boroughs which

have been widely claimed as proving a strong protection drift in Great Britain:

[From the New York Evening Post, January 9, 1904.]

DISASTROUS TO THE VICTORS—REPRESENTATIVE BAKER'S ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF RECENT BY-ELECTIONS IN LONDON BOROUGHES.

WASHINGTON, January 9, 1904.

"The recent by-elections in Dulwich and Lewisham, both boroughs of London, which have been so widely heralded as Chamberlain victories, turn out on analysis to be victories of a sort disastrous to the victors," remarked Representative BAKER of Brooklyn, to-day.

"In the former borough the Tory vote in 1895 was 5,218. This was increased to 5,819 on December 15, an increase of 11½ per cent. The Liberal vote was, in 1895, 2,176, which was increased to 4,382, an increase of 101 per cent. In the case of Lewisham the Tory vote in 1892—which was the last previous contested election in that constituency—was 5,309. This was increased to 7,709, an increase of 45½ per cent, while the Liberal vote increased from 2,805 to 5,097, an increase of 81 per cent.

"Anyone familiar with the constituencies—many being with less than 500 majority—can see that, if a change should take place at the general election proportionate with that which has taken place in the case of these two suburbs of London, the Liberals would certainly be returned to power. So far from these two by-elections indicating any great drift of popular feeling in favor of 'protection,' they indicate that the British people have no present intention of abandoning the free-trade policy instituted by Sir Robert Peel sixty years ago, and which even the great landlords of the United Kingdom have been compelled to acquiesce in. At the same time it must be admitted that there is no present indication that the Liberal party intends to carry the free-trade policy to its natural and logical conclusion so as to include free production."

I am led to do this by the fact that the General, during the Ohio campaign last fall, made me an issue in that State for twenty-four hours, one of his daily 2,500-word manifestos being devoted to an appeal to Tom L. Johnson not to adopt my single-tax views. To be thus made the issue even for twenty-four hours in a campaign in that State was very flattering, but was entirely undeserved, as Tom L. Johnson became a single taxer some three or four years before I accepted Mr. George's philosophy. In fact, during those three or more years I was engaged in doing that which the General himself is now doing—trying to "save" society—being one of those who then viewed with alarm what was represented as being the possible great calamity to the city of New York that would follow the election of Mr. George in his first campaign for mayor of New York in 1886.

An investigation of the principles promulgated by Henry George having shown me the error of my ways and led me to see that, so far from proposing to destroy property rights, the enactment into law of the principles he advocated was the only means by which those who produced wealth could be protected in its possession, I am hopeful that the General will at an early date himself thoroughly investigate this question of taxation, not permitting his mind to be warped by existing prejudices, but in a spirit of determination to seek the truth wherever it may lead. If he will do this, I have no doubt that he will become a supporter of those fundamental principles which Mr. George stood for and through which alone can "equal rights to all and special privileges to none" be secured.

THE CAUSE OF INVOLUNTARY POVERTY.

I would, Mr. Chairman, that I could put into burning language, language that would arrest the attention of every Member of this House and of the country, the causes of these deplorable conditions, of which such incidents as these Cincinnati soup houses are simply the more glaring manifestations. Experience has taught me, however, as it has taught everyone else who has attempted beneath effects to discover the cause of the persistence of involuntary poverty despite the enormous increase in the capacity of mankind to produce wealth, that so soon as one endeavors to explain its cause he is almost invariably met with the answer: Oh! you fellows are always trying to prove that every maladjustment of society is due to one cause. It doesn't matter, they say, whether it is poverty, drunkenness, and vice, or whether it be the possession of vast wealth; you ascribe all these things to land monopoly. The crowding of population into our large cities, the unhygienic conditions in which thousands live, the hard life of the average farmer, particularly of the farmer's wife, who, living remote from the cities, finds her life monotonous, barren of almost all that gladdens; aye, even the contests between capital and labor—all these, they say, you claim are traceable to one cause.

Priding themselves upon their practicality, they shrug their shoulders and pass on, refusing to believe that so many different manifestations of the maladjustments of society can be due to one common cause. And yet it is not strange that these things should have a common cause. That cause is "land hunger." To whoever will set himself to study the primary, fundamental cause of any of these things; who will ask himself, for instance, how it comes that the suspension of river navigation on the Ohio for two or three weeks (which we are told is the reason why soup houses have been opened in Cincinnati) results in hundreds, if not thousands, being reduced to starvation; who will ask himself why these men can not in forty-eight or fifty weeks earn enough to enable them to feed themselves for fifty-two weeks; who will

ask himself why strong, able-bodied farm laborers, even in the home of "protection" (Pennsylvania), only receive \$5 a week for eight months in the year and sometimes can not get work even at that wage; who will ask himself why men will work in the chemical factories, where in a few years they lose much of the semblance of human beings (their teeth and nails rotting and falling out, losing their hair, and even their eyelashes), for a pittance of \$8 to \$10 a week; who will ask himself why men fight for the privilege of engaging in such hazardous occupations as coal mining, where they daily take their lives in their hands, for a wage that will not keep many men in this House in cigars; who will ask himself why tens of thousands of other men's daughters are driven every year in our large cities to sell themselves upon the streets; whoever will seriously ask himself these questions and sets out determined to find the answer, no matter what may have been his previous prejudices—whoever will do this will, I say, find that there is one common cause for these diseased and withered limbs, for these drooping and dying branches upon the tree of society.

The cause was epitomized (although quite unconsciously) by the President of the United States, in a speech eighteen months ago. I wish I could so present the matter to this House that it would appear in the mind of Members as though arranged in the deadly parallel column. The function of government, he says, is to see "that the cards are not stacked." If these are not mere words, it means that the people—all the people—should have a free field; that favors should be granted to none. Well, let us see.

This is what he said:

About all we have a right to expect from the Government is that it will see that the cards are not stacked. (President Roosevelt, at Concord, N. H., August 23, 1902.)

The Republican party—the Government—enacts laws which enrich the steel trust and other favored pets, who contribute liberally to its campaign fund, recouping themselves by charging enhanced prices to consumers.

These cards are "stacked" with his potent approval.

Distant foreign territory is forcibly acquired so that valuable "special privileges" can be conferred on greedy speculators. The "cards are stacked" against the helpless natives thus robbed, as well as against the masses here who pay the cost of the "benevolent assimilation."

Every grant of special privileges to a railroad is a "stacking of the cards" against the people who are charged all the traffic will bear, regardless of the cost of the service.

Every grant to a private corporation to perform governmental functions, whether it be to operate street railways or to supply water, gas, or electricity, is a "stacking of the cards" against the people.

Every child born in the slums finds the cards "stacked," being compelled to yield an ever-increasing tribute for the privilege of living on the land of that city, so that the Astors may luxuriate in "unearned" wealth.

That the Concord speech, so far as he who delivered it is concerned, ended there, that it was mere words, that it has not and will not be backed up by deeds, is graphically illustrated in an editorial which appeared recently in one of the great Democratic papers of this country, the owner of which is not here to-day, but who is one of the most modest men on this side [laughter on the Republican side], a paper which supports Democratic principles unwaveringly and unfalteringly at all times, whose influence is not confined to the State in which it is published nor to the adjoining State—Iowa. I refer to the Omaha World-Herald.

I shall not take up the time of the House to ask the Clerk to read the editorial, but I do hope when it appears in the RECORD in due course my Republican friends will read it, so that they can appreciate the Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde exhibition that it makes of the great exponent of strenuosity.

The editorial is entitled, "Telling the truth and sticking to it."

[World-Herald, Omaha, Nebr., Sunday, December 27, 1903.]

Addressing Yale students, Reverend Doctor Rainsford said:

"Mr. Roosevelt has earned the thanks of this country for the good he has done by his fearlessness in telling the truth."

"The man who tells the truth and sticks to it does the most lasting good, whether he tells that truth at the dinner table or in public."

Did Mr. Roosevelt tell the truth when, in his Life of Thomas H. Benton, he agreed with political economists that protection "is vicious in theory and harmful in practice?" Then did he stick to it when he advocated a protective tariff wherein the duty should be "more than" equal to the cost of wages abroad and at home?

Did he tell the truth when he said that appointments to office should be based upon merit? Then did he stick to it when he appointed such spoilsmen as Payne and Clarkson to important offices under his Administration?

Did he tell the truth when, in his Cincinnati speech, September 20, 1902, he said that the tariff did not foster trusts and asserted that the anthracite trust was not protected by tariff duties? Did he stick to it when, in his message of December, 1902, he admitted that the tariff can produce monopoly and recommended the removal of the tariff on anthracite coal?

Did he tell the truth when, in his speech at Logansport, Ind., he admitted that the tariff might need revision, and when in his message of December, 1902, he said it was important that a tariff commission be appointed? Did he stick to it when he later adopted the "stand-pat" policy and showed his utter contempt for the tariff question by ignoring it in his latest message to Congress?

Did he tell the truth when he rejected the little gift of a silken flag woven by the hands of a patriotic American girl on the ground that the President of the United States should not receive gifts? Did he stick to it when he accepted free of all cost special trains at the hands of railroad magnates?

Did he tell the truth when he removed from office the postmistress at Greenwood, Del., on the ground that it was his duty to do so, because the postmistress was objectionable to Addicks's Senator? Did he stick to it in the South Carolina case when he appointed to office a postmaster not only over the protests of both the South Carolina Senators, but over the protest of an overwhelming majority of the patrons of the office?

Did he tell the truth when in his Ranch Life and the Hunting Trail, he said that the cowboys "are much better fellows and more pleasant companions than small farmers or agricultural laborers; nor are the mechanics and workmen of the great cities to be mentioned in the same breath?" Did he stick to it when he came to appeal for the votes of the small farmers, the agricultural laborers, and the mechanics and workmen of the great cities?

Did he tell the truth when in an article published in the Review of Reviews, September, 1896, he said: "The men who object to what they style 'government by injunction' are as respects the essential principles of government in hearty sympathy with their remote skinclad ancestors who lived in caves, fought one another with stone-headed axes, and ate the mammoth and woolly rhinoceros. They are interesting as representing geological survival, but they are dangerous whenever there is the least chance of their making the principles of this age-buried past living factors in our present life. They are not in sympathy with men of good minds and sound civic morality." Did he stick to it when he took to his arms John Mitchell and other representatives of labor unions and delivered to them preachments indicating that in his opinion, after all, they are entirely "in sympathy with men of good minds and sound civic morality?"

Did he tell the truth when in February, 1900, speaking to Albert Shaw, editor of the Review of Reviews, he said that under no circumstances would he accept the nomination for the Vice-Presidency, thus encouraging a number of other Republicans to aspire to that position? Did he stick to it when he marched down the aisle of Philadelphia's convention hall, clad in sombrero and high boots, and gave impetus to the Vice-Presidential boom that was then being operated in his behalf?

Did he tell the truth when in his message of December, 1902, advocating Cuban reciprocity, he said that "we should with ungrudging hand do our generous duty by the weak," and that "the giant Republic of the north should make all her sister nations of the American continent feel that, whenever they will permit it, we desire to show ourselves disinterestedly and effectively their friend." Also, "no independent nation in America need have the slightest fear of aggression from the United States. It behooves every one to maintain order within its own borders and discharge its just obligations to foreigners. When this is done, they can rest assured that, be they strong or weak, they have nothing to dread from outside interference." Did he stick to it when he entered upon his Panama filibustering expedition, ignoring our Government's duty to the weaker Government of Colombia and prohibiting by force of arms the Colombian Government from "maintaining order within its own borders?"

Did he tell the truth when he said that he would be unfit for the duties of his high office if he did not adhere to the principles of Abraham Lincoln? Did he stick to it when in his official actions he deliberately repudiated Lincoln's principles?

Did he tell the truth when he said that because of his conduct as a Republican official Perry S. Heath should be forced to retire from the post of secretary to the Republican national committee? Did he stick to it when, in the presence of Mark Hanna's mandate that Heath should not be retired, he had nothing more to say on the Heath retirement proposition?

Did he tell the truth when he said that men who faithfully serve the American people on land and on sea were entitled to know that their services were appreciated? Did he stick to it when he charged Schley, the hero of Santiago Bay, with cowardice; insulted Dewey, the hero of Manila, and permitted Miles to retire, after forty years of faithful service in the Army, with nothing more than a formal and cold-blooded order, written by one of Miles's discredited subordinates?

Did he tell the truth when he said that men charged with serious offenses should be required to explain or leave the public service? Did he stick to it when, after having promoted General Wood above a large number of officers who had served a much longer period than Wood had, he upheld him and insisted upon rewarding him, in spite of the fact that very serious accusations had been made against him?

Did he tell the truth when, in his famous speech at Minneapolis, while he was Vice-President, he said that it might be necessary to "shackle cunning in the future as in the past we had shackled force?" Did he stick to it when he confined his shackling process to the cumbersome injunction proceeding and avoided altogether the application of the criminal indictment or an explanation of why he failed to employ that formidable weapon?

Did he tell the truth when, in his several speeches, he said that there were good trusts and bad trusts? Did he stick to it when, like all other Republican politicians, he dodged the demand that the "good" trusts be named?

Did he tell the truth when he said that "words are good when backed by deeds, and only so?" Aside from his pulpit orations and his platform speeches, have we any reason for saying that Mr. Roosevelt has stuck to it by backing his words with deeds? On the contrary, do we not now learn from the representatives of powerful interests that object to Mr. Roosevelt's nomination that the fear of what an uncertain and impetuous man might do after his election, rather than the objection to anything he actually has done, prompts them to prefer some one other than Mr. Roosevelt as the Republican nominee for President?

The continued reiteration of the prevalence of prosperity—that there is labor for all at a "compensating wage"—recalls to my mind a poem written a year ago, when prosperity was declared to be universal. It was written at the time New York celebrated her two hundred and fifty years of existence, by one of those bright, alert, quick-witted men, the reporters of the metropolitan press, whose favor is eagerly sought by even the most influential, as they can make or unmake "statesmen," their frown being more dreaded than that of any woman. The author of this poem is one of the brightest of New York's reporters. But he is more. Having been assigned years ago to investigate an unusually distressing case of poverty, he was shocked and appalled at the demoralizing and de-

basing conditions that prevailed over a considerable area on the east side of New York. Further investigation compelled him to the conclusion that the poverty which prevailed was involuntary, due to causes beyond the power of these people to remove. He became convinced that the cause was to be found in land monopoly, and from that time has been one of that band of earnest, enthusiastic, self-sacrificing, ever-zealous propagandists who compose the Manhattan Single Tax Club, who are working incessantly to bring the people of New York, and particularly of the borough of Manhattan, also to realize the cause of involuntary poverty. Too high tribute can not be paid to their unfaltering devotion to a great cause—the cause for which Henry George gave his life. I am proud of the friendship of William Everett Hicks, the author of—

TWO HUNDRED FIFTY YEARS AGO.

[Poem written for New York City's celebration of its two hundred and fiftieth anniversary, January 1, 1903.]

It wasn't just like this, you know,
Two hundred fifty years ago.
No steamships clove the splendid bay
From early morn till close of day;
No palaces of trade reared high
Their cornices to kiss the sky;
No whizzing trains roared in the air;
No street cars flittered everywhere;
No mansions of the great defied
The scorn for wealth and gilded pride;
No charities then sought to show
There was no need for want and woe,
Two hundred fifty years ago.

They tell us life was very slow
Two hundred fifty years ago.
It didn't have the rush and speed
That we have come to think we need;
And yet—and yet I sometimes feel
A vague suggestion o'er me steal
That they had things to stir their pride
That now we find to us denied:
They had no slums of dark despair
For sin and crime to flourish there;
No human beings faint for bread
Dropped in the city's highways dead;
No souls found all the pain and strife
So sad a mockery of life
That, smiling with their latest breath,
They daily sought the peace of death;
Their prisons had no murderers' row,
Two hundred fifty years ago.

—WILLIAM EVERETT HICKS.

WHY DOES NOT PROSPERITY EXIST?

Now, Mr. Chairman, why does not prosperity exist in the United States? [Laughter on the Republican side.] Prosperity never will exist in the United States until a great economic reform takes place. It is because on this side occasionally, I am sorry to say, but more particularly and more flagrantly, forty times as often, on the other side of the House, you have voted away special privileges; you have voted to give a few men the power to rob their fellow-men; you have voted continuously year by year to give into the hands of some men the power to tax other men. You Republicans, by these laws, laws which grant special privileges, create monopoly; and these so-called good times which at the best are poor for the toiler, for even at the best of times there are always hundreds of thousands of men out of employment—that condition will not and can not be altered until you strike at the root of the evil, which is grounded in monopoly, and you can only uproot this evil by abolishing every form of taxation which taxes labor, which taxes accumulation, which taxes production, and put the tax upon the monopolization of land in all its various forms.

THE ENORMOUS LAND VALUES IN LARGE CITIES.

One of the great causes of the unequal diffusion of the benefits of this boasted prosperity can be found in some figures to which I desire to call the attention of the House, which I have gleaned at random from the official list of assessments made by the tax commissioners of the city of New York, and which is the basis for the assessments levied in that city for 1904, as published in today's New York papers. These figures relate to ten office buildings, the structures being ten or more years old; also ten other such buildings of comparatively recent construction. Together they embrace a score of the larger office buildings of that city. Contrast two of these properties, both well known. One, the Stock Exchange, just completed—the value of the building is fixed at \$900,000, while the land is officially appraised at \$3,800,000, or four times as much as the building. The Mills Building, erected some twenty years ago, is directly opposite on Broad street. The land in this case is appraised at \$3,464,000, while the value of the materials and the labor employed in its erection is put at \$636,000, less than one-fifth the value of the land.

Another building known throughout the country is the Equitable Life Assurance Building, the land being appraised at \$8,365,000, while the value of that magnificent structure is put at

\$2,580,000, or only 30 per cent of the value of the site. The appended table embraces these twenty properties:

Buildings erected within ten years.

	Value of land.	Value of building.
Hanover.....	\$1,985,000	\$1,090,000
Fuller (Flatiron).....	1,500,000	1,200,000
Stock Exchange.....	3,800,000	900,000
Washington.....	1,350,000	650,000
Clearing House.....	866,000	304,000
Exchange Court.....	2,085,000	1,025,000
Broad Exchange.....	2,180,000	3,020,000
Metropolitan Life.....	1,332,000	798,000
Speyer & Co.....	490,000	180,000
Kean, Van Cortlandt & Co.....	484,000	176,000
Total.....	16,072,000	9,543,000

These are the largest and most recently constructed office and banking buildings in the city of New York, and yet only one of them—the Broad Exchange—is worth more than the land, several of them being worth less than half what the land is worth.

Buildings ten years old and over.

	Value of land.	Value of building.
Union Trust.....	\$1,795,000	\$305,000
United Bank.....	1,695,000	270,000
Manhattan Co.....	1,685,000	865,000
Time Savings.....	450,000	150,000
Pulitzer.....	1,258,600	731,400
Mills.....	3,464,000	636,000
Equitable.....	8,365,000	2,580,000
Boreel.....	2,410,000	290,000
Adams Express Co.....	1,625,000	145,000
Schmerhorn.....	1,414,000	236,000
Total.....	18,986,600	4,768,400

In the case of these ten buildings the land is therefore worth four times as much as the buildings, while in the case of nine of the leading theaters the disparity is even greater, as the land on which they are situated is assessed six times as high as the theater buildings—the land at \$7,900,000 and the structures at only \$1,290,000.

Sixteen of the leading hotels—excluding the Waldorf-Astoria, where the building is worth twice as much as the site—are assessed at \$6,445,000, but the land on which they are built is assessed at \$20,805,000, more than three times the value of the structures.

