

Now, what is the real issue before us? What changes will be made in our tariff relations with Cuba when this treaty goes into operation? When we get right down to the kernel in the nut, there is nothing that will occur, except simply this: We will ship our goods into Cuba cheaper than any other country can ship their goods there; and so we shall enjoy an advantage which no other country can enjoy. In the course of time we shall get Cuba's trade. And, Mr. President, Cuba likewise will ship her goods into our country more cheaply than any other country can ship its goods here. They are simply reciprocal relations, or, as I say, benefits. We get certain benefits and the people of Cuba get certain benefits.

To tell you the truth, Mr. President, I should be glad to see the United States have the trade of Cuba and that of all the Central and South American republics. I want to live to see the day when our trade relations with the South American and Central American republics and Cuba shall be closer and when we shall do more business with them than we now do. It is mortifying to me to read the statistics of our exports and imports and to see the business that Germany and Great Britain do with those republics and with Cuba.

So far as the resolution of my friend from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] is concerned, I have just a word to say, and then I shall be through.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of any resolution inviting Cuba to come to us, but I do say that I see no harm in the resolution of the Senator from Nevada. He simply proposes, in a kind and friendly way, to invite the people of Cuba to come and join us as a State of this Union. So far as that is concerned, I do not favor any action on it, but I see no harm in it. The criticisms which have been made against the resolution I do not believe are just.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that the time will come when we shall have something to say of a friendly nature in regard to our neighbors, the South American and Central American republics, including Colombia.

I do not believe that any injury to any of the great industries of our country will flow from the passage of this bill. I believe that in the future great benefits will