But when we come to the palaces of the multimillionaires we find an even greater disparity between the value of the land and the palaces erected thereon. Scores of thousands of people, no doubt, have paraded up and down Fifth avenue and viewed—from the outside—these stately mansions. Not one of the buildings, it will be noted, is assessed at less than \$300,000—surely a comfortable house, even for a multimillionaire—and yet these extremely costly houses are valued by the assessor at less than 38 per cent of the value which he places upon the land beneath them.

	Value of land.	Value of building.
Andrew Carnegie.....	\$1,770,000	\$500,000
Senator W. A. Clark.....	1,200,000	800,000
W. K. Vanderbilt.....	2,350,000	650,000
Mrs. C. P. Huntington.....	1,175,000	325,000
J. J. Astor.....	1,160,000	440,000
W. W. Astor.....	1,115,000	335,000
W. D. Sloane.....	2,010,000	890,000
Wm. C. Whitney.....	775,000	375,000
E. T. Gerry.....	1,050,000	300,000
May A. Yerkes.....	750,000	400,000
Total.....	13,355,000	5,065,000

The aggregate of the assessment of land values in the city of New York is placed at \$3,697,686,935, while the total value of the structures of all descriptions is placed at \$1,100,000,000, or about 23 per cent of the whole assessment. This, it must be remembered, includes all of the small dwellings in the city, which in the suburbs are worth usually two to four times as much as the lots upon which they are situated. If we take the borough of Manhattan alone, it will be seen that the land values are almost \$3,000,000,000, while the cost of all the structures, including all the immense office buildings, large hotels, theaters, etc., is less than \$600,000,000.

These figures bear out and put the official stamp of approval on what the single taxers have for years contended, viz, that the land values of a populous community far exceed the aggregate of improvement values. These figures, adduced by unsentimental assessors, supposedly based on full valuation of the property, are

eloquent in demonstrating how vast fortunes have been accumulated and added to without effort on the part of their possessors. Who will question that these enormous land values of the city of New York, paralleled in minor degree in every town and city in the country, are the result of communal growth, due to the people congregating there, with the consequent competition for locations driving the value ever upward? These land values represent an enormous toll which the people must pay to the fortunate speculators who had the foresight and craft to anticipate future needs.

The figures here cited give some hint of how pressing a question we have to face, and, in my opinion, the day for settlement can not long be postponed. The contention I make, Mr. Chairman, is that justice requires that these values, concededly created by all of the people, should be utilized for their common benefit and not be longer permitted to enrich a favored few. The only rational, practical way in which this can be done is through the taxing power of the government, State or city. By taxing this value into the public treasury we would relieve all forms of industry from the burdens of taxation which now oppress and discourage it, at the same time restoring to the people that which is their own, because they have created it.

How great this burden is in the city of New York is indicated when I state that competent authorities put the annual rental value of the land there at not less than \$225,000,000, of which to-day very little finds its way into the city treasury, probably four-fifths being absorbed by private individuals, thus enabling the Astors and others to luxuriate in unearned wealth.

Yet I suppose even in the face of this demonstration our farmer friends will continue to insist that a tax on land values only would be a great hardship to them, whereas the fact is that, deducting the value of the farmers' houses, his outbuildings and barns, his fencing and drainage, etc., the value of the land would be extremely small, unless adjacent to a large town, in many cases the cost of reproducing the buildings and other improvements I have enumerated being greater than the total value of the whole farm. No; so far from the farmer having his tax burdens increased by the adoption of the single tax, they would be very much reduced—certainly one-half, in many cases three-quarters, and in some cases even more. It must be remembered that the farmer has to sell his produce in a free-trade market, while in the price of almost every article which he purchases (his farm implements and clothing in particular) he is carrying the "white man's burden," i. e., he is staggering along under a load of indirect taxation which amounts to several hundred dollars a year. Whereas if land values alone were taxed—unless, as I have said, he lived immediately adjacent to a large town—he would be called upon to pay a very slight direct tax, while his present heavy indirect taxes would be entirely done away with.

While the beneficial effect upon the workers in cities would, if anything, be still greater, as they would not only also be relieved from the present onerous burden of indirect taxation, but avenues of employment now closed would be opened to them, as it would be no longer profitable for anyone to withhold land from use. The result would, therefore, be an enormous increase in the demand for labor in all forms of productive enterprises. The surplus labor market would be wiped out, and instead of two, aye, ten men chasing after one job there would be competition among employers for every man who desired to perform useful labor. Then, indeed, it would be true to state "that there is work for every man who desires to labor in this country at a 'compensating' wage." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

APPENDIX.

[The Public, Saturday, January 2, 1904.]

Many explanations of the terrible disaster at the Iroquois theater in Chicago will be given by the newspapers and echoed by excited readers, and much of their scolding of managers and architects and city officials will probably be deserved. So it would seem like "carrying coals to Newcastle" for us to give particular attention to any of the causes for these over-late criticisms. But there is one explanation which is barely likely to be given through the usual channels of criticism, and to that we invite a little common-sense attention. We refer to the impossibility of making an auditorium safe when the builders are forced to wedge it in among other buildings, as the theater builders in large cities are forced to do. This is an explanation which lies back of all others. This is a condition which makes such catastrophes inevitable, no matter what minor precautions may be taken.

No such disaster could occur in the Mormon Tabernacle at Salt Lake City. Why? Because an abundance of exits on all sides open immediately into "all out doors." There are no windings and turnings leading into one narrow alley at the rear or one narrow doorway in the front. Let a fire break out or an explosion occur in that structure, and unless the structure itself were destroyed within three minutes, every person in it could reach a place of safety.

Of course it may be impracticable to build theaters in large cities out "in the open" as the Mormon Tabernacle is built; but it is not impracticable to surround them with open alleys, so that numerous exits may make of all four sides of the building a clear way to the street when occasions of danger require. Nor are architects altogether to blame for not building theaters upon that plan. The Iroquois Theater, for instance, had to be built in the form of an L, if built at all upon the chosen site, and one stem of the L was so narrow as to afford only reasonable room for the regulation entrance. Moreover,

sites are so inordinately dear in locations appropriate for theaters that the space necessary for alleys would create a burden of cost so great as to be in itself a formidable, if not impossible, commercial obstacle.

Therein lies the fundamental cause of such disasters as that of the Iroquois Theater. By encouraging investments in sites merely for the purpose of securing the advantages of higher prices an abnormal scarcity of sites is produced and abnormal concentration results. It is this abnormal concentration, more than anything else or all things else together, that makes of what ought to be but an accident to a building a calamitous destruction of human life. And this is a condition the fault of which lies at no particular man's door. The responsibility rests upon us all for our persistent and unreasonable ignorance of the natural laws of municipal development.

Public sentiment in Chicago is being stirred to its depths by a "citizens' movement for the suppression of crime. A large committee has been formed, which is bespangled with prominent names. Subcommittees have been carved out of the larger committee, a princely fund is being collected by popular subscription, and through the local press a hue and cry is raised.

This is good work. No community can exist in reasonable comfort—much less can it flourish—where crime is rampant. Protection for life, liberty, and property is the first essential of civilized life; and none of these rights are secure where crime holds sway. That crime does hold sway in Chicago is evident. It flourishes in many forms, from mere "touching" and pocket picking all the way up, through the various grades of hold up, housebreaking, and city hall "graft," to the tentative traction ordinance now pending before the city council. All are criminal, for each kind is in some way a menace to the security of some one's rights of life, liberty, or property.

The only objection to the "citizens' movement against crime in Chicago is that it is not directed against crime and criminals on principle. It is directed against only some kinds of crime and some grades of criminals. Let us not be misunderstood. We do not criticize the movement and its patrons for confining their present crusade to particular crimes and particular classes. Such criticism would be unjust and foolish. Very often it is necessary to do only one thing at a time. This is especially true of rooting out crime. It must be attacked in detail. The indictment that does lie against the projectors of this movement is not that they are assailing only the lower grades of crime, but that they are not assailing crime, as crime, at all.

The movement is animated by no principle of hostility to crime in general. It is only against certain species of crime that its projectors are excited and valiant. The crime genus does not arouse their hostility. Some of them, indeed, are even vigilant to protect their own favorite species of this genus. Boastful as they are about their crusade against crime, what they are really fighting is only the "other fellow's game." They are like the little girl of the oft-told but very pertinent story who prayed, "O Lord, make Martha Smith a good little girl, so that I may take all her playthings away from her and she won't make any fuss about it."

Let the generous doubter compare the attitude of these crime chasers toward vulgar "graft" and pistol hold-ups with their attitude toward the "graft" and hold up of the Chicago City Railway, for instance, of which some of them are expectant beneficiaries. Yet there is really no moral difference between the two kinds. The hold-up man relieves you of your pocket money and your watch at the point of a pistol. The traction company holds up the city officials with threats of unconscionable litigation for a prize of at least \$200,000,000. Where are these virtuous crime chasers when that kind of crime flourishes? Do they denounce crime then? Surely it is pertinent to call upon them, before they expand too much with a sense of their virtue, to consider what crime is before they begin to chase criminals, and then to ask the guiltless among them to lead in the chase.

Let us repeat, however, that we are raising no objection to the suppression of vulgar forms of crime. By all means eradicate them. But eradicate them in the right spirit. Eradicate them, not because they happen to disturb you, but because they are a species of the genus crime. Thus you cultivate a disposition to eradicate the whole genus, the species of your own household as well as the species of the slums. Not only is this the right spirit, but it is the only spirit which can crown any movement against the vulgar species of crime with success. Crusades against all crime can abolish all crime, step by step, if intelligently and sincerely prosecuted; but crusades with one-sided motives, against the crimes of the lower classes of criminals only, can never succeed. So long as trespasses upon the life, liberty, and property of the masses are permitted under forms of law, so long will the masses breed vulgar criminals to defy the law.

When you commend your policemen for boasting of "violating the law in order to enforce the law," what are you to expect of men who suffer from what seem to be unfair discriminations? When the police forbid lawful public meetings of the "lower classes," as they have recently done in Paterson, N. J., or break them up, as they did in Chicago prior to the anarchist episode, what are you to expect of the "lower classes" who are thus denied one of the most fundamental of rights? When prisoners without influential friends, arrested without warrant and confined without legal authority, are tortured into making confessions (true or false, as may be) in utter defiance of law, and this official criminality is publicly approved or condoned as necessary to successful criminal chasing, what are you to expect of the prisoners and their friends as they begin to realize that the safeguards of the law, nominally for the protection of all, are not for the protection of such as they?

These are but surface suggestions. To go fully into even so much as a bare enumeration of the various approved species of crime that tend to produce the species that excite the ire and stimulate the civic enthusiasm of your polite crime chaser would require much more space than we can spare. It would take us back to the traction ordinance hold up and "graft" which some of the wealthiest people of Chicago are coercing the city council's committee into approving. It would take us even beyond that. We should have to point to the various other sources of unearned incomes of the respectable sort, which are extorted under forms of law from the working forces of society. There is a great measure of truth in the general feeling and common talk among the proscribed criminals that "all is graft," and that their proscribed practices are "in kind the same as those of the respectable gangs who chase them, and in degree milder."

Until the present crusade against crime in Chicago vitalizes itself with a better civic spirit, it will neither deserve nor command success. It can not command even respect, except in the limited class out of which it springs, while it represents nothing more than it seems to now. Not even a citizens' committee for the suppression of crime can divide its allegiance and yet be worthy of confidence. It can not be trusted to exterminate the vulgar crimes of the poor while condoning the gilded graft of the rich. Crime is crime, be the criminal rich or poor, of high station or low, official servant or private citizen. Nor is it any the less crime for having been legalized or having become respectable. It consists essentially in depriving men of their natural rights to their own life, their own liberty, and their own property. Do the Chicago committee agree to this? Then let them declare their purpose. Do they purpose exterminating crime wherever and however it raises its head, and whether it be sanctioned by law and custom or not? Or are they only sportsmen on a man hunt in the slums?

[The Public (box 687, Chicago, Ill.), Saturday, January 9, 1904.]

Without receding from our principal contention of last week, relative to the Iroquois Theater fire (p. 609), we are forced by subsequent developments to a consideration of some of the secondary causes of that terrible catastrophe.

Laws designed for the security of life in Chicago theaters and other structures appear to have been wantonly violated. For this the responsibility rests not only upon theater builders and managers and architects, but with even greater weight upon city officials, and with still greater weight upon the business classes of Chicago—the same classes that are loud in their denunciation of crimes of far less magnitude.

We shall explain our meaning in holding the business classes to this awful responsibility. But one step at a time. First, as to the persons immediately responsible for this particular calamity—the builders, architects, and managers of the Iroquois Theater. Even the commonest precautions seem to have been neglected. The asbestos curtain was badly hung and was inflammable besides. Exit doors were either locked or rusted fast, and some of them swung in such a way as to obstruct instead of facilitate safe egress. No automatic sprinklers were in place, and there was not a drop of water within reach to extinguish fire. No fire alarm was available. Stairways met so as to churn the converging currents of escaping people like converging currents of water. Fire escapes, so narrow at the top as to barely accommodate one thin stream of panic-stricken people, were so adjusted to exits as to receive different streams at different altitudes, and yet were no wider at the bottom than at the top. But why enumerate? Had the theater been expressly constructed and equipped for wholesale and horrible slaughter, it could hardly have been adapted to the purpose much better than it was. And many of its dangerous defects were in conscious and not improbably corrupt violation of the safety laws.

But this particular theater was not peculiar in those respects. Some Chicago theaters may be safer, but most of them are not, and some are even more dangerous. It was only blind fate and not greater negligence or turpitude that has made the persons connected with the Iroquois Theater so especially and unenviably conspicuous at this time. Had the fire occurred at almost any other Chicago theater during a performance, the calamity would have been similar. And it would have come from similar causes—wantonly neglect of reasonable precautions, jaunty indifference to the rights of patrons, and callous neglect of legal requirements. The whole fraternity of theatrical management in Chicago is morally as responsible for the Iroquois disaster as are the managers of that ill-fated theater.

Of the facts upon which this conclusion is based there is but little room for dispute. The mayor has now closed all the theaters. His orders are so stringent that he will not allow even the ground floors to be occupied by audiences. The necessity is so great that he is as adamant to all appeals, though his action deprives thousands of employment. He will not allow any theater to open until it has installed safety devices in strict conformity with the law. This seems more like a panic spasm than wise administration, since the result could be accomplished without much risk by requiring each theater to conform to the law within a reasonable time on pain of being closed in case of neglect. But it testifies most convincingly to the dangerous and lawless conditions that have heretofore been perpetuated with impunity.

On the top of this testimony comes an astounding disclosure. It appears that the building department reported in detail the unsafe condition of the Chicago theaters as much as two months ago, and that the facts in this report have been practically disregarded by the building department, the mayor, and the city council. How is it possible wholly to exonerate any of these authorities?

That brings us to the responsibility of the business classes, which, we repeat, is the weightiest of all. Why did the building department merely report the universal violation of safety laws by the theaters of Chicago instead of also proceeding at once to secure compliance with those laws?

Because the head of that department was afraid of arousing the hostility of the business classes by what he thought, and with reason, they would regard as a finicky interference with business interests. And not the theatrical business classes alone, mind you, but the business classes in general; for not only might business in general have been prejudicially affected by enforcing the laws against theaters, but office buildings, churches, stores, and so on, are sinners like the theaters. Why did the mayor merely refer this damning report to the city council, instead of also proceeding—more considerably than he is doing now, but promptly and energetically—to secure compliance with the safety laws? Because he, too, feared the business classes of the city. As he now says, he would have been mobbed had he taken that course at that time. And so, probably, he would have been; and by a broadcloth mob at that. He could not have relied upon any business-class sentiment of respect for the law.

Again, why did the city council merely toss the report over to a committee, and why did the committee merely refer it to a printer, and indifferently await the printer's pleasure—why all this piddling over violations of laws so vital to the security of human life? The same reason. The city council, too, was afraid of the business classes.

So we may trace responsibility for the Iroquois catastrophe back from the Iroquois managers to the managers generally, whose derelictions they followed; and back from the managers to the officials, who winked at these derelictions; and back of the officials to the business classes, whose deadened conscience has latterly become so characteristic of American business men.

Among these classes right and wrong have ceased to be distinguishable except momentarily as the distinction may happen to be useful for selfish ends, while respect for law is something which, though the "lower classes" are said to owe it to society, the business classes seem to owe to nobody whenever they are agreed upon its inconvenience or unprofitableness to themselves. With this spirit prevalent, it is certain that any official who had undertaken to enforce the fire laws prior to the Iroquois disaster would have run counter to a business-class sentiment, reinforced by local advertising mediums, which would probably have ended his career in public life.

Officials are culpable, of course, for not having bravely met that obstacle; but the culpability of those who created the obstacle is far the greater of the two. One of the manifest lessons of the Iroquois calamity is the importance of revitalizing public opinion with a conscience capable of distinguishing right from wrong and disposed impartially to respect laws for the right regulation of social life. This lesson needs to be learned not merely by labor strikers and hold-up men, as your modern pharisee thinks, but it is needed by the business class most of all. Nor is it applicable to Chicago alone.

Incidentally, the vice of free passes is brilliantly illuminated by disclosures regarding the Iroquois Theater fire. It was by this means that minor officials were bribed to be good-natured about infractions of the law that have proved so disastrous. For instance, an inspector reported the Iroquois as "O. K." only a few minutes before the audience began a terrible struggle for life in this lawlessly equipped theater lawlessly packed with human beings. It is just that sort of inspection, just that sort of official oversight, that free passes encourage. And the free-pass evil is not confined to theaters nor to minor officials. How many members of the Chicago city council are not in possession of railroad passes? How often does the mayor travel without a pass? How many judges in Chicago reject the proffered passes of railroads

on whose interests they may have to sit in judgment? How many officials anywhere are without free passes? That these "courtesies" do not effect the bribery of officials with reference to large matters is doubtless true.

Corrupt officials do not sell themselves so cheap. But it is beyond dispute that passes do secure small favors, compensating "courtesies"—such, for instance, as the "O. K." of a theater's violation of the law in trifles, trifles which, however, may precipitate calamities. If free passes do not improperly influence judges, inspectors, councilmen, legislators, etc., why do railroad officers and theater managers make them the regular perquisites of public servants with whom they have official relations? Surely not for their health. The "O. K."-ing of the Iroquois Theater just before it burned tells the story. Passes put public officials in good humor toward law breakers. The public official who takes them may not know he is bribed; but the theater or railroad manager who gives them, he knows it.

That is reason enough for this resolution offered in the Chicago city council on the 4th by Alderman Dunn:

"Whereas the receipt of gratuities, such as free passage or tickets from railroads, theaters, or other public utilities or places of amusement by city legislators, city officials, and employees, is clearly detrimental to the free discharge of official duties: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this council that the asking for or receipt of any free pass, ticket, or special favor from railroads or places of amusement be condemned; and be it further

Resolved, That this asking or accepting such favors be made a ground for disqualification from municipal office or employment.

Resolved, That the judiciary committee of this council be requested to report the necessary order to bring this resolution into full force and effect."

And it is rather discouraging to be obliged to report that the "reform" council of Chicago has buried Mr. Dunn's excellent resolution in committee, thus following the example of the Democratic caucus in Congress (p. 503), which made a similar disposition of Congressman BAKER's resolution pledging the party to refuse railroad passes.

President Roosevelt's special message to Congress is unusually interesting for a Presidential message; and, while long, necessarily so because of the mass of its detail and the subtlety of its argument, its substance may be boiled down to Tweed's noted inquiry: "What are you going to do about it?"

And, sure enough, what are we going to do about it? If we concede that the right to recognize new governments is vested in the President exclusively and absolutely, which is a precedent set by President Cleveland, nothing remains to do, for in that case Panama is not only an independent nation, but it is one whose sovereignty, if Secretary Hay is right in his theory as to treaty covenants "running with the land," we are bound by the old Granada treaty to defend. No matter what the American people may wish, no matter what Congress might have been disposed to do, if the President's irresponsible recognition of this new nation is conclusive, then nothing remains for Congress to do but to attend to details. The President himself will have done the vital thing without so much as "By your leave, Messrs. Congressmen."

It is upon this basis that Mr. Roosevelt virtually demands of Congress that it fill in the details of the Panama policy which he of his own unbridled will has inaugurated. He has virtually made himself an absolute monarch as to this most important matter, for does he not say:

"The only question now before us is that of the ratification of the treaty, for it is to be remembered that a failure to ratify the treaty will not undo what has been done, will not restore Panama to Colombia, and will not alter our obligation to keep the transit open across the Isthmus and to prevent any outside power from menacing this transit?"

And does he not "repeat that the question actually before this Government is not that of the recognition of Panama as an independent republic. That is already an accomplished fact. The question, and the only question, is whether or not we shall build an isthmian canal?"

Take those two admonitions out of his special message and nothing but a plea for Panama and the Panama Canal route remains. But there is power in those admonitions. They are Rooseveltian for Tweed's less polished but not more defiant phrase.

How did Panama's independence come to be "an accomplished fact?" Simply through the favor of Mr. Roosevelt. It was by his orders, as his message shows, that Commander Hubbard, United States Navy, "prevented either party from attacking the other;" that is, that prevented Colombia from coercing a seceding State as we coerced South Carolina in the sixties. It was by his recognition of the seceding State, regardless of Congress, that this State became a sovereign power, which we are bound by treaty (according to the Hay theory that "the covenant runs with the land") to protect from the parent power. So Mr. Roosevelt virtually says to the Senate: "You might as well ratify the treaty, for I have already done everything else, and whether you like it or not, what are you going to do about it?"

Obviously only one of two things can be done. The President's constitutional authority to put Congress into such a hole can be conceded, in which case a treaty with Panama must be confirmed whether the confirming power likes it or not. The only alternative is to attack this evil at the roots, by contesting the authority of the President to force his own will upon the country in a manner involving, as the recognition of new nations does, far-reaching questions of treaty obligations, of national honor, and even of war. If the President's recognition of Panama is constitutionally conclusive, he has virtually usurped the war-making authority; for in that case his recognition imposes upon Congress the necessity of making war upon Colombia if Colombia attempts to hold Panama to its repudiated allegiance.

COMPARISON OF COST OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT IN CLEVELAND AND CINCINNATI—CINCINNATI'S IRRESPONSIBLE "BOARD PLAN"—CLEVELAND'S RESPONSIBLE "FEDERAL PLAN"—INDORSED BY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE—PER CAPITA EXPENDITURE IN CINCINNATI 50 PER CENT GREATER THAN IN CLEVELAND.

[Open letter of Carl H. Nau, public accountant, to Governor Myron T. Herrick.]

CLEVELAND, OHIO, January 11, 1904.

HON. MYRON T. HERRICK, Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: I take the liberty of addressing you in behalf of myself and my fellow-citizens in order to lay before you certain facts and figures which may be useful to you in view of legislation which will be necessary to be enacted by the present general assembly, and in which you, by virtue of your high office, will be a powerful factor.

For two years past the Cleveland federal plan of government, both in municipal and school affairs, has been subject to systematic attacks by interests in other parts of the State, and a vast amount of false and misleading information has been put into the public mind.

You, as one of Cleveland's first citizens, must feel the injustice that has been done our city. The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, of which you are a member, has, without dissenting voice, declared that the federal plan of municipal and school government in Cleveland is admirable. It is to be hoped that any changes that the general assembly may make in the present munic-

ipal code will tend along the lines of the federal plan, and that the new State school code may follow the general lines of the time-tried and efficient federal plan now in operation in Cleveland.

It is repeatedly asserted that the "board plan" of Cincinnati has furnished a more economical administration of the city's affairs than the city of Cleveland under a sane, logical plan of government under which executive responsibility was centralized. This belief has been fostered by no less an authority than your predecessor in office. On the contrary, census reports and other authorities show that the government of Cincinnati was grossly extravagant when compared with that of Cleveland, but when the tax rate of Cleveland was pointed to in comparison with the one in Cincinnati, and the Cincinnati rate shown to be lower than that of Cleveland, it was supposed to have settled the question of the relative excellence of the plan of government or efficiency of administration of the two cities.

It is true that the tax rate of Cincinnati is lower, and for some years has been lower, than that of Cleveland. How this could be true, and it also could be true, that the expense of operation of the city of Cincinnati was 50 per cent greater per capita than that of Cleveland has always been considerable of a mystery. When this matter is carefully examined it ceases to be a mystery, and the government of Cincinnati is shown to be grossly extravagant when compared with that of Cleveland, and the purpose of this letter is to call attention to the misrepresentations upon which the above relief is founded.

Let us first examine the operating expenses of the two cities. The following figures are not taken from biased authority, but are the figures made by the State bureau of inspection under the uniform municipal accounting act, passed by the last session of the legislature. The publication of reports according to the schedules prescribed by this bureau, under this uniform accounting act, make it possible for the first time to make a comparison of like things with like things in the reports of the two cities.

Excluding capital expenditures of either city, or the payment of debt, and excluding expenditures for educational or county purposes, the cost of operating the city of Cleveland for the year 1902 was \$3,684,675.53, while in Cincinnati it was \$5,261,675.01. This expense was divided among the various items of cost which go to make up the aggregate, as per the following table:

	Cleveland.	Cincinnati.
General government—Council, clerk, mayor, auditor, treasurer, solicitor, sinking fund, elections; police, justice, and other courts (including in Cleveland the tax school).....	\$172,147.48	\$176,248.68
Police.....	300,479.57	555,580.12
Fire.....	601,953.00	479,977.05
Fire and police telephone (included above for Cleveland).....		13,314.22
Sanitary.....	55,461.05	46,924.04
Quarantine.....	163,697.26	
Bureau inspection (including smoke inspection).....		25,204.10
Total protection, life, health, property.....	1,211,500.88	1,121,008.53
Public service, general advertising.....	14,932.67	32,197.37
Hospital, infirmary, etc.....	150,740.04	252,168.53
Blind.....	9,050.00	6,678.00
Workhouse, reform, free employment.....	60,394.26	126,066.54
Total charity and correction.....	230,184.30	384,943.07
Engineering (including smoke inspector in Cleveland).....	83,208.35	28,924.66
Street paving and repairing of sidewalks.....	129,895.97	207,283.57
Street cleaning.....	133,468.97	231,891.73
Lighting.....	230,039.56	336,927.30
Garbage.....	69,400.00	44,553.75
Sewers, etc.....	50,128.99	28,987.42
Bridges.....	103,877.46	35,546.96
Rivers and harbors.....	27,545.05	
Miscellaneous.....	947.55	3,922.70
Total public ways.....	837,539.90	918,040.90
Waterworks.....	264,602.76	607,238.46
Markets.....	20,354.20	17,229.77
Docks, etc.....		4,489.89
Parks.....	108,584.16	41,493.65
Public buildings and lands.....	59,025.53	49,830.99
Cemeteries.....	32,141.17	
Miscellaneous items not classified.....	21,342.51	41,601.53
Interest.....	718,759.97	1,867,381.58
Grand total operating expenses.....	3,684,675.53	5,261,675.01

Taking the entire operating expenses of the two cities, therefore, and apportioning it per capita upon the basis of the census of 1900, it shows the maintenance of the government of Cleveland to have cost its citizens \$9.65 per capita, while that of Cincinnati cost \$16.15 per capita.

In order to make a perfectly fair comparison, however, it ought to be said that the city of Cincinnati renders some services and performs some functions which the city of Cleveland does not perform. Likewise does the city of Cleveland render to its citizens services which are not rendered by the government of the city of Cincinnati. The largest item of expense incurred by the city of Cincinnati, which it would not be fair to consider in a comparison between the expenses of the two cities, is the amount of interest which the city of Cincinnati pays on the bonds issued by the city of Cincinnati against the steam railroad which it owns (known as the Cincinnati Southern). This amounts in the year of 1902 to \$1,103,185.

Likewise does the city of Cincinnati maintain an institution for children, known as the "House of Refuge" at a cost of \$64,635.71. Cleveland now renders a similar service, and an offset against the cost of this institution will be the expense of maintaining the "Boys' Farm" but this expense had not yet been incurred in the year 1902. It will certainly be fair to Cincinnati to deduct this also from the total operating expense of Cincinnati. Adding \$4,489.89, which Cincinnati spent for maintenance of docks and wharves, will make a total of \$1,172,310.60, which, for purposes of comparison, it will be fair to deduct from the operating expenses of Cincinnati shown above, in order to compare the expenses of like things with like things in the two cities.

Upon the other hand, Cleveland performs some services which do not

enter into the expenses of operating the city of Cincinnati, among which are the following:

Removing night soil.....	\$17,637.70
Work done for private parties.....	44,060.99
(Cost of which is borne by private parties in connection with the repair of streets, where openings are made in the streets, and instead of permitting private parties to replace the street in the condition in which it was found, Cleveland undertakes to do this work itself as a matter of precaution against the improper performance of this work, and collects the cost from private individuals. This cost, however, has gone into the above total expense, and hence should be here deducted.)	
In this year the city maintained a quarantine against a smallpox epidemic costing.....	163,607.26
(Cincinnati having no similar expense this year.)	
Cleveland has a magnificent park system, and the excess cost for parks in Cleveland amounts to.....	67,120.51
Cleveland has a multitude of expensive bridges, which Cincinnati does not have, and therefore it would be proper, for purposes of comparison, to deduct the difference between the cost of maintenance of bridges in Cincinnati and Cleveland, amounting to.....	68,330.60
Cleveland spends on rivers and harbors.....	27,120.51
(An expense the city of Cincinnati does not have.)	
It cost the city of Cleveland for the care of its cemeteries (Cincinnati has no public cemeteries).....	32,141.17

Taking into account, therefore, only the above items of expense, where Cleveland performs a very apparent and considerable service not performed by the government of Cincinnati, amounting in total to \$420,443.23, and deducting them from the total expenses of operation for the city of Cleveland, and we arrive at a cost of similar service performed by each city, which in Cleveland amounts to \$3,261,322.25 and in Cincinnati to \$4,089,364.41, or a per capita in Cleveland of \$8.55 and in Cincinnati of \$12.55.

The above table shows the division of this expense as exhibited by the schedules of the State inspection bureau.

I would call special attention to some of the glaring differences in the cost of rendering certain services in Cincinnati as compared with Cleveland. The cost of operating the Cincinnati waterworks was \$607,238.46, while in Cleveland it was \$204,602.76. The pay rolls of Cincinnati waterworks alone amount to one and one-half times the cost of the entire expense of the Cleveland waterworks, while Cleveland pumps 40 per cent more water than Cincinnati and has 50 per cent more consumers. The average cost of raising 1,000,000 gallons of water 1 foot, which is the recognized unit of comparison at waterworks pumping stations, was 7.15 cents in Cincinnati, while in Cleveland it was 2.6 cents.

To maintain its hospitals and infirmaries it cost Cincinnati \$252,168.53, or an average per capita cost of the population of these institutions of \$199, while in Cleveland the cost was \$150,740.04, or \$182 per capita of institution population.

So much for a comparison of the expenses of the two cities. It has been a mystery to some people how Cincinnati could, in view of the gross extravagance of its government, nevertheless have a lower tax rate than Cleveland. This ceases to be a mystery when this question is analyzed. The taxes levied in 1901 were the funds raised to pay the above expenses, and in that year the tax rates in the two cities were as follows:

	Cincinnati.	Cleveland.
City levy.....	13.78	11.45
Board of education levy.....	4.93	8.10
Library levy.....75
County levy.....	3.82	3.51
State levy.....	2.89	2.89
Total.....	24.82	26.70

It will be noticed that the lower tax rate of Cincinnati is entirely accounted for by the small levy for educational purposes, and that the levy for municipal purposes, the levy out of which the above expenses were paid, was higher in Cincinnati for this year than in Cleveland. In addition, Cincinnati had a duplicate \$18,000,000 greater than Cleveland, so that this levy raised in Cincinnati \$2,914,907.70, while the levy in Cleveland raised from the taxpayers only \$2,294,423.63. But to this may be added (to be entirely fair) \$204,450.76 raised in Cleveland from its sewer-district taxes, making a total raised from general property taxes of all kinds \$2,468,883.39, or a per capita in Cincinnati of \$3.94 and in Cleveland of \$6.46.

It may also be noted that included in the above levy for city purposes was 0.99 cent, to bear out city's share of cost of paving, while the city of Cincinnati issued bonds to pay its share of the cost of paving.

In addition to this increased income for municipal purposes from general property taxes, the city of Cincinnati has other taxes and income from other sources which the city of Cleveland does not have. In this year it raised over \$100,000 from various licenses, which income Cleveland does not have. It raised \$190,000 of income from its street railroad companies. It has an income of over \$400,000 from the lease of its steam railroad, being the difference between the rent of \$1,210,000 per year and the interest on the bonds against this property, amounting since July, 1902, to only \$806,000 per year. Hence the city of Cincinnati has an income other than general property taxes of nearly \$700,000 which the city of Cleveland does not have.

Much has been said, however, about Cincinnati tax rates having been reduced and Cleveland's tax rate having been increased. The tax rate in 1903 for the expenses of 1904 in Cincinnati, for municipal purposes, is 11.80, and in Cleveland 13.04. The reduction of the Cincinnati rate was made possible by the refunding of certain bonds against its steam railroad from 7.3 per cent to 3.5 per cent, these bonds maturing in 1902 and being refunded at the lower rate. This enabled the city to reduce its levy for sinking fund and interest purposes from 4.96 to 2.74—a greater difference than the reduction in the city levy. This may be an argument for municipal ownership, and be a case where Cleveland can learn a lesson from Cincinnati, but it does not indicate any reduction in the cost of the operating expenses of the city of Cincinnati.

Upon the other hand, Cleveland's rate has been increased, but the increase in the levy in Cleveland for interest and sinking fund (due to vast public improvements here made, and to recent questions about the legality of our charter, causing low premiums on bonds sold), and the levies made necessary by the withdrawal of certain revenues from the city for State purposes (necessitating a direct levy for fire, police, and sanitary pension funds), measures the increase in the Cleveland levy. It is true that this latter revenue was also taken from the city of Cincinnati; but Cincinnati made but a small levy for its pension funds as compared with Cleveland, evidently preferring to sell bonds to take care of current expenses from these pension funds, rather than buy them from current revenues raised by taxation, thus putting into the

future the problem of providing for the increased pensions necessary as time goes on.

The above analysis therefore shows that on a comparison of operating expenses of the two cities Cincinnati, under its so-called "boss rule" board plan form of government, costs 50 per cent more per capita than Cleveland, under the so-called federal plan, costs its citizens. This after being eminently fair and excluding from the expenses of each city those very apparent and unusual expenses incurred in the one which were not incurred in the other. In making this comparison the benefit of the doubt has always been given to Cincinnati, and anyone acquainted with the two cities can easily pick out instances where the service rendered in Cleveland is vastly superior to that rendered in Cincinnati, although, in this comparison, only those entirely different and considerable expenses for functions performed in the one city not performed in the other at all have been eliminated from the totals in making a comparison of the cost of similar service rendered.

It also shows that even on the comparison of tax rates in the two cities (even after excluding entirely from consideration the considerable revenue from indirect taxes and other sources which Cincinnati raises and the higher duplicate of Cincinnati) Cleveland has the advantage in that not only the money raised, but even the rate on general property taxes for municipal purposes was higher in Cincinnati than in Cleveland, and Cincinnati obtains an advantage in a comparison of rates only when taking into consideration the much lower rate levied for educational purposes.

In conclusion I will say that I write this open letter to you in a spirit of loyalty to Cleveland and to pure, economical, and efficient public service, and I place these facts and figures in your hands solely as a voluntary contribution, the fruit of long study, which may aid you in the performance of your multitude of duties and arm you to defend the schools and the good name not only of our own city, but the schools of the whole State.

Respectfully,

CARL H. NAU.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I think I have fifteen minutes remaining on this side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has twenty minutes remaining.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield fifteen minutes of that to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the honorable committee to what is known as a "clean-money bill" (H. R. 5068), which I introduced in Congress November 27, 1903. The provisions, in brief, of that bill are these: That all national banks, and all other banks that are national depositories, are required—not simply allowed or privileged, but are required—to send all dirty currency and mutilated paper money issued by the Government of the United States to the Treasurer of the United States for the purpose of having it reissued in clean bills, the cost of transportation both ways to be paid by the Government.

The bill permits individuals, corporations, and money establishments of all sorts to enjoy this privilege. The law at present compels the sender of the money to pay the transportation, which is so high as to be practically prohibitory, except in the great cities, where the people can in person take their dirty money to the subtreasuries, of which there are but eight or nine in the United States and only one in the South—New Orleans—and get it exchanged for clean bills.

I will give instances of the necessity for a law of this kind. Some months ago a man was drowned in the Potomac River. Unfortunately, the body remained in the river about four months. In the clothing of the deceased money was found. Some one took this money to the Treasury Department, and it was reissued in clean money; but before that was done the Department had to disinfect the money and later disinfect the office.

Another case I recall. A box of money was brought by a Government undertaker from Cuba and carried to the Treasury office. I do not know who the man was, but I was so informed of this fact several times, and, indeed, so late as this morning by Treasury officials. That money was reissued. It was money which had been taken from the bodies of soldiers.

I do not know what became of the money which was reissued, but the money taken there in the box was so foul, so reeking as it were in microbes and micrococci, and all other sort of germs that breed disease, that the Department had to fumigate it with great particularity before they would undertake to destroy and reissue the money. After this was done they had to fumigate the machinery and fumigate the office.

Only yesterday or the day before some one brought to the Treasury some of this foul money and the same thing occurred. The odor drove everybody out of the office until it was thoroughly fumigated. I speak of the odor, to say nothing of the microbes and disease-breeding condition of the money itself.

These are cases which have occurred in the Treasury of the United States in Washington. This bill as a sanitary measure will be invaluable and timely. Near the Treasury or a subtreasury the people can and do go in person and get new money for old without expense. But away out in the country, out West, in the Southwest, and in the West until you strike the gold belt, in the extreme East, and, in fact, in the Northeastern States, they have to send it to the Treasury or subtreasury, if it is sent at all, but they pay from 60 to 75 cents per each thousand dollars—an exorbitant rate.

If you can send it by "Government rate," it is 60 cents a thousand each way from the city of Nashville, my home. It is 20

cents on the main line of the express company in certain sections.

The regulations as of March 23, 1900, as shown by Department Circular No. 32, Treasurer's Office, No. 69, handed me by Treasurer Roberts a few days ago, I will insert here, as follows:

X.—EXPRESS CHARGES.

25. The Government contract with the United States Express Company for the transportation of moneys and securities extends to all points accessible through established express lines reached by continuous railway communication in all the States and Territories of the United States, excepting Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Washington, but does not embrace sea, river, or stage transportation of any kind.

26. The contract rates for the transportation of all kinds of paper currency to or from Washington are:

Between Washington and points in the territory of the United States Express Company and reached by it, 20 cents per \$1,000 or fractional part thereof over \$500; sums of \$500 or fractional part thereof, 10 cents.

Between Washington and points in the territory of another express company, excepting points in Texas, Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, 60 cents per \$1,000 or fractional part thereof over \$500; sums of \$500 or fractional part thereof, 40 cents.

Between Washington and points in Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, 75 cents per \$1,000 or fractional part thereof over \$500; sums of \$500 or fractional part thereof, 50 cents.

Between Washington and points in Texas, Arkansas, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, \$1 per \$1,000 or fractional part thereof over \$500; sums of \$500 or fractional part thereof, 65 cents.

27. Express charges are paid by the Government, at contract rates, on standard silver dollars, in sums or multiples of \$500, on subsidiary silver coin in sums of \$200 or more, and on minor coin, sent by the Treasurer or assistant treasurers, in sums or multiples of \$20, and on national-bank notes sent to the Treasurer for redemption in sums or multiples of \$500.

28. On United States notes, Treasury notes of 1890, gold certificates, or silver certificates sent for redemption or exchange, or any kind of lawful money sent for credit of the 5 per cent redemption fund, and on national-bank notes sent for redemption in other amounts than multiples of \$500 the charges, if not prepaid, are deducted from the proceeds at contract rates.

29. On United States notes, Treasury notes of 1890, gold certificates, or silver certificates returned for United States currency or national-bank notes redeemed or exchanged the charges are deducted at contract rates.

30. On gold coin, standard silver dollars, subsidiary silver coin, and minor coin sent for exchange or redemption the charges must be prepaid by the sender.

31. On transfers of funds from national-bank depositaries, under letters of instruction, the charges must be paid by the depositaries.

32. Express charges can not be prepaid at Government contract rates. The Treasury has no control over rates exacted when the charges are prepaid, or for transportation outside of the territorial limits of the contract.

33. No charge is made for the amount of express charges inclosed with a remittance when separately noted on the wrapper. Packages should always be marked with the exact amount of the contents.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I insert here some further rules on the subject. We can profitably read them all:

VI.—REDEMPTION AND EXCHANGE OF PAPER CURRENCY.

11. United States notes, Treasury notes of 1890, and gold certificates are redeemable in gold coin, and silver certificates in silver dollars, by the Treasurer and assistant treasurers. National-bank notes are redeemable in lawful money of the United States by the Treasurer, but not by the assistant treasurers.

United States notes, Treasury notes of 1890, gold certificates, and silver certificates, unfit for circulation, when not mutilated so that less than three-fifths of the original proportions remains, may be presented to the Treasurer or any assistant treasurer for exchange, at face value, for new United States paper currency. Fractional currency notes are redeemable in lawful money.

12. United States notes, Treasury notes of 1890, fractional currency notes, gold certificates, silver certificates, and national-bank notes, when mutilated so that less than three-fifths, but clearly more than two-fifths, of the original proportions remains, are redeemable by the Treasurer only, at one-half the face value of the whole note or certificate. Fragments not clearly more than two-fifths are not redeemed, unless accompanied by the evidence required in paragraph 13.

13. Fragments less than three-fifths are redeemed at the face value of the whole note when accompanied by an affidavit of the owner or other persons having knowledge of the facts that the missing portions have been totally destroyed. The affidavit must state the cause and manner of the mutilation, and must be sworn and subscribed to before an officer qualified to administer oaths, who must affix his official seal thereto, and the character of the affiant must be certified to be good by such officer or some one having an official seal.

Signatures by mark (X) must be witnessed by two persons who can write, and who must give their places of residence. The Treasurer will exercise such discretion under this regulation as may seem to him needful to protect the United States from fraud. Fragments not redeemable are rejected and returned. Paper currency which has been totally destroyed can not be redeemed. The Department does not furnish blank forms for affidavits.

VII.—RETURNS FOR PAPER CURRENCY.

14. For remittances received under the Government contract: For remittances from a place where there is no subtreasury returns will be made in new United States paper currency by express, at the expense of the consignee, at Government contract rates; or in subsidiary silver coin, in sums of \$200 or more, at the expense of the Government for transportation.

For remittances from a place where there is a subtreasury returns will be made in new United States paper currency by express, at the expense of the consignee, at Government contract rates; or, subject to the convenience of the Treasury, in the Treasurer's transfer checks on the subtreasury in the place whence the remittance is received.

No exchange for remittances of currency to the Treasurer for redemption under the Government contract will be furnished either by transfer checks or shipments of currency.

VIII.—REDEMPTION OR EXCHANGE OF SILVER AND MINOR COIN.

15. Subsidiary silver coin and coins of copper, bronze, or copper-nickel may be presented in sums or multiples of \$20, assorted by denominations in separate packages, to the Treasurer or an assistant treasurer for redemption or exchange into lawful money, and standard silver dollars for exchange into silver certificates only. When forwarded by express, the charges should be prepaid.

16. Depositors of subsidiary silver coin will obtain quicker returns and aid the Department in retiring the old issues from circulation if they will present coins of the old designs and the new in separate packages.

17. No foreign, mutilated, or defaced silver coins, or coins to which paper or any other substance has been attached as an advertisement, or for any other purpose, will be received. Reduction by natural abrasion is not considered mutilation.

18. Minor coin that is so defaced as not to be readily identified, or that is punched or clipped will not be redeemed or exchanged. Pieces that are stamped, bent, or twisted out of shape, or otherwise imperfect, but showing no material loss of metal, will be redeemed.

IX.—TRANSMISSION TO THE TREASURER.

19. United States notes, Treasury notes of 1890, gold certificates, silver certificates, and national-bank notes should be sent in separate remittances. The notes should be assorted by denominations and inclosed in paper straps, not more than 100 notes to each strap, and the straps should be marked with the amount of their contents. Not more than 8,000 notes should be put in one package.

20. An inventory, giving the amount of each denomination of notes, the total amount in the package, the address of the party sending, and the disposition to be made of the proceeds, should be inclosed with each package, and a letter of advice sent by mail. A compliance with the foregoing regulations will insure prompt returns for remittances.

21. The package, if it be sent by express, should be sealed up in stout paper and addressed to the "Treasurer of the United States, Washington, D. C." The wrapper should be plainly marked with the owner's name and address, the amount and kind of currency inclosed, and, if the sender desires the benefit of the Government contract, with the words "under Government contract with the United States Express Company from the nearest point of transfer."

22. When gold, silver, or minor coin is shipped for credit of the 5 per cent redemption fund or as a transfer of funds, it should be so stated on the shipping tag attached to the bag.

23. It is the duty of postmasters to register free of charge all letters on which the postage has been fully prepaid, addressed to the Treasurer, containing currency of the United States for redemption. It is recommended that all such letters be registered as a protection against loss.

24. Remittances of money by mail should be addressed to the "Treasurer of the United States, Washington, D. C." Such remittances and returns therefor by mail are invariably at the risk of the owners. All communications to the Treasurer in regard to packages lost in the mail are referred for investigation to the chief post-office inspector, Post-Office Department, Washington, D. C., to whom any subsequent inquiry on the subject should be addressed.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Is not your worst trouble in regard to the one-dollar notes, the two-dollar notes, and the five-dollar notes—not the larger bills? Is not the difficulty in regard to the smaller bills?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. No. The trouble is the great cost of transportation which the sender has to pay to get the money sent and returned. Neither the people nor banks will pay these rates.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I was going to explain why the trouble occurs in regard to the smaller bills particularly. It is owing to a mistake in the language of the law, which limited the amount of bank notes of the denomination of \$5. The five-dollar notes are printed on separate plates from the tens and twenties, and the banks have declined to issue the five-dollar notes in the amounts required, so that where we ought to have at present \$140,000,000 of these bank notes we have only about sixty million. Now, it has been very difficult for the Treasury Department to supply the demand for the \$1 and \$2 silver certificates.

If the gentleman's bill went into effect it would not relieve the situation very much. The trouble is in the inability of the Treasury Department to supply a sufficient quantity of small bills. I called upon the Treasury Department a few days ago for a statement of the amount of small bills which it had been unable to furnish to its correspondents.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I yielded to the gentleman with pleasure; but I do not like the gentleman to occupy so much of my time.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. If the gentleman will present his proposition in another form he may reach the difficulty.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, let me proceed.

Mr. MACON. Did not my friend say a moment ago that he was glad to be interrupted by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL]?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes; but not to take all my time, which is very limited. I am glad that the gentleman from Connecticut interrupted me, but I am going to show he is entirely wrong. Here is some dirty money that came in this morning to the Treasury Department for redemption, and I wish gentlemen would look at it.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I will take it. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. All right; here it is. I never saw a statesman from the Nutmeg State that would not take money. [Laughter.] It will be observed that here is some old and some new money. There are two one and two five and two ten dollar bills—a dirty and a clean one of each denomination. The dirty bills, you see, have worn out and had to be sent to the Treasury for reissuance—at the sender's expense. You see these bills stink and are revolting.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the trouble is thus stated, as Mr. Roberts, the Treasurer, tells me, and I am satisfied that he approves the policy of this bill. So do the people and press. The Bankers' Association of Tennessee favors it. I ask the committee to look at this huge bundle of letters addressed to me indorsing this bill.

They are from bankers of Tennessee and some from Indiana.

Many Members of the House have had similar letters about this bill. I have not time to read them, but will insert them here:

THE INDIANA BANKERS' ASSOCIATION,
Indianapolis, December 22, 1903.

Hon. J. W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We were very much pleased to receive a communication from the secretary of the Tennessee Bankers' Association regarding your clean-money bill (House bill 5068).

We sincerely hope that you will be able to pass the same through Congress, as we regard it a splendid measure. We have written to our Representative in Congress, Hon. JESSE OVERSTREET, and urged him to support the measure. It will certainly be a great boon to western bankers to have nice clean money for their patrons instead of the dirty rags which we are now compelled to handle.

Wishing the bill success, we remain, yours, very truly,

ANDREW SMITH, Secretary.

NASHVILLE TRUST COMPANY,
Nashville, Tenn., December 2, 1903.

Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have seen through the papers something of your introducing a bill the object of which was to give the people who live in the interior towns the benefit of having new and clean bills issued by the Government in place of the mutilated and filthy bills that we, especially in this part of the country, have to contend so much with.

Have just received from you this a. m. copy of the bill which you have introduced, and I trust that you will use every effort to see that same is passed, as it will be of very great benefit to everybody in your district, and I am sure that the bankers and everyone else who handles money will be deeply indebted to you if successful, and whether so or not I can assure you that we will appreciate your efforts in this matter.

Again thanking you for looking after our wants, I am,
Yours, very truly,

JOS. H. THOMPSON, President.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
Nashville, Tenn., December 2, 1903.

Hon. J. W. GAINES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GAINES: I am in receipt of a copy of the bill recently introduced by you, providing for the redemption of mutilated United States notes. You will please accept my thanks for remembering me in mailing out these bills, and my congratulations upon the effort you are making in that direction, which I am sure every bank man as well as every citizen who is a frequent handler of currency will appreciate.

Yours, truly,
F. O. WATTS, President.
THOMAS W. WRENNE & CO., BANKERS AND BROKERS,
No. 407 Union street, Nashville, Tenn., December 2, 1903.

Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are to-day in receipt of the copy of the bill introduced by you to further provide for the redemption of mutilated United States notes and to maintain the cleanliness of the circulation, and thank you for favoring us with a copy.

The proposed measure should be passed without a dissenting vote. It is full of merit, and aside from its many other advantages as a Federal sanitary measure the act would be second only to the National Board of Health in the excellence of the results obtained therefrom.

In this connection we desire to call your attention to the fact that north of the Ohio River new, clean paper currency is kept in constant circulation, while generally over the South we have about the most ragged, worn, frayed, and unsanitary paper currency and the greatest quantity of silver money that can be found in the United States. By all means endeavor to have the bill enacted into a law.

With best wishes, we are, yours truly,

T. W. WRENNE, President.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL BANK,
Nashville, Tenn., December 3, 1903.

Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: We want to congratulate you; also express our thanks for the wise measure which you have offered in Congress in the name of a "clean-money bill."

We certainly think that the people of this country, if it should ever become a law, will rise up and call you "blessed."

Trusting it may soon become a law, we remain,
Yours, truly,

N. P. LESUEUR, Cashier.

THE MERCHANTS' NATIONAL BANK
OF THE CITY OF NASHVILLE,
Nashville, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We write to thank you personally for introducing the bill for the purpose of securing clean money for the interior. Every banker in the United States understands the advantage of this bill.

With best wishes, yours, very truly,

E. A. LINDSEY, Cashier.

THE FOURTH NATIONAL BANK,
Nashville, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

Hon. J. W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have seen notice of the introduction by you of House bill No. 5068, known as the "clean-money bill," and wish to express our hearty indorsement of the measure.

We are in full accord with your ideas on the subject, being convinced that something should be done to relieve the interior of the necessity of using paper money which is unfit for circulation, especially in view of the fact that such results can now be gained only at considerable cost on the part of the sender to Washington of mutilated money.

As is well known, currency which has become very much soiled by handling is a constant menace to health, and something certainly should be done along the lines you have taken up.

My recollection is that your bill contemplates handling the currency by express at the expense of the Government. Could it not be done at less expense if the money were carried by the United States registered mail, insured? There are several companies in the United States thoroughly solvent whose business it is to insure currency, bonds, and other valuables sent by registered mail, and the cost is much less than for the same service by the express companies.

I merely mention this as a suggestion, though doubtless it has already occurred to you.

Very truly,

J. T. HOWELL, Cashier.

CITY SAVINGS BANK, OF NASHVILLE,
Nashville, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

JOHN WESLEY GAINES, Esq., Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: We are heartily in sympathy with your new bill to give us clean currency in the South.

Please accept our best wishes for your success therein, and let us add, too, our hope that you may spend a merry Christmas.

Very truly,

EDGAR MAGNESS, Cashier.

NASHVILLE HOSIERY MILLS COMPANY,
Nashville, Tenn., December 30, 1903.

Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to express our unqualified indorsement of your bill introduced into the present Congress for the purpose of securing some improvement in the cleanliness of our circulating currency.

We think and believe that the bill would be approved by all of the other manufacturers of the United States if the matter was brought to their attention. We also believe that contagion is more often transmitted by means of filthy currency than any other way.

We beg to remain, yours, very respectfully,

NASHVILLE HOSIERY MILLS COMPANY,
J. A. BISHOP, Secretary.

NATIONAL BANK OF FRANKLIN,
Franklin, Tenn., December 15, 1903.

Hon. J. WESLEY GAINES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to House bill No. 5068, introduced by you on November 27 last, and, joining heartily in the purpose contained therein, I wish to congratulate you on being the author of so important and beneficial a measure to the interests of not only the banks, but the citizens of this country who are so remote from the metropolis as to be denied the advantages the more favored sections of our country have heretofore enjoyed at no expense to them other than that in which we all bear our part.

Trusting the bill will become a law, and thereby advance your present high position in the hearts of your constituency, I am,

Very truly, etc.,

J. L. PARKES, Cashier.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
Fayetteville, Tenn., December 17, 1903.

Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is my pleasure to write you, saying that the bill lately introduced in Congress by yourself known as the "clean-money bill," has my hearty approval, and I have written the Hon. JAMES D. RICHARDSON, the Representative of this, the Fifth Congressional district, expressing a hope that he would give it his support.

Wishing you success, I am, yours, truly,

J. R. FEENEY, Cashier.

UNION BANK AND TRUST COMPANY,
Chattanooga, Tenn., December 17, 1903.

Hon. J. W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are heartily in favor of your bill, No. 5068, known as the "clean-money bill," and trust that you may secure its passage.

Very truly, yours,

F. F. SMITH, Cashier.

BANK OF BLOUNT COUNTY,
Maryville, Tenn., December 17, 1903.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are heartily in favor of your "clean-money bill" and hope it will be passed without delay.

We have written our Representative, the Hon. HENRY R. GIBSON, asking his support of the measure.

Yours, very truly,

BANK OF BLOUNT COUNTY,
JNO. M. CLARK, Cashier.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
Tulahoma, Tenn., December 18, 1903.

Hon. J. W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are heartily in accord with you on your House bill No. 5068, known as the "clean-money bill," and hope that you will be able to secure its passage, and will say the other Members of Congress have been written to in its behalf. We are,

Yours, truly,

F. A. RAHT, President.

THE GREENFIELD BANK,
Greenfield, Tenn., December 19, 1903.

Hon. J. W. GAINES, M. C., Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please pardon us for presuming to write you, but we do so to express our thanks to you for introducing in the House bill No. 5068, or what is termed the "clean-money bill."

We beg to say that we heartily approve the measure and trust you will be able to make it a law.

Wishing you continued success, we beg to remain, yours, very truly,
R. L. GOOLSBY, Cashier.

THE BANK OF GAINESBORO,
Gainesboro, Tenn., December 11, 1903.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your bill known as the clean money bill, No. 5068, we heartily approve, and hope you may be able to secure an early passage of the same that we may get rid of the defaced, ragged, worn-out bills.

Respectfully,

J. A. WILLIAMS,
Cashier Bank of Gainesboro.

—
RIPLEY BANK,
Ripley, Tenn., December 11, 1903.

Hon. J. W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Our attention has been directed to House bill No. 5068, and known as the "clean-money bill," and we want to commend you very highly for your course, and hope you will be able to push it through right away.

Yours, truly,

C. R. BARBEE, Cashier.

—
BANK OF GORDONSVILLE,
Gordonville, Tenn., Dec. 11, 1903.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We notice that you have introduced a bill known as the "clean-money bill."

We think the passage of such a bill will be to the interest of all classes with but little expense to any.

Respectfully,

WM. GWALTNEY.

—
MELTON'S BANK,
Gassaway, Tenn., December 12, 1903.

Hon. Mr. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to a bill you introduced in Congress November 29, known as House bill No. 5068, as clean-money bill, I think it would be a grand thing to have nice and clean currency, as some of our currency is very sorry that is now in circulation.

I now ask you to do all you can in securing the passage of said bill.

Yours, truly,

JOHN H. MELTON,
Cashier Melton's Bank, Gassaway, Cannon County, Tenn.

—
PEOPLE'S BANK OF MILAN,
Milan, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

Hon. J. W. GAINES, M. C., Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I feel that I express the feelings of all bankers when I say that we are very much gratified at the bill you have recently introduced to get clean new currency for all banks, and through them for the people.

I have just written our Representative, Hon. RICE A. PIERCE, asking his help in this matter. If you will urge this bill with your usual energy we can not see why it should not become a law. It seems to us that in this progressive age it is a public necessity.

With best wishes, we are, yours, very truly,

J. R. HARRISON, Cashier.

—
THE BANK OF MONTEREY,
Monterey, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I take pleasure in indorsing the measure you have introduced in the House of Representatives known as "the clean-money bill."

I am constrained to say I think this one of the most sanitary measures ever introduced, as well as a measure that will take out of circulation all the rags now circulating as a medium of exchange among the people of this the greatest country on earth. I heartily congratulate you, and see no reason why the bill should not carry without opposition.

Yours, very truly,

O. H. ANDERSON, Cashier.

—
BANK OF WATERTOWN,
Watertown, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is with great pleasure that we notice House bill No. 5068, known as the "clean-money bill," which has been introduced by you, and we take this opportunity of notifying you of our appreciation of your remembrance of us as bankers having to handle so much nasty, filthy, dirty money.

We sincerely hope it will pass, and will be under many obligations to you for your efforts in our behalf.

We do most heartily indorse the bill and do sincerely thank you for the introduction of same.

With best wishes and a hope that we may at some time do something for you for your efforts in our behalf, I am,

Yours, truly,

J. N. YOUNG, Cashier.

—
THE KNOXVILLE BANKING COMPANY,
Knoxville, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I beg to congratulate you on the introduction of House bill No. 5068 (clean-money bill). We bankers in the interior appreciate especially your efforts to better the condition of the currency that we are compelled to handle.

We have been very much handicapped under the existing law since it incurred special expense to keep the currency in presentable shape, while the more fortunate bankers in towns having the facility of treasuries and subtreasuries have enjoyed it. We trust that you will have no trouble in putting the matter through, and we believe every fair-minded Representative and Senator will cooperate with you in the same.

Yours, very truly,

W. H. GOSS, President.

—
THE BANK OF CHATTANOOGA,
Chattanooga, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We notice you have introduced a "clean-currency" bill into Congress, and we are glad to know that you are making an effort to relieve the public of the old germ collectors and ragged currency which is now in circulation, and it would be a great satisfaction to us to know that the bill had passed.

Very truly,

FRANK A. NELSON, Cashier.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
South Pittsburg, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

Hon. J. W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I write to thank you for the introduction of your bill in Congress known as "clean-money bill," and hope you may be successful in having it passed, as the expense of keeping decent bills in circulation ought to be at the expense of the General Government.

I heartily approve of your course and think all others that understand it will do the same.

Yours, truly,

T. G. GARRETT, President.

—
BANK OF MARTIN,
Martin, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I note with pleasure that you have introduced in Congress a "clean-money bill." I trust that you will succeed in getting this measure passed.

Most respectfully,

T. J. TAYLOR, Cashier.

—
THE NATIONAL BANK OF McMINNVILLE,
McMinnville, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

Hon. J. WESLEY GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We notice the introduction of your "clean-money bill" in Congress, November 27, 1903, and wish to say that we heartily approve same. We have just written Mr. MOON to do all he can for the support and passage of your bill, and hope you will have no trouble in procuring its passage, by which it may become a law.

Very truly yours,

H. R. WALLING, Cashier.

—
THE BANK OF PETERSBURG,
Petersburg, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to inform you we certainly approve of the "clean-money bill," and I am writing our Congressman to that effect in to-day's mail.

It seems to me that this bill is certainly desirable and necessary and is above party prejudices, and I certainly trust it will pass.

Very truly,

W. Z. DOZIER, Cashier.

—
THE BANK OF VIOLA,
Viola, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

Hon. J. W. GAINES, M. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to assure you of my approval of bill No. 5068 and to urge upon you the necessity of the passage of same.

Yours, truly,

A. J. BREWER, Cashier.

—
PEOPLE'S NATIONAL BANK,
McMinnville, Tenn., December 10, 1903.

Hon. JNO. W. GAINES, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We note with pride and pleasure that you have taken the initiative in the matter of "clean money" and have introduced a bill in Congress to remedy the evil and get rid of the filthy, ragged money now in use in all the country except the East and large cities.

The banking fraternity generally and all handlers of money will be under lasting obligations to you if you push the matter to a successful conclusion.

We are writing our Member, Mr. MOON, and commend the proposed legislation as most meritorious.

Yours, truly,

FRANK COLVILLE, Cashier.

—
THE PEOPLE'S BANK,
Sparta, Tenn., December 11, 1903.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We heartily indorse the bill introduced in Congress by you November 27, identified as bill No. 5068, and known as the "clean-money bill."

I trust you will have no difficulty in securing its passage.

Yours, truly,

T. K. WILLIAMS, Cashier.

—
THE FARMERS AND MERCHANTS' BANK,
Henderson, Tenn., December 11, 1903.

Hon. J. W. GAINES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a banker and citizen of Tennessee, I most heartily approve of your bill known as the "clean-money bill," and trust that you may be able to have the bill enacted into law.

The filthy rags that we have to handle as money in the interior are a disgrace to decency, and I am sure that not only your constituency, but the citizens of the entire State heartily approve the measure and will appreciate your efforts in the matter.

Yours, truly,

R. E. MCKINNEY.

—
THE HOLSTON NATIONAL BANK OF KNOXVILLE,
Knoxville, Tenn., December 11, 1903.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to indorse the House bill No. 5068, known as the "clean money bill," which was introduced by you on November 27, 1903.

It seems to us that this bill ought to be passed strictly upon its own merits, and we hope you will not lose an opportunity to get it passed into a law.

We are writing our Representative, the Hon. HENRY R. GIBSON, to-day, urging him to use his best efforts in securing the passage of this bill.

Very truly,

JOSEPH P. GAUT, President.

—
BEDFORD COUNTY BANK,
Wartrace, Tenn., December 11, 1903.

Hon. J. W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As interested parties, wish to thank you for your efforts in trying to secure House bill No. 5068, known as the "clean-money bill," enacted into law. We trust that you will be successful in this, for we believe the law would be of great benefit to our section.

Have written to Mr. J. D. RICHARDSON, our Representative in Congress, soliciting his support for your measure.

With best wishes, I am, yours, respectfully.

E. L. BLACKMAN, *Cashier.*

THE BANK OF PARSONS,
Parsons, Tenn., December 11, 1903.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES, M. C., Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We hope you will be successful in getting your "clean-money bill" through the House, and have asked Mr. SIMS to kindly aid you in pushing the matter through.

Very truly,

L. H. BURKE, *President.*
L. A. RAINS, *Cashier.*

PEOPLE'S BANK,
Smithville, Tenn., December 11, 1903.

Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We desire to make known to you our hearty approval of the bill introduced by you in Congress known as House bill No. 5068, or "clean-money bill," and earnestly ask you to do all in your power to secure its passage.

Yours, very truly,

PEOPLE'S BANK.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I have lost a strong letter from the bank of Goodlettsville, Tenn.

Mr. Chairman, people in the country districts, people away from subtreasuries (as a gentleman in the Treasury Department said to me this morning), the people away out on the hills or cities anywhere—away from the subtreasuries of the United States—are obliged to continue transacting business with this revolting and horrible money because of the rates they must pay to get their money sent to and returned from the Treasury of the United States.

Think of our people handling and circulating money found on the bodies of dead people. Think of that money going into circulation and spreading disease. Then again, the money goes into the pockets of the negroes and whites of the South, where the weather is hot.

Then think, too, of the sources of contamination which this money passes through when used by the laborers in our mines and manufactories and by the laborers in the cornfields and in the woods, where much of the business of the country is prosecuted.

This money is stuck into their nasty, sweaty clothes. This money which they carry in their pockets carries disease-breeding germs. The physicians of Philadelphia, Pa., so declared recently, after a searching and scientific investigation, and it holds to reason.

It goes to and returns from far Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines, and to miserable and unfortunate Panama, and we still use it, soaked with disease germs.

The paying tellers in the banks of my city tell me that they have to use an antiseptic wash constantly in order to protect their hands and their eyes from becoming diseased by the handling of this dirty money.

There is no question in the world but what this is a proper bill.

It does nothing except to compel the national banks, at the expense of the Government, and to allow other banks that are national depositories to send in to the Treasury of the United States this money packed up in a certain way in accordance with the present regulations of the Department. When it comes here the Government pays the transportation and reissues the clean money and destroys the dirty money.

The national banks are now required to do that, but the charge for the transportation is so great that it is practically not required of them. The dirty national-bank notes are in circulation, the dirty silver certificates that do the principal money work of this country are in circulation, the dirty greenbacks and gold certificates are in circulation, and the people in the country prefer the metallic money because cleaner.

They will take clean silver money, because not so liable to carry disease. Now, behold for a moment the amount of dirty and disease-carrying money that there is in the country! I have here some specimens of money that should be immediately destroyed, as England destroys her bank notes after once issuing and receiving them. She never allows a bill to go out a second time.

Now let us get down to the moral obligation of this matter and to the duty that is imposed upon the American Congress. Congress has the right to coin money, to regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin. That power belongs to the great sovereign of this country. It belongs to no private individual.

It is the duty of the Government to issue that money and maintain it in its integrity. It is the duty of the national banks to issue their paper money, and the law requires them to deposit so much money for the reissuance of those notes. How about the other paper money? Whose business is it? The people do not issue that money or any money.

The Government issues it. The Government helps to dirty it. It takes it to Cuba, it takes it to the Philippines, it takes it to Panama, I am sorry to say, and all around the world. It takes

it to a great many dirty places, and yet the Government wears out and befools this money and turns it over to the people to put their hands on and to put into their pockets, to breed and carry disease wherever the American flag floats.

It is the duty of the Government to see that this money is clean. It is not the duty of an individual. Before the adoption of our Constitution, away back in the colonial days in the early history of our country, there were private individuals who had the right and who did coin money. It was their business to keep it exactly as they coined it, but we surrendered these money rights to the Government by the people of the United States when we framed our Constitution.

The coining and emitting of money is a governmental function,* so that it is perfectly right and proper under the circumstances, and it is the duty of the Government to furnish the people clean money and keep it clean. When the Government helps to befool our money it certainly has a moral duty, and we ought to make it a legal duty upon the Government of the United States, to keep that money as clean as it was when it was first emitted.

Now, for Heaven's sake, look at this money. I hold up a bill that I got from the Treasury this morning. I now hold up another that I got where it was being redeemed this morning. I will hold up a new ten-dollar bill that I received this morning from the Treasury Department.

Now, look at that. That came, I might say, from "Dayton, Ohio," showing that at least sometimes from the great and good State of Ohio, that I am glad to say is to be Democratic next year, there does come this unclean thing. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the letters to which I alluded a while ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD his remarks by inserting the letters to which he refers. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I wish I could put a picture of these dirty bills in the RECORD also. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the Chair inform me how much time remains to this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] has twenty-six minutes remaining and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] five minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] ten minutes.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, there is a good deal to be said in behalf of the proposition which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] has just brought before the House. There is no question about the fact that much of the paper money of the country is filthy and vile and ought to be redeemed. The trouble, however, will not be overcome by the bill which the gentleman from Tennessee has introduced. At least, that is my opinion.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the gentleman think the banks ought to pay for having this clean money transported for reissuance?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I know of no more reason why the Government of the United States should transport moneys than it should transport the overcoats of gentlemen or the potatoes of the country. The trouble is under the system of redemption which we have, so far as the national banks are concerned.

A study of the system of redemption will convince the gentleman that it takes two years to redeem the circulation of the national banks, so that the bills will remain outstanding for at least a year. I started to say to the gentleman that he will find the greater portion of the trouble is with the small money, the one, two, and five dollar bills.

The mistake in regard to the five-dollar bills was that the act of March 14, 1900, provided that one-third of the circulation shall be limited to five-dollar notes. Many of the small banks which have since organized, wishing to save the expense of one of the two plates from which the notes are printed, have declined to issue any five-dollar notes. Hence the five-dollar note is kept in circulation far beyond the time in which it should be taken up.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the gentleman think it is right to charge that little bank, or whether it is a rich individual or a big bank, 60 cents a thousand for sending dirty money back here and having it reissued?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The express charge for sending it back is nothing compared with the interest that the banks will lose for the time the money is out of their possession when it goes to the Treasury Department for redemption and return.

If the gentleman will stop for a moment and think, he will find that it is not the express charge, but it is the loss of interest on

the money from the time that they send it away until they get it back again.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. This may not work a very great injury to a bank in New York City, but it might injure a bank in the smaller places, far removed from subtreasuries or the Treasury.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. We do not have any trouble about dirty money in New England, because we are right accessible to the subtreasury, where it can be exchanged at any time, and it is the loss of time and not the cost of transportation charges that makes this trouble.

Then there is another thing, and it is the inability of the Treasury Department to furnish ones and twos.

I called upon the Treasury Department a few days ago to furnish me the amount of money, of ones, twos, and fives, silver certificates and bank notes, that they were unable to furnish during the months of November and December in response to their calls.

Treasurer Roberts has given me a letter, which I propose to use in another place, showing that during the month of November they were unable to fill their orders for ones, twos, and fives by 30 per cent of the entire amount called for, and for the month of December by 39 per cent, and the aggregate of the money which they were asked to furnish and unable to furnish during this month was \$18,000,000.

Now, that practically means a retention in circulation in the remotest parts of the country of eighteen millions of small money which ought to have been canceled and destroyed.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does not my friend want to see clean money used in the country?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do. I propose to give the Treasury Department, in a bill which is now before the Committee on Banking and Currency, unlimited authority to issue this money, both greenbacks and silver currency, in any denominations that the people call for.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Who pays the transportation?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The man who wants the circulation.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do you think it the duty of the citizen to give the Government clean money?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. It is not the Government's but the bank's duty to keep the clean money. If the gentleman will look at the question for a moment, he will see that the trouble is in the persons being kept out of the use of the money more than the cost of transportation.

Now, then, so far as the banks are concerned, we must get down to the system of redemption, and when you shall have your redemption agencies in a commercial center, in the city of New York, instead of in the city of Washington, where no business transaction is carried on, you will find great relief.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman know the law is now that the Government shall issue new money for all this dirty money that the people may send in?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. If they are able to do it—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Exactly; but the people are not able to pay 60 or 75 cents per \$1,000 for sending it to be reissued.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. In case the Government was called upon to do it little relief would be given, because the law is restrictive and ought to be repealed and changed.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. We had a law in 1881 or 1882 or thereabout whereby we appropriated about \$50,000 one year and the next year \$40,000 to provide for this dirty money, but it dropped out of the appropriation bill, and hence I introduced it in this bill. If you have a better one, I will vote for it.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I simply wish to add that the gentleman is working with a right purpose, but in the wrong way, and he will have a great deal better result than now if he will—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The difference between the gentleman and myself is that he wants the people to pay 60 or 75 cents a thousand for keeping the Government's own money clean, and I believe that the Government ought to do it.

Mr. STANLEY. I believe the gentleman objects to Mr. GAINES's bill on the ground that the banks hold this dirty money rather than lose the use, or interest, which is the same thing, they would gain by keeping it in their banks.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. To some extent. There are other reasons.

Mr. STANLEY. This is the question I want to ask: Does not the law require all your national banks, and I believe all other banks, to keep a certain per cent—15 per cent—on hand of the amount of money that they have to loan?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Fifteen per cent in country banks and 25 per cent in others.

Mr. STANLEY. That this amount must be kept on deposit. I mean that this old dirty money is not sent to the Treasury, but is kept in the hands of the bank on account of this law which requires them to keep a certain amount on deposit?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Not at all; a certain proportion

must be cash in their vaults. The trouble is in another direction—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Where is the trouble—in the question of the people having to bear the burden of the transportation?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think it has very little bearing on it—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I think if the gentleman will go into the matter as far as I have he will find that the trouble is in the minds of the people and not the banks.

The bankers in Nashville said they could not and would not pay the 60 or 75 cents a thousand both ways to have the Government send them clean money for the transaction of the business of the Government and of the people; that it was not their business or their duty to do so.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no more requests for time on this side, and therefore I will ask for the reading of the bill.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Office of the Vice-President: For secretary to the Vice-President, \$2,220; for messenger, \$1,440; telegraph operator, \$1,500; telegraph page, \$300; in all, \$5,760.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. Why is it that an appropriation is made here for employees in the office of the Vice-President for one year, when presumably there are no employees in the office of the Vice-President at the present time, because it is vacant?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will say that the appropriation for the next fiscal year is identical with that of the current year. These clerks are now employed in that office. The presiding officer of the Senate, although a Senator, acts as Vice-President and has the use of these subordinate officers, and this force will continue for the next year.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Under Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds: For chief engineer, \$1,700; three assistant engineers, at \$1,200 each; six conductors of elevators, at \$1,100 each, who shall be under the supervision and direction of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds; laborer, \$820; six firemen, at \$900 each; electrician, \$1,200; laborer, \$1,000; four laborers, at \$720 each; three cabinetmakers, who shall be skilled in their trade, one at \$1,200 and two at \$900 each; and for the following for service in old library portion of the Capitol: Two attendants, at \$1,200 each, and two watchmen, at \$900 each; in all, \$30,400.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend this paragraph in line 16, page 13, by striking out the word "six" and inserting the word "seven," so that it will read "seven conductors of elevators." I do that, Mr. Chairman, for the reason that there ought to be—

Mr. BINGHAM. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. HEPBURN. For the reason that there ought to be an additional conductor. The conductors that we have now are most efficient men, but as soon as the House adjourns they adjourn. They are always adjourned on holidays and on Sundays.

Now, there are a good many Members of this House, and a good many officers of this House, whose duties require them to be here, and who are here on these holidays and on Sundays, and at times after the House has adjourned. I am one of those. I know that on very many occasions, very many, I have to climb these stairs.

I do not want to do it, and I think that it is only right and proper that an elevator should be run on these occasions, and I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania not to make the point of order, which I would have to concede if he does, but to let the House vote on this proposition.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Let me suggest to the gentleman if it would not be well, if that is the purpose, to put it in his motion, because I am afraid that if we had the extra conductor he might adjourn with the others.

Mr. HEPBURN. I thought of that, but I thought also that the Clerk of the House, or some person having control of the employees, after this discussion would require that some one person be here at all times when there are Members or officers of the House here.

Mr. PALMER. Why can not you require one of the present conductors to be here at those times?

Mr. HEPBURN. We could, but it would make difficulty and add to their labors.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will say, as I understand the proposition, there are six conductors now.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes; and eight on the Senate side.

Mr. BINGHAM. They are annual clerks, or messengers, or whatever you may call them. They receive \$1,100 annually, and a large portion of their time is not used. It seems to me, as they are under the control of the Superintendent of the Capitol, their hours can be fixed to obviate this amendment.

Their compensation is large; their employment is only for

about twelve or fourteen months in the two years, continuously. I feel that the number of conductors is large enough now and that their compensation is ample.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania sees fit to make the point of order, I shall have to submit to it.

Mr. BINGHAM. I make the point of order because I feel that in the line of employment these conductors receive a large compensation for the services they render, and that the disposition of their hours can be arranged by the Superintendent of the Capitol so as to obviate any objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Does not the gentleman think that the distribution can be arranged to such an extent now with the employees that we now have as to meet the suggestion made by the gentleman from Iowa? Certainly, all of us who have duties that occupy us here until 5 o'clock and later have frequently been put to great inconvenience on account of the absence of conductors, and I see no reason why they should desert their posts at any hour that the House may adjourn.

Mr. HEPBURN. Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania be willing to modify the language so as to require the service of one of these men or the operation of one elevator at all times up to 6 o'clock in the evening and on holidays and Sundays?

Mr. BINGHAM. We will arrange it so that it will be acceptable to the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to pass this paragraph and go back to it later to change the verbiage to that extent.

Mr. HEMENWAY. And for that sole purpose?

Mr. BINGHAM. For that sole purpose.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen asks unanimous consent that this paragraph may be passed and returned to for the purpose stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Stenographers to committees: For three stenographers to committees, at \$5,000 each; assistant stenographer to committees, \$3,500; assistant stenographer to committees, \$1,600; in all, \$20,100.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment, which I will send to the desk and ask to have read. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 20, line 18, strike out the words "thirty-five hundred" and insert in lieu thereof the words "five thousand;" and in line 20 strike out the words "twenty thousand one hundred" and insert in lieu thereof the words "twenty-one thousand six hundred."

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

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question in regard to this matter. How are stenographers to committees paid?

Mr. BINGHAM. There are no stenographers to committees in the sense of committee stenographers.

Mr. HEPBURN. But there are stenographers who serve committees.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is the character of this appointment.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then there are other stenographers than those three or those six?

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the gentleman mean those here?

Mr. HEPBURN. Those that are named in this bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. They are paid as provided for in this bill, \$5,000 each.

Mr. HEPBURN. The official reporters are, but I am speaking of those gentlemen who from time to time serve committees when there are hearings.

Mr. BINGHAM. Those are the stenographers indicated in this paragraph that we are now upon.

Mr. HEPBURN. I ask for this reason: The other day the committee over which I preside had the services of a stenographer. He was present at one session. We were in session one hour and ten minutes, so I am told by the clerk of the committee. He presented to me a bill, which he desired me to approve, of \$43 for his services on that occasion. I declined to certify it. He told me that under the rule they were paid, as I understood him, out of the contingent fund at a rate that justified that charge of \$43.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman that I am more familiar with this matter than is the gentleman in charge of the bill. We were short and have been short for the last two years on committee stenographers, and there have been two provided for in this bill, as reported from the Committee on Accounts.

Different committees of the House require the services of a stenographer, and the corps that we have had here was not large enough, so some had to be employed, and when they were employed they were paid as the gentleman suggests. All of their accounts have to pass the Committee on Accounts.

Now, the Committee on Appropriations ascertained that last

year we paid out a great deal more money than we ought to have paid out for the services of stenographers called in just temporarily, and we concluded that it was better and safer for us to increase this force of stenographers, so that all of the committees of the House might have the services of an official stenographer and not have to pick up some one from outside.

Mr. HEPBURN. I am not criticising that. I approve of that method, but what I wanted to know is whether there is such a number now provided for in this bill as will do away with this temporary employment at these extravagant figures.

Mr. HEMENWAY. We hope so.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is the theory of the increased number.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is very evident that that will not do away with it on all occasions. It is impossible now to get a stenographer for any of the committees that do not regularly have stenographers.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Oh, it is very evident that there are times when we will have to call in an extra stenographer, but we have business enough continuously to keep at work the two extra stenographers that are put on now. As the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I would say that I have continuous trouble, because the chairmen of other committees, who are equally entitled to a stenographer, complain that the committee of which I am the chairman takes up too much of the time of the official stenographers.

The present Speaker of the House has had that trouble. The committees of the House are entitled to have official stenographers to take hearings when they want them taken, and the Members of the House are entitled to have the hearings reported when they desire it, and it is for the benefit of the House.

Now, I have no doubt that even with this addition we shall occasionally have to call in an extra man to do committee reporting work. For instance, when the Committees on Elections are at work they may often require stenographers—

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HEMENWAY. And may at certain times require them continuously. But those committees are only at work a short time, and it would not pay to have an official man on hand at all times to meet such calls.

Mr. HEPBURN. Permit me to make this suggestion: Is it not practicable to so arrange the terms of this bill that the six stenographers now provided for at \$5,000 a year, and who, I understand, render comparatively little service for that large sum, may, when not engaged in taking the debates of the House, serve as stenographers for the committees?

Mr. HEMENWAY. They do it now when called upon, as they very often are.

Mr. HEPBURN. I did not know that.

Mr. MANN. Will the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations inform us by what process we can call upon them?

Mr. HEMENWAY. By simply sending down word that you want a stenographer, and if they have one there they will send him.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman speaking of the official reporters of the House?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The official reporters aid in getting out the work after the committee stenographers take it down; it would take all the time of the committee stenographers to do this work if they did not have such help.

Mr. HEPBURN. Allow me to make a suggestion. Take the morning hours. At that time the stenographers of the House, if I understand the matter, are not engaged—say up to 12 o'clock.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Sometimes not.

Mr. HEPBURN. Those hours of the morning are when the committees are most frequently in need of stenographers. Now, I want to know whether, without impertinence, I can make a requisition upon those stenographers for services in my committee in the morning, if necessary?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I should think so; but if there is any doubt about it, I certainly should have no objection to putting such a provision in this bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then let this be passed over for the present.

Mr. BARTLETT. Allow me to say a word to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. Provision was made by a resolution reported from the Committee on Accounts at this session of Congress for an additional stenographer to the five of the regular force and an additional stenographer for the exclusive purpose of doing extra work before the committees, at a salary of \$3,500. From my investigation of the matter before the Committee on Accounts I did not think that was an improper increase of force. I thought that probably this assistance was necessary. But the gentleman from Iowa ought now at least to be able to get his committee reporting done because of the reporting and adoption of that resolution; and provision for the officer contemplated by that resolution is now embraced in this legislative bill—a stenographer in addition to the regular force of the House, at \$5,000 a

year, and also an assistant reporter to aid in the committee work, as will be found provided for in the next paragraph of this bill.

As a member of the Committee on Accounts, one of the objects which I had in view in voting for and advocating the resolution reported by that committee and adopted by the House was to aid the gentlemen who require the services of stenographers in work before the committees—in securing the services of an additional stenographer when they needed one.

It was shown that last year we paid out, in addition to the salaries of the regular force, nearly \$3,000 for extra stenographic work for committees. We believed that with this addition to the force of committee reporters we had furnished to the committees of the House the necessary provision in this respect. I did not know but that the gentleman from Iowa had overlooked this fact.

Mr. PALMER. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee this question: Who has the right to employ stenographers at the rate of \$43 an hour, and how is that charge made up?

Mr. HEMENWAY. All those accounts are passed on by the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. PALMER. That does not answer my question. Who has the right to employ a stenographer at the rate of \$43 an hour?

Mr. HEMENWAY. No one. I have just explained that no account of that kind can be paid without being approved by the Committee on Accounts. That committee determines the amount that shall be paid per hour.

Mr. PALMER. But I understood it to be stated here that that amount had been paid.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman who referred to that matter simply stated that some one suggested to him that that sum had got to be paid.

Mr. PALMER. No; he brought in a bill, and said he was entitled to \$43 for the hour's work.

Mr. HEPBURN. About an hour and ten minutes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. As I understand, the gentleman from Iowa did not certify that he was entitled to that.

Mr. PALMER. He did not certify to the bill. He refused to certify to it.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do not know of any such pay ever having been granted to anyone. I suppose that if the gentleman will investigate he will find that no one has ever been paid such a sum per hour for his services.

Mr. PALMER. Who has the right to call in these extra stenographers?

Mr. HEMENWAY. They are employed by the different chairmen of committees, and then the Committee on Accounts determines whether or not they shall be paid for their services.

Mr. PALMER. When anybody wants a stenographer he has the right to hire him, and if he can get the bill through the Committee on Accounts that is all right.

Mr. HEMENWAY. If he can.

Mr. PALMER. And he generally can.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Oh, no; I think if the gentleman will investigate he will find that the Committee on Accounts have performed their duties with a great deal of care.

Mr. MANN. I think I can satisfy the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to the procedure.

Mr. PALMER. I did not ask the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I have just been up against the method of procedure in an endeavor to get a stenographer for the Committee on Elections. I am informed by the official committee stenographers that when they have no stenographer who is available, all the official stenographers to committees being engaged, they send an outside stenographer to the committee and certify subsequently that they were all engaged. The outside stenographer charges the same fees to the House of Representatives that he would to John Jones—no more and no less. He brings in his bill when his transcript of the hearing is prepared, and that bill is presented to the chairman of the committee, who makes a proper certificate, and then it is passed upon by the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I am obliged to the gentleman for the very clear statement he has made.

Mr. MANN. It is the ordinary procedure of any business man.

Mr. PALMER. Did you ever hear of John Jones having to pay \$43 for an hour and ten minutes' work?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has been one of the most eminent practitioners at the Pennsylvania bar, and he must know that the principal cost of stenographic work is having it written out.

Mr. PALMER. But it does not cost so much as that.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman has never paid any stenographer's bill that paralyzed him, then I am very much astounded.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I want to ask if the gentleman ever had to pay \$43 an hour?

Mr. PALMER. No; that is why I am amazed at the statement of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MANN. I am informed that the regular rate charged by

shorthand reporters in the city of Washington is 25 cents per folio, and that is what the Government is in the habit of paying when other stenographers besides the regular force of committee stenographers are employed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. I think I can cover the difficulty of the gentleman from Iowa. I offer this amendment:

On page 20, line 11, after the word "each," insert "who shall also, when so required, perform duties as stenographers to committees."

I ask for the adoption of that amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. It ought to be after the word "dollars," I think, in the next line, so as to include the assistant official reporter.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The assistant official reporter is a reporter to committees.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment first offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania has not yet been adopted. The question is on the adoption of that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 20, in line 11, after the word "each," insert "who shall also, when so required, perform duties as stenographers to committees."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Increase of Library of Congress: For purchase of books for the Library, and for freight, commissions, and traveling expenses incidental to the acquisition of books by purchase, gift, or exchange, \$90,000.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if the amount provided for the purchase of new books for the Library of Congress is the entire amount asked for in the estimate?

Mr. BINGHAM. I would state to the gentleman that we gave the Librarian the current law, giving him for the next year the same as he has had for this.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fuel, lights, repairs, and miscellaneous supplies, electric and steam apparatus, reference books, stationery, and all incidental expenses in connection with the custody, care, and maintenance of said building and grounds, \$32,500.

For furniture, including partitions, screens, shelving, and electrical work pertaining thereto, \$40,000.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman having the bill in charge a question, if he pleases.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will listen to the gentleman.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman state to the committee the total cost of the Library of Congress?

Mr. BINGHAM. When the gentleman speaks of the total cost he includes not only the Library proper, I presume, but the maintenance of the building, together with the publication fund.

Mr. HEPBURN. Everything connected with it.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would state, taking the estimate for this bill as the basis, because I have the figures here, it amounts to \$823,510.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is the annual cost of this Library.

Mr. BINGHAM. Twenty-five thousand dollars included here in one item which the committee has omitted. In other words, I can state to the gentleman it will cost about \$800,000.

Mr. HEPBURN. Everything for the Library. How much of it, if the gentleman pleases, is devoted to the purchase of books?

Mr. BINGHAM. Ninety thousand dollars is recommended in this bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. So that there is over \$700,000 annually paid to maintain that building and to provide for the distribution and use of the books.

Mr. BINGHAM. For the gentleman's information I would state that the amount carried on the sundry civil bill is \$180,000 for printing and binding.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. That has been gradually increasing.

Mr. LITTAUER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is mistaken about that.

Mr. HEPBURN. Exclusive of the \$800,000. The gentleman's statement is that \$800,000 in round numbers is recommended in this bill or under it.

Mr. BINGHAM. No; that is the total expense of the Library. Does that cover the point of the gentleman's inquiry?

Now, before I conclude I will ask the privilege of going back to-morrow to this paragraph at the conclusion of the Library items, in order that a gentleman who is not present, but who went away because not feeling very strong, may have an opportunity to offer an amendment. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr.

RICHARDSON] has an amendment which he desires to submit, and desires at the same time to make some remarks.

If there is no objection on the part of the House, I will ask leave to recur to that paragraph, which is the concluding paragraph, in order that he may submit his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the committee return to this paragraph to-morrow for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. BINGHAM. I reserve the point of order, which the gentleman understands.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will permit another inquiry—

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEPBURN. How many employees are there required to care for the Library—the total number?

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman of course means the Library force, as well as their salaries?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes; all.

Mr. BINGHAM. The number of salaries, 428.

Mr. HEPBURN. Four hundred and twenty-eight; and the amount of salaries?

Mr. BINGHAM. Five hundred and eighty-seven thousand six hundred and forty-five dollars is the sum total of the appropriation.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOTANIC GARDEN.

For superintendent, \$1,800.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last word. I would like to inquire, Mr. Chairman, of the gentleman in charge of the bill how vigorously he would oppose an amendment increasing the salary of the superintendent of the Botanic Gardens from \$1,800 to \$2,000?

Mr. BINGHAM. I would state to the gentleman—

Mr. MANN. I recognize it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would state to the gentleman that the beneficiary has never requested your committee to make the increase.

Mr. MANN. The beneficiary has never requested the chairman and his committee to make the increase—

Mr. BINGHAM. And he has lived many years contented and happy at this salary.

Mr. MANN (continuing). He is a man who never requests anything from anybody, and that is one reason why it would be proper to increase his salary. Further, he is one of the most eminent men in his profession in this country or in any other country.

I suppose there is no man in the country who has stood on so high a plane in botanical matters as Mr. Smith, who does not live for himself, but lives for the Botanical Garden and the memory of Bobby Burns; and it seems to me that for all that he does he is one man who ought to have a slight increase in salary as a recognition of his worth.

Mr. BINGHAM. I make the point of order against the proposition.

Mr. MANN. Then I will not press it. The gentleman was kind enough last year not to insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

For three Commissioners, at \$3,500 each; chief examiner, \$3,000; secretary, \$2,250; assistant chief examiner, \$2,250; law clerk, \$2,000; two chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; eight clerks of class 4; thirteen clerks of class 3; sixteen clerks of class 2; thirty-two clerks of class 1; twenty clerks, at \$1,000 each; ten clerks, at \$900 each; eight clerks, at \$840 each; one messenger; engineer, \$840; two firemen; two watchmen; one elevator conductor, \$720; three laborers; and three messenger boys, at \$360 each; in all, \$164,060.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman who has charge of the bill if this paragraph that has just been read covers all the expenses of the Civil Service Commission for employments?

Mr. BINGHAM. So far as we can legislate; yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Are there not details from other Departments serving now under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman doubtless knows under the organic act of the Civil Service Commission they have the right to ask the Departments to detail them such clerks as they may desire and need for their work.

One year ago, in this bill, we took up that question and gave the Civil Service Commission every clerk additional to their then force that they required, with the distinct understanding that all the detailed men then on duty with the Civil Service Commission should be returned to the respective Departments. That, we were informed, has been duly carried out, and we gave the Commission current law for this line of work.

Now, to go a little further with the gentleman's inquiry. In

the great cities there are boards of examiners, and I can best illustrate that by my own city, where they have a committee to make the examinations, I will say, for clerks in the post-office, customs, and carrier force for the Post-Office Department. They have on that board one official and clerk paid on the roll of the custom-house.

They have also a secretary on that board paid on the roll of one of the Philadelphia offices. They are detailed to do this work for the Commission in examinations, and they do nothing as to work in the custom-house, or nothing as to work in the post-office.

The other members of that committee are detailed, one from the mint, one from the post-office, and one from the custom-house, I think. They, however, do other work in their respective lines of employment. I do not know, but I presume that that line of operation runs to all the large cities of the country.

Of that we have no exhibit in this bill, and no knowledge as to what extent that is carried. I have drafted an inquiry—I do not know whether it has been sent, but I have made inquiry—I have forgotten the verbiage now—asking the Civil Service Commission to send me a list of the several examining boards outside of Washington, where the members of the boards are carried on the rolls either of post-offices or custom-houses or other Government offices, and their compensation. I will send that if it has not been sent.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman will permit me, I have seen a list of places where civil-service examinations were to be had, a large list—a number of cities, I think seven or eight—in the State in which I live. There are boards, I understand, in each one of those places. Can the gentleman give the committee any information as to the permanence of these boards, whether they are performing any other service?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am disposed to think in the smaller communities they do as they did until recently in cities like Philadelphia and other large cities—other services.

Mr. HEPBURN. Now, can the gentleman give to the committee any idea of the number of persons who are absorbed from other branches of service by this Civil Service Commission—

Mr. BINGHAM. That I could not say.

Mr. HEPBURN (continuing). And under their control for a greater or less period of time, in addition to the force you allow them directly?

Mr. BINGHAM. The force we allow them is wholly here. They send from this office occasionally—it comes in their traveling expenses, and wholly so, \$3,500 allowed in this bill—to the various sections of the country their examiners or such officials as will organize these boards.

A few years ago all of these boards came from the subordinate force of the various Departments of the Government, as located in the respective cities where they had their examining board. To what extent their recent order has gone I can not state, or in a reliable way, the amount of money, but I know that in my city, which is the third largest, they have a board detailed; but as to the rest I have no information.

Should I get the information, which I have stated to the gentleman I will ask for, I will give it to him, of course, with pleasure.

Mr. HEPBURN. It will perhaps be too late for my purpose. Will the gentleman give his best estimate of the cost of this fad and foible we call the civil service to the Government of the United States as it is now organized and being conducted and illustrated?

Mr. BINGHAM. I can give the gentleman only the items as they are in this bill, together, of course, with all that runs to their rentals and matters of that kind.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does the gentleman think it will cost as much as a half a million dollars?

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that in his State perhaps they have seven or eight boards, and it may be a dozen. A board is constituted of United States officials detailed to make these examinations. The same is true in my State and in other States.

Mr. HEPBURN. They are adding to the cost of this service while engaged in making these examinations and serving upon these boards, and swelling the aggregate amount that we are paying for this amusement.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will state to the gentleman that this bill carries \$172,750. What the sum total will be of the details carried on custom rolls and post-office rolls, and perhaps on other rolls in other large cities, I can not tell.

Mr. HEPBURN. Has the gentleman any estimate or any idea that he could give to the committee of the pecuniary benefit to the United States resulting from the existence of the Civil Service Commission? [Laughter.]

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will permit me, I will say that in 1883, when the civil-service bill was before the House to be enacted into law, I voted for the legislation.

Mr. HEPBURN. I will state that I was one of the same hopeful idiots. [Laughter.]

Mr. BINGHAM. Let me further say that joining him six or seven years ago, when the question was under general discussion, I made the unqualified statement, and I have no qualification to make to that statement to-day, that it was clearly declared in the limited debate in the House that the civil service in its operation would reach 10,000 subordinate clerks of the Government.

I further stated that the act literally, as then understood, as well as the spirit of the legislation, had been long since departed from, and had I the opportunity to-day to cast my vote I would cast it against the civil service as it now exists. [Applause.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, every time that I have a vision of the gentleman from Pennsylvania he grows upon my admiration. [Laughter and applause.] Now, if the gentleman will permit me, I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, to strike out this paragraph. Mr. Chairman, I know that no result will follow the adoption of this motion.

I know that the bill will come back to us with it reinserted. I know that we would have to pay these salaries, but I believe it is the deliberate judgment of every Member of this House, save perhaps a score, that we are wasting the public money and that we are in pursuit of a phantom when we attempt to improve the civil service through the instrumentality of that which we call the Civil Service Commission. [Applause.]

I believe it to be the judgment, the deliberate judgment, of every man who has given serious attention to it, who is really familiar with the legislation and the operation of this scheme of so-called improvement, I believe it is their judgment that as we have civil service it is a failure.

In these twenty I shall have to enlarge it so as to include the amiable gentleman from Massachusetts, that gentleman who has been so assiduous for the last six or eight years in preventing, under the rules, the House from acting upon the question. The Committee on Civil Service Reform has never dared to come to this House with any proposition that by amendment or otherwise could give the House an opportunity to express itself upon this question.

It is utterly impossible to do it, and there is no other way in which we can express our condemnation of this fad and this folly other than in voting it out, knowing that it will come back; but I hope the House will have the courage to do it.

For, with the utmost respect to all the gentlemen now before me, I have no hesitation in saying that it is their timidity—I was about to say cowardice—their timidity, their deference to a supposed existing public opinion, that prevents them from asserting themselves and wiping out this fraud upon the public.

I perhaps ought not to use so harsh a word as that, but you will remember, Mr. Chairman, that it is in the mouth of all of these reformers that we who do not follow them in their pursuit of this will-o'-the-wisp are "spoilsmen;" that we are trying to get back to the "spoils" system; that we have an ulterior purpose in view, and they alone are the purists who would redeem the public service from all the evils that it has undergone or suffered since civilization began.

I undertake to say, Mr. Chairman, that if there is a "spoils" system, a system thus to be reprobated by harsh words, it is a so-called civil service—"merit system"—that we have now, with its expenditures of the public money from which no good result comes.

I have lived here in this capital under both the systems—the so-called spoils system of twenty years ago and the so-called merit system of to-day—and I would invite a comparison of those employees who were appointed twenty years ago and those that crept through the intricacies of civil service into the public service now. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman yielded more time.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to have the gentleman yielded more time. I think that is the best speech he has made since he has been here. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Then I shall expect my honored friend from Missouri to vote with me.

Mr. CLARK. You bet I will.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, there is no better illustration of the truthfulness and correctness of the statement made by my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] than is contained in a letter from the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General giving an account of the alleged frauds in the Post-Office Department.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman name one of the persons mentioned in that who are guilty of corruption?

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not know who they are or whether they are guilty. I do not say they are guilty. Some of them are now being tried and their guilt will be determined by the courts. I say that the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, name Machen.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Oh, Machen was a Democrat, appointed—not under the civil service.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No; he was appointed under the civil service and kept there under the civil service.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. He never went through under civil-service rules at all.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Oh, yes; he did.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, have I the floor or have I not the floor? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not know the political faith of the various men in the Post-Office Department who have been indicted for frauds in that Department, some of them by the courts and a number of them by this communication I hold in my hand from the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General. There is a list of them, covering some two pages of the memorandum of the President, attached to this report, thirty-five in number, and out of that number all of them except four were appointed and entered the Government service under a Republican Administration.

I did not arise for the purpose of discussing the politics of these officials who are charged with a violation of the law, but I desire at this time to call the attention of this House and of the country to the conduct and actions of the Civil Service Commission in permitting a man to be appointed as a chief of the division of supplies in the Post-Office Department, and in turning out a man who was then under the civil-service law, and with their action in allowing to be appointed, in an irregular way, contrary to law and the civil-service rules, a man who is charged with having violated and defrauded the Government and, it is alleged, who was appointed for the purpose of giving him control of the division of supplies during the letting of contracts. I refer to the case contained in the report of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, of Michael W. Louis, chief of division of supplies.

Here is what Mr. Bristow says with reference to it and how the civil-service law was violated, and how that violation was not only permitted but winked at by the Civil Service Commission; how the papers which showed it and were of record in the office of the Civil Service Commission disappeared from the files of that commission when inquiry was instituted seeking to bring out the fact as to the manner of his appointment. Mr. Burwell had been appointed in 1896 and was then the chief of the division. No complaints were made against him, but his resignation was demanded and he was forced out. The following is the portion of that report to which I have reference:

APPOINTMENT OF MICHAEL W. LOUIS.

It has been stated that Louis's appointment was made in an irregular way for the purpose of giving him control of the division of supplies during the letting of contracts for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1897.

Mr. W. A. Burwell was appointed superintendent of this division on February 4, 1896. The position is within the classified service, and it does not appear that any complaints were ever filed against him. On April 15, 1897, he was requested to resign by the First Assistant Postmaster-General, but was not accused of inefficiency or misconduct. He submitted his resignation, to take effect in thirty days (Exhibit A-1), and was given leave of absence for that period.

In relation to the appointment of Louis, I beg to submit the following letter (Exhibit A-2):

In your reply please refer to initials.
Subject: Cashier.

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
SALARY AND ALLOWANCE DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., April 17, 1897.

POSTMASTER, Kansas City, Mo.

SIR: Certain exigencies have arisen which make it necessary to employ an expert in the Post-Office Department for a short period. As the Department has no appropriation available for this purpose, I have decided to create the position of cashier in the Kansas City office, at a salary of \$2,000 per annum, effective this date, Saturday, April 17, 1897.

You will therefore carry upon your roster Mr. Michael W. Louis as cashier of your office, at a salary of \$2,000 per annum. Mr. Louis to be assigned to work in this Department under my direction until otherwise advised.

You will forward on the 1st and 15th of each month a check to Mr. Louis to cover his semimonthly salary, accompanied by a voucher which will be returned to you for file with your pay roll in lieu of his signature upon same. To provide for the position your clerk hire allowance has been increased to-day to \$80.544.

Very respectfully,

(Signed) PERRY S. HEATH,
First Assistant Postmaster-General.

COL—ECF]

In your reply please refer to initials and number. A. S. 140.
Subject: Appointment of Michael W. Louis.

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
SALARY AND ALLOWANCE DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., April 17, 1897.

Personal.

HOMER REED, Esq.,
Postmaster, Kansas City, Mo.

SIR: As the appointment of Mr. Michael W. Louis has been fully explained to the members of the Civil Service Commission, it will not be necessary for you to make a report of the appointment to the Civil Service Commission.
Very respectfully,

(Signed) PERRY S. HEATH,
First Assistant Postmaster-General.

COL.]

On the same day that Louis was appointed cashier in the Kansas City post-office he was assigned as acting superintendent of the division of supplies in the Department at Washington, D. C. He never visited Kansas City and never performed any work of any character in connection with the Kansas City post-office.

After Louis had been installed as acting superintendent the First Assistant Postmaster-General requested that the position of superintendent be excepted from the classified service, but the Civil Service Commission refused to recommend such exception. They did, however, consent to give a special examination for that position.

This examination was held in July, and Louis was allowed a rating of 50 points because of his alleged experience, he having then been in charge of the division about three months. The examination papers can not now be found, having disappeared from the files of the Civil Service Commission (Exhibit A-3). As a result of the special rating, Louis received the highest grade of any of those examined and was given a permanent appointment. In the meantime, however, he had been in charge of the division of supplies since April 17 and had performed all of the duties of superintendent.

This unusual proceeding in the appointment of Louis as cashier of the Kansas City post-office and his immediate assignment as acting superintendent of the division of supplies gives color to the allegation that there was some special interest in having Louis placed in charge of that division before the letting of contracts, advertised for May 6. It would have been much more creditable, at least, for Louis to have come into possession of the office in a regular manner, after he had passed the examination prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, since there does not appear to have been any pressing necessity for a change of superintendent.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, this report says that the First Assistant Postmaster-General appointed an officer as cashier of the Kansas City (Mo.) post-office and by the direction of the First Assistant Postmaster-General he was carried upon the rolls of that post-office, though he never did one particle of work in connection with that post-office.

In compliance with the request that was made the Civil Service Commission permitted him to be appointed. When he came to stand his examination, having been appointed and having been in charge of this office only three months, after he had been installed as superintendent, what did they do? The Civil Service Commission were asked that he be excepted from the classified service.

This the Civil Service Commission refused to recommend, but they did, however, consent to give a special examination for that position. This examination was held, and he was allowed 50 points because of his alleged experience, he having been in charge of the division about three months, and by reason of this special rating he was given a permanent appointment.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that he may have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. I was about to move that the committee rise, as it is after 5 o'clock. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to go on to-night?

Mr. BARTLETT. I will suit the pleasure of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, whatever that is.

Mr. BINGHAM. I think there are a number of gentlemen who desire to be heard on this paragraph, and if the gentleman will yield I will make a motion that the committee rise.

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly, I will yield. I will inquire of the chairman whether I shall have the floor when the committee resumes its sitting?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have the floor.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. 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. 9840, the legislative appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SNOW AND ICE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The bill (H. R. 9866) making appropriations for clearing the

Potomac River of ice and for the removal of snow and ice in the District of Columbia was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are hereby appropriated, payable from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and from the revenues of the District of Columbia, in equal parts, namely:

For clearing the Potomac River of ice within the District of Columbia, \$5,000.

For cleaning snow and ice from cross walks and gutters under the act approved March 2, 1895, \$5,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose the request is to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. Yes; that is the request. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

GORDON, IRONSIDES & FARES COMPANY (LIMITED), OF CANADA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit a report by the Acting Secretary of State, with the accompanying papers, in regard to the application of the British embassy in behalf of Messrs. Gordon, Ironsides & Fares Company (Limited), of Canada, for reimbursement of \$7,626.08, which they allege the United States customs authorities improperly exacted of them in November, 1902, as duties on certain sheep and cattle.

In view of the facts as recited by the Acting Secretary of State and shown in the correspondence, I recommend that provision be made for the company's reimbursement.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, January 12, 1904.

The message and accompanying documents were referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

BUST OF WASHINGTON BY DAVID D'ANGERS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Acting Secretary of State, with inclosure from the ambassador of the French Republic, relative to the desire of certain French citizens to present to this Government a reproduction of the bust of Washington by David d'Angers, which the donors wish to have placed in the Capitol.

I recommend that Congress accept this gift by joint resolution and that suitable provision be made for its ceremonial installation.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, January 12, 1904.

The message and accompanying documents were referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9323) to amend so much of an act approved March 3, 1903, as authorized the erection and completion of new buildings for the accommodation of the United States Naval Hospital, Washington, D. C., as concerns the location thereof, and the same was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2536) to suppress and prevent unfair and dishonest competition in trade, and the same was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence indefinitely, on account of a death in his family.

And then, on motion of Mr. BINGHAM (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

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

A letter from the Acting Attorney-General, transmitting a list of judgments rendered against the Government by the circuit and district courts of the United States—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for construction of an army general hospital—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Nathan H. Cloyes v. The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Revision of the Laws, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6293) to revise and codify the criminal and penal laws of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 225); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9597) authorizing the Secretary of State to reimburse the Compagnie Française des Câbles Télégraphiques for expenses incurred in repairing its cables and property which were cut and damaged by forces of the United States in Cuba during the Spanish-American war, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 292); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Insular Affairs, to which was referred H. C. Res. 26, reported in lieu thereof a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 79) for the transportation of Porto Rican teachers to the United States and return, accompanied by a report (No. 294); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2529) to set apart certain lands in the Territory of Arizona as a public park, to be known as the Petrified Forest National Park, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 296); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GREGG, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8326) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of all claims presented on behalf of churches, schools, libraries, hospitals, and establishments conducted for the benefit of churches, or for charitable purposes, arising from the occupation and use of the buildings, grounds, and other property of various kinds occupied, used, taken away, injured, consumed, or destroyed by the United States or its Army during the civil war, or for its benefit in any way, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 282); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7287) to authorize the Mobile and West Alabama Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Tombigbee River between the counties of Clarke and Choctaw, Ala., in section 7, township 9, range 1 west of St. Stephens meridian, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 283); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1924) authorizing the recorder of the General Land Office to issue certified copies of patents, records, books, and papers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 284); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 833) for the relief of Joseph M. Simms, captain, United States Revenue-Cutter Service (retired), reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 226); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 744) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Gascoigne, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 227); 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. 745) granting a pension to John Swenson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 228); 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. 930) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Wiedemann, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 229); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4365) granting a pension to Barney L. Brookins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 230); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1543) granting an increase of pension to William W. Jackson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 231); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 547) granting an increase of pension to Irving W. Coombs, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 232); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7682) granting an increase of pension to William H. Howard, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 233); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 471) granting an increase of pension to Silas Meserve, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 234); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LUCKING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 134) granting a pension to Wilhelmina Miller, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 235); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1491) granting an increase of pension to James A. Hoover, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 236); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 929) granting an increase of pension to Charles Sterner, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 237); 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. 5699) granting an increase of pension to James P. Johnson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 238); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1334) granting a pension to Amy C. Bosworthy, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 239); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 182) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Holt, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 240); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4457) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Meldrum, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 241); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1826) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Cutts, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 242); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4045) granting a pension to Minnie Gusler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 243); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1429) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Paquin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 244); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1335) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Daws, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 245); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3815) granting

an increase of pension to Hester E. Mooney, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 246); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1437) granting an increase of pension to Clarence E. Bullard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 247); 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. 959) granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Ranard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 248); 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. 4276) granting an increase of pension to H. E. Burritt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 249); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1259) granting an increase of pension to John M. Stanyan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 250); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1402) granting an increase of pension to William Paul, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 251); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LUCKING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3037) granting a pension to William Bieber, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 252); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 814) granting a pension to Mamie Thayer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 253); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1487) granting an increase of pension to D. T. Drake, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 254); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2183) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Soule, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 255); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1497) granting an increase of pension to Dana Cook, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 256); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 821) granting an increase of pension to W. Neil Dennison, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 257); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5199) granting a pension to Tracy M. Johnson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 258); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 847) granting an increase of pension to John L. Beveridge, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 259); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2923) granting an increase of pension to John G. Fairchild, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 260); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 865) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Chase, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 261); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 798) granting an increase of pension to James A. Templeton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 262); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 589) grant-

ing an increase of pension to George W. McMullen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 263); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8187) granting an increase of pension to George Jeffrey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 264); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 898) granting an increase of pension to John B. Carter, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 265); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 681) granting an increase of pension to Ella P. Kerstetter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 266); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LUCKING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4114) granting an increase of pension to Robert Carns, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 267); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4251) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hinkle, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 268); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 587) granting an increase of pension to Anson P. Williamson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 269); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 484) granting a pension to Nancy S. Marsh, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 270); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 565) granting an increase of pension to James E. Barnard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 271); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2111) granting a pension to Henry D. Tousley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 272); 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. 478) granting an increase of pension to Olive J. Bailey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 273); 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. 478) granting an increase of pension to Byron D. Babcock, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 274); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4325) granting an increase of pension to John Amer Sills, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 275); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3298) granting a pension to Mary E. Pennock, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 276); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6036) granting an increase of pension to John Shafer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 277); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6701) granting an increase of pension to John A. Reeds, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 278); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5634) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Miles, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 279); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1316) granting an

increase of pension to George W. Day, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 280); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3032) granting an increase of pension to William Pittenger, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 281); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8743) for the relief of Thomas W. Higgins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 285); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HASKINS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4944) for the relief of Sarah A. Clapp, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 286); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1009) for the relief of Isaac Davenport and others, citizens of Virginia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 287); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1696) for the relief of the Methodist Church South, at Newhaven, Ky., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 288); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9261) for the relief of Gallatly, Hankey & Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 289); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8411) for the relief of John A. Meroney, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 290); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DENNY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8748) for the relief of Serenus Kilbourne, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 291); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9548) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 293); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 2305, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 9675) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 295); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6352) granting a pension to Mary Huff and her five children—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7438) granting an increase of pension to Corinne Tolman—Committee on Invalid Pension discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7826) granting an increase of pension to Wiley H. Jackson—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9458) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Harper—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 195) granting a pension to Michael J. Landy—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1623) granting an increase of pension to John H. Reed—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 9635) to consolidate the duties of

certain staff departments of the Army, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 9636) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant right of way for pipe lines through Indian lands—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 9637) to provide for the improvement of the road between Baxter Springs, Kans., and the Baxter Springs (Kans.) National Cemetery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 9638) to adjust the rank and pay of certain officers of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9639) to purchase a painting of the several ships of the United States Navy, known as the "Squadron of Evolution" and entitled "Peace"—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 9640) to amend an act granting to the Keokuk and Hamilton Water Power Company right to construct and maintain a dam, and so forth, approved February 8, 1900—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 9641) to increase and fix the compensation of the appraisers of merchandise at the port of New York, State of New York—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 9642) to provide for the contest of elections in the Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9643) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, to authorize and provide for the maintenance and supply of fuel and illuminating gas and its by-products in Honolulu—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9644) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Honolulu, island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9645) providing for the construction of a vessel of the first class for the Revenue-Cutter Service, to be stationed with headquarters at Honolulu, Hawaii—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9646) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hilo, island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9647) to provide a site and erect a public building at Troy, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9648) to amend the first section of an act providing that the circuit court of appeals for the fifth judicial circuit of the United States shall hold at least one term of said court annually in the city of Montgomery, in the State of Alabama, approved January 30, 1903—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9649) to provide a site and erect a public building at Greenville, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9650) for the improvement of New River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9651) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 9652) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Highways, and to provide for national aid in the improvement of such highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. METCALF: A bill (H. R. 9653) to appoint an additional district judge for the northern judicial district of California—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 9654) to provide for site and public building at Meadville, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9655) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to cause a survey to be made of Big Swift Creek, Craven County, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 9656) for the erection of a Federal building for the United States courts at Texarkana, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9657) for a topographic and geologic survey of the iron-ore region of northeast Texas—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 9658) to provide for the withdrawal, free of duty under bond, for incorporated institutions established for religious, philosophical, educational, scientific, or

literary purposes, of articles and materials exhibited at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 9659) to divide the State of California into three judicial districts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 9660) for the construction of a lock and dam in the Ohio River, below mouth of Big Sandy River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 9661) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase an additional site for public building at Georgetown, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 9662) to establish four permanent military camp grounds, in the vicinity of Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; Camp Douglas, Wis.; in the Conewago Valley, Pennsylvania, and at or near Nacimiento Ranch, California—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9663) to provide for an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the eastern district of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROFT: A bill (H. R. 9664) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Aiken, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9665) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Beaufort, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 9666) to provide allotments to Indians on White Earth Reservation, in Minnesota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9667) to amend chapter 109, approved January 30, 1897, relating to the sale of intoxicating drinks to Indians, providing penalties therefor, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9668) to provide suitable medals for the officers and crew of the United States vessel of war *Kearsarge*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: A bill (H. R. 9669) to prevent the adulteration of blue grass, orchard grass, and clover seed—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 9670) for the extension of Wyoming avenue to Twenty-third street west—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 9671) for the erection of a Federal jail at Little Rock, Ark.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 9672) to amend section 5480, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 9673) to provide for a macadamized approach and roadway to the national cemetery at Little Rock, Ark., and for a suitable wall or iron fence around said cemetery, and other improvements therein—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 9674) authorizing the appointment of a nonpartisan commission to inquire into the past and present condition of the American merchant marine, especially into its relation to promotion of the commerce and increase of the foreign trade of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DRESSER: A bill (H. R. 9676) to confirm a lease made by the Seneca Nation of New York Indians for mining purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 76) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish condemned cannon for a life-size statue of Gen. Henry Leavenworth, at Leavenworth, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 77) for the resurvey of the waterway between Jefferson, Tex., and Shreveport, La., and for ascertainment of probable cost of digging out falls below Little Pass and of improving channel from mouth of Little Pass to stream proper below the falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MINOR: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 78) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause a survey and examination to be made of the harbor at Oconto, Wis., with a view to securing a depth of 18 feet of water, and the necessity for providing an interior basin at the mouth of the river—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, from the Committee on War Claims: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 79) for the transportation of Porto Rican teachers to the United States and return—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. LOUD: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 30) author-

izing the Secretary of War to cause survey to be made near Rogers City, Presque Isle County, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 29) providing for survey of Little River, South Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A resolution (H. Res. 135) calling on the Secretary of War for certain information—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A resolution (H. Res. 136) requiring the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to report on a system of labor insurance—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A resolution (H. Res. 137) defining the word "days" when leave to print is granted by the House—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A resolution (H. Res. 138) providing for an annual clerk to the Committee on the Territories—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Memorial of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, asking for the amendment of section 44 of the act to provide a government for said Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, asking legislation for the deepening of Honolulu Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, against legislation for retransporting of lepers to the island of Molokai—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial from the legislature of Hawaii, asking for statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, asking for appropriation of \$250,000 for benefit of department of education in the said Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims: A bill (H. R. 9675) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased, in lieu of H. R. 2305—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 9677) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Wise—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9678) granting an increase of pension to Enoch French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9679) granting an increase of pension to John W. Gaston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9680) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert L. Eberhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9681) granting an increase of pension to George Castor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9682) granting an increase of pension to Philip Loney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 9683) granting a pension to Henry Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BADGER: A bill (H. R. 9684) granting a pension to Anna L. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9685) granting an increase of pension to John B. Keller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9686) granting an increase of pension to C. H. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9687) granting an increase of pension to Alexander S. Hempstead and giving him the rank of major from July 30, 1864—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9688) granting an increase of pension to A. C. Pindell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9689) for the relief of Robert W. Caldwell, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 9690) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Hardin P. Cochrane, Louisa Cochrane, and William G. Cochrane—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9691) for the relief of Thomas J. Naugher, jr., administrator of Thomas J. Naugher, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 9692) granting a pension to James O'Hagan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9693) granting an increase of pension to William W. Wharton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9694) granting an increase of pension to Mark N. Luce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 9695) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Spears—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9696) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9697) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Nightingale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 9698) granting a pension to John J. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9699) granting a pension to W. J. Cleveland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9700) granting an increase of pension to William A. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9701) granting an increase of pension to T. B. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9702) granting an increase of pension to Patrick H. Hurley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 9703) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Tipton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9704) to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke to the grade of Lieutenant-General in the United States Army and place him on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 9705) to correct the muster of Alvin F. Clark—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 9706) granting an honorable discharge to John P. Webber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9707) granting a pension to Sarah A. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 9708) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of those civilian employees of the Government who were killed by the explosion of gunpowder and 13-inch shell at the United States naval magazine, Iona Island, New York—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 9709) granting a pension to Louis De Witt—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 9710) granting an increase of pension to Henry Frazier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 9711) for the relief of Henry Arnold—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 9712) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Titus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9713) granting an increase of pension to James W. Hudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9714) to pay \$110 attorney's fees to A. Y. Trogon, of Paris, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CASSEL: A bill (H. R. 9715) granting a pension to Mary Gembe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROFT: A bill (H. R. 9716) for the relief of Charles E. Danner & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 9717) granting an increase of pension to Frederick R. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 9718) for the relief of Patrick Larkin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9719) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Darling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9720) granting a pension to Nehemiah Gunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9721) granting a pension to Ashbell G. F. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9722) granting a pension to Robert Kenish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9723) to correct the military record of James M. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 9724) granting an increase of pension to William O. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9725) granting an increase of pension to Allison M. Munn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 9726) granting a pension to John McEliece—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9727) granting a pension to Palmetto Dodson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: A bill (H. R. 9728) to extend for ten years from May 1, 1905, United States patent No. 381972, granted to George W. Tooker—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 9729) granting an increase of pension to Frank W. Fretwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9730) granting a pension to Adam Minear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9731) for the relief of Thornton A. Merri-

field, of Fairmont, Marion County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 9732) for the relief of Adelaide E. Grant and Alice Adelaide Grant—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 9733) granting an increase of pension to Milo W. Seeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9734) granting an increase of pension to Harrison C. Dunham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERICH: A bill (H. R. 9735) granting an increase of pension to Harry Bachrach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9736) to remove the charge of desertion against Patrick Cassidy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 9737) granting an increase of pension to Electa E. Brooks—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 9738) granting a pension to Rebecca Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9739) granting a pension to Lizzie M. Worsler—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9740) granting an increase of pension to William W. Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9741) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Dale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: A bill (H. R. 9742) for the relief of John H. Fralick—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9743) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Gilbert Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9744) granting an honorable discharge to Charles J. Chatfield, jr., deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: A bill (H. R. 9745) granting an increase of pension to Ida J. Peixotto—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 9746) granting a pension to James F. Mace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9747) granting a pension to Thomas L. Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9748) granting an increase of pension to William A. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9749) for the relief of D. C. Cunningham—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9750) to correct the military record of James A. Stewart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9751) to correct the military record of Thomas McKee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 9752) for the relief of Thomas E. Streeter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9753) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Loomis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 9754) for the relief of the First Baptist Church, of Springfield, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 9755) granting an increase of pension to N. B. Meade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9756) granting an increase of pension to Jesse T. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9757) granting an increase of pension to James M. Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9758) for the relief of the heirs of George McGhehey for services rendered as mail contractor—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9759) for the relief of James H. Elgin—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 9760) granting a pension to Mary Jane Crane—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9761) granting an increase of pension to William Nolan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 9762) for the relief of Daniel F. Shirk—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 9763) granting an increase of pension to George Beckley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9764) granting an increase of pension to George W. Haney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 9765) placing the name of J. R. Mann, of Salyersville, Ky., on the muster rolls of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9766) granting an increase of pension to John J. McCoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9767) granting a pension to Jasper Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 9768) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Cormany—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9769) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Pershing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 9770) for the relief of the heirs of William Hunt, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9771) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9772) granting an increase of pension to Z. T. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9773) granting an increase of pension to Absolom Shiltz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9774) granting an increase of pension to James M. Prince—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 9775) granting an increase of pension to Anna S. Christopherson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 9776) for the relief of Michael B. Ryan, son and administrator de bonis non of John S. Ryan, deceased, or to his legal representative—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9777) granting to the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington, for park purposes, certain portions of the Government reserve in said city—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9778) granting a pension to Lauriston W. Adkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 9779) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Jane Simon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9780) for the relief of Robert Galbreath—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9781) for the relief of Silas Maggard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY: A bill (H. R. 9782) to correct the military record of L. L. Bedell, alias Latero Degroat—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9783) granting an increase of pension to Hugh H. Poe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9784) granting an increase of pension to Ransom B. Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 9785) granting an increase of pension to Philip Bessor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9786) granting an increase of pension to John B. Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 9787) granting an increase of pension to William Barge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9788) granting an increase of pension to George W. Blanchard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9789) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOPF: A bill (H. R. 9790) granting a pension to Ada L. Carpenter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9791) granting a pension to Abram Claypool—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 9792) granting a pension to Fanny Tracy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 9793) to remove the charge of desertion against Edwin F. Vinton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9794) granting an increase of pension to Robert F. McCurdy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 9795) for the relief of Jacob Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LILLEY: A bill (H. R. 9796) granting an increase of pension to William Berkley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9797) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Langridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9798) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Sherman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUCKING: A bill (H. R. 9799) to remove charge of desertion from military record of John Dorsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9800) to pay James Caniff \$5,000 for personal injuries received in service of the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9801) granting a pension to Jane McNeil—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 9802) granting an increase of pension to Edwin K. Lamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9803) granting an increase of pension to George Hutchings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9804) granting an increase of pension to John B. Oren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9805) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Armitage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9806) to quiet the titles of certain lands in the State of Mississippi, and for the relief of the estate of Eli Ayers, deceased—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF: A bill (H. R. 9807) granting an increase of pension to Hugh S. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9808) for the relief of laborers and mechanics injured, and the families of those killed, while employed at navy-yards or naval stations, through negligence on the part of other persons in the service of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9809) granting an increase of pension to James E. Speake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9810) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9811) granting a pension to Felix Hendrickson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9812) to increase the pension of Henry N. McLane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 9813) granting an increase of pension to William Lukens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9814) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim M. Boltz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9815) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim O. Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9816) granting an increase of pension to John A. Walter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9817) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9818) granting a pension to Lucetta C. Grafius—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9819) granting a pension to Silas W. Rank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 9820) granting an increase of pension to Vint Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 9821) for the relief of the estate of William Johnson, late of Maury County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9822) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin Bolton, late of Maury County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9823) to pension William R. Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9824) granting a pension to William Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9825) to authorize the President to appoint John J. Washburn assistant quartermaster with rank of captain and to place him on the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 9826) granting an increase of pension to George H. Knight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 9827) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of William Viers Bonic, administrator of the estate of Elijah Thompson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 9828) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Allen Nelson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9829) granting an increase of pension to Stephen J. Saddler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 9830) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Clarksville, Johnson County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9831) for the relief of certain Arkansas soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 9832) granting an increase of pension to Edwin M. Alden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 9833) granting a pension to Adda Tubbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOBER: A bill (H. R. 9834) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth McL. Haughey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 9835) to pension Maggie E. Fitzpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9836) granting a pension to Henry T. Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9837) to remove the charge of desertion against Archibald Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9838) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Jasper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9839) granting an increase of pension to J. A. Kemp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9840) granting a pension to Enoch Kessinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9841) granting a pension to Lloyd Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9842) for the relief of David L. Terry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9843) for the relief of James Clark Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 9844) granting an increase of pension to James H. Parks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 9845) granting a pension to Celia Spitsnale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 9846) granting a pension to Mary Kirk—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9847) granting an increase of pension to Julia Adele Bainbridge-Hoff—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 9848) granting a pension to Rebecca J. H. Rupe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9849) granting a pension to Martha J. Grose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 9850) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Mrs. Harriett Miles—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9851) for the relief of William T. Ratliff, administrator of the estate of Sarah G. Clark, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9852) for the relief of Harriett Miles—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9853) for the relief of E. L. Brien, administrator of estate of Ann Lum, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 9854) granting a pension to Rosa Lee Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9855) granting an increase of pension to Albert M. Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9856) for the relief of E. C. Hatch—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9857) for the relief of Sophia M. Pettit—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9858) for the relief of Mary A. Coleman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9859) for the relief of the heirs of Moses Cunningham, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 9860) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Colvin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9861) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Horning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9862) granting a pension to Mary Yaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYNN: A bill (H. R. 9863) granting an increase of pension to James M. Jackson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 9864) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Willett Pierce and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9865) granting an honorable discharge to Dewitt C. Robbins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ACHESON: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to George Castor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill to grant an increase of pension to Gilbert L. Everhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring arbitration treaties between the United States and foreign countries—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of Thomas W. Alexander and 68 others, fishermen of Orrs Island, Maine, for legislation to prevent the destruction of edible ocean fish by schools of dogfish, etc.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BADGER: Resolution of Franklin Lodge, No. 628, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Columbus, Ohio, in favor of bills H. R. 89 and 7040, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy," etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of J. M. Wells Post, No. 451, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Ohio, favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: Papers to accompany bill to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in claim of Hardin P. Cochran et al—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of Thomas J. Naugher—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Resolution of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring arbitration treaties between United States and foreign countries—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP: Resolution of N. H. Ferry Post, No. 3, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, and Murray Post, No. 168, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, indorsing proposed post-check currency bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, favoring the reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Wisconsin Industrial and Mercantile Association, indorsing the establishment of a naval training station on the shores of Lake Michigan within the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Resolution of Bates Post, No. 58, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Maine, favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Resolution of the Western Retail Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Association, suggesting an amendment to Senate bill 1261—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Henry Arnold—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Sons of Herman and 101 similar associations of German-Americans, protesting against the enactment of legislation to subject articles of commerce in the original packages to State sumptuary legislation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. Y. Trogdon, of Paris, Ill., for payment of certain pension claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition and statement asking for an increase of pension to James W. Hudson; also, petition asking for an increase of pension to Daniel Titus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of A. L. Schaffer, remonstrating against legislation for establishing a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorial of the State Federation of Labor of California, praying that the people of Colorado may be granted the protection of the Federal Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUSINS: Resolutions of Grand Army of the Republic Post, No. 457, Coggon, Iowa; Grand Army of the Republic Post, No. 467, Liscomb, Iowa; Grand Army of the Republic Post, No. 261, Dysart, Iowa; Grand Army of the Republic Post, No. 13, Clarence, Iowa, and Grand Army of the Republic Post, No. 386, Reinbeck, Iowa, favoring a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of J. G. Saffley Post, No. 125, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa; Dennison Post, No. 244, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, and West Branch Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIER: Petition of Clement Brown and other residents of the District of Columbia, protesting against a railroad on M street NW.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURTIS: Resolutions of Greenleaf Post, No. 134, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, urging the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of soldiers and sailors of the National Military Home, Kansas, in favor of the passage of bill H. R. 7873, granting pensions to officers and enlisted men of the military and naval service of the United States, etc.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of certain settlers of the Indian Pasture Reserve No. 3, Comanche County, Okla., asking for the opening of the lands within said pasture to settlement under the homestead laws—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of Thornton A. Merrifield, for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring arbitration treaties between the United States and foreign countries—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Resolutions of A. E. Welch Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Red Wing, Minn., and resolutions of McKinley Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Cannon Falls, Minn., urging passage of service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Memorial of independent tobacco manufacturers, against bills H. R. 6 and 97, relating to tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: Resolution of Knowlton Post, No. 160, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, favoring passage of service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Cary W. Miner Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, and petition of citizens of Georgetown, N. Y., urging passage of service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of North Manlius, N. Y., demanding a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Electa E. Brooks—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, resolutions of I. W. Earll Post, of Colley, Wis., Grand Army of the Republic, urging passage of service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLACK: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 8354, granting a pension to Mary A. Sands—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petitions of the citizens of Moscow, Idaho, and of citizens of Bonners Ferry, Idaho, against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Somonauk, Ill., in opposition to parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, affidavits to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Dale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Rebecca Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to William W. Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 7719, granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Cozine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 6592, granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 7382, granting a pension to Ellen A. Harmon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Lizzie M. Worster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Resolutions of Tom Talbot Post, No. 143, Grand Army of the Republic, of Somerset, Ohio, and of R. Marshall Post, No. 684, of South Perry, Ohio, in favor of the passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Interlake Yachting Association of Ohio, in favor of establishment of a naval training station on Lake Erie—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GUDGER: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of James A. Stewart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Resolutions of Carter Post, No. 96, Grand Army of the Republic, Union, Mich., favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of the Universalist Church, Woodstock, Vt., asking the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Petition of C. L. Alexander and others of Evansville, Ind., against passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of Boon Post, No. 202, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, and A. O. Buchanan Post, No. 26, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce, Coos Bay, Oreg., for survey and estimate for enlarged project for improved navigation at entrance and inner bay—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HILDEBRANT: Resolutions of Kilpatrick Post, Grand Army of the Republic, No. 189, of Goshen, Ohio; Carr B. White Post, Grand Army of the Republic, No. 232, Georgetown, Ohio;

John M. Barrere Post, Grand Army of the Republic, No. 205, Hillsboro, Ohio; L. W. Frazier Post, Grand Army of the Republic, No. 271, Bethel, Ohio; Lewis Post, Grand Army of the Republic, No. 347, of Xenia, Ohio, and Zeno H. Scott Post, Grand Army of the Republic, No. 479, Moscow, Ohio, urging passage of service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: Resolution of Captain A. F. Knight Post, No. 460, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: Petition of merchants and business men of Rico, Dolores County, Colo., against the passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of Post No. 35, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Colorado and Wyoming, and of Post No. 106, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Colorado and Wyoming, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KALANIANA'OLE: Resolution of Chamber of Commerce, Honolulu, Hawaii, asking that foreign vessels be permitted to carry passengers to and from Honolulu and Pacific coast—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Builders and Traders' Exchange of Honolulu, Hawaii, for dredging Honolulu Harbor, a breakwater at Hilo, etc.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Bar Association of Honolulu, Hawaii, suggesting an amendment to the act providing a government for the Territory of Hawaii, increasing the number of justices for the supreme court from three to five—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, resolution of Chamber of Commerce, Honolulu, Hawaii, against passage of Senate bill 289—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KNAPP: Papers to accompany House bill to increase the pension of George W. Blanchard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting increase of pension to William Barge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEHOE: Petition of citizens of Greenup County, Ky., in support of bill H. R. 3574—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolutions of Phil Kearny Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Oskaloosa, Iowa; Townsend Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Bloomfield, Iowa; What Cheer Post, Grand Army of the Republic, What Cheer, Iowa; and Eldon Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Eldon, Iowa, favoring passage of service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LILLEY: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to William Berkley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolutions of Harry Lee Post, No. 21; of Mansfield Post, No. 35, and of Abel Smith-First Long Island Post, No. 435, of Brooklyn, N. Y., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of Boston Chamber of Commerce, in favor of continuing the rebate of duty on bituminous coal—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Resolution of Sully Post, No. 10, Grand Army of the Republic, Blue Earth, Minn., favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, letter of Prof. Harry Snyder, of the University of Minnesota, and an article on the work of the Division of Soils of the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of W. H. Cox and other citizens and business men of Fairmount, N. Dak., in opposition to the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of pastors of Presbyterian, Baptist, and Methodist Episcopal churches of Langdon, N. Dak., for investigation of charges against Senator SMOOT; in favor of Hepburn-Dolliver bills and the McCumber bill; in favor of the Gillett bill, the Allen bill, and for amendment of Lewis and Clark Exposition bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of the citizens of Spearfish, S. Dak., in favor of the McCumber bill and the Hepburn-Dolliver bills—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to James E. Speaks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Petition of heirs of Caroline Hinyard, praying reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany a bill to increase the pension of Henry N. McLane, of Maryville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: Papers to accompany bill to pension William Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of William Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of Benjamin Bolton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Julia Gailey, heir, praying reference of claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of W. S. Fogg, praying reference of claim of the estate of D. C. Kimbrough, deceased, to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PORTER: Resolution of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring arbitration treaties between United States and foreign countries—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: Petition of Charles K. Fulton and others, asking for removal of charge of desertion in case of Allen G. Nelson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Stephen J. Saddler, asking for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of citizens of Rockport, Ill., protesting against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ROBB: Petition of J. H. Renfroe and 39 other citizens of Fredericktown, Mo., against the army canteen and sale of liquor in Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Edwin M. Alden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of W. T. Foster and 68 other citizens of Kendallville, Ind., in opposition to the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RYAN: Memorial of independent tobacco manufacturers, against passage of bills H. R. 6 and 97, amending section 3394 of the Revised Statutes, relating to tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, urging a continuance of the improvement of the channels in the harbor of the Brooklyn water front—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the Grain Dealers' National Association, relative to the inspection of grain at terminal points by the Government—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH: Petition of citizens of Little River, S. C., for a survey of Little River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCOTT: Resolution of the Western Retail Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Association, against passage of Senate bill 1261—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Association, against the supervision of inspection of grain at terminal markets—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Paper to accompany bill granting a pension to James A. Kemp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill granting a pension to Charles H. Jasper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Lloyd Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of David L. Terry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers granting an increase of pension to Peter P. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 1848—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 7507—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Eliza Ferguson, asking for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: Resolutions of A. Linnabary Post, No. 621; Hiram London Post, No. 155; Theodore G. Marchant Post, No. 683, and Weiser Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Ohio, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Celia Spitsnale, of Dupont, Ohio, asking for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Petition of citizens of Lyle, Minn., and of citizens of Mower County, Minn., against the passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorial of residents of Lake City, Minn., for the permanent improvement of the upper Mississippi River between

St. Anthonys Falls and the mouth of the Ohio River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of J. B. Harvey and others, favoring the improvement of Swift Creek, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Irene E. Johnson, administratrix of the estate of Leo L. Johnson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WADE: Petitions of members of the German Methodist Episcopal Church of Victor, Iowa, and of the Baptist Young People's Union of Clinton, Iowa, in favor of the McCumber and Hepburn-Dolliver bills—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYNN: Petition of Templeton committee and Santa Margarita committee, of Templeton and Santa Margarita, Cal., requesting an examination of Nacimiento and other sites for a permanent military camp on the Pacific coast—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 3533, granting an increase of pension to Capt. R. H. McIlroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 13, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved.

RENTAL OF BUILDINGS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 17th ultimo, a statement of buildings rented for the use of the several bureaus under the Department of the Interior in the District of Columbia and the States and Territories; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, 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 passed a bill (H. R. 9866) making appropriations for clearing the Potomac River of ice, and for the removal of snow and ice in the District of Columbia; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented memorials of the Turn Verein of Grand Rapids; of the Schwaben Verein of Grand Rapids; of the Germania Aid Society, of Grand Rapids, and of the Germania Club, of Saginaw, all in the State of Michigan; of the German-American Executive Board of the German-American Alliance of Ohio; of Lodge No. 27, of Marion; of the German Sick Relief Society, of Youngstown; of Lodge No. 41, of Newark; of the Goethe Lodge, of Youngstown; of the German Benevolent Society, of Newark; of the German Beneficial Society, of Portsmouth; of the Singing Society of Chillicothe; of Lodge No. 18, of Tiffin; of the Maennerchor of Youngstown; of the Kesser Benevolent Association, of Toledo; of the Beneficial Society of Springfield, and of the Arbeiter Saengerbund, of Toledo, all in the State of Ohio; of Lodge No. 113, of St. Killian; of the Harmonic Club of Appleton; of the Germania Maennerchor, of Fond du Lac; of the German Soldier Aid Society, of La Crosse; of the Frohsinn Singing Society, of La Crosse; of the German Veteran Society, of Green Bay, all in the State of Wisconsin; of the St. John's Society, of Albany; of Victoria Lodge, No. 455, of Albany; of the Maenner Quartette Singing Society, of Albany; of the German Young Men's Catholic Union, of Albany; of Court Schiller Lodge, No. 373, of Troy; of the German-American Society of Rochester; of the Turn Verein of Troy; of the St. Anthony Society of Albany; of the Deutscher Bund of Utica; of the Caecilia Singing Society, of Albany; of the German Benevolent Society, of Clarkstown; of the German Legal Aid Association, of Brooklyn; of the Baden Sick Aid Association, of Utica; of the German Veteran Society, of Troy; of the Rhein Preussen Benevolent Association, of Buffalo; of the John Hahn Mannie Order, of Utica; of Lodge No. 15, of Albany; of the Badischer Volks Verein, of Albany; of the Singing Society, Saengerbund Harmonia, of Albany; of Lodge No. 1778, of Buffalo; of the Deutscher Soldaten Bund, of Buffalo; of the Maennerchor of Buffalo; of the German-American Benevolent Society, of Buffalo; of the Swiss Maennerchor, of Rochester; of the Bavarian Saenger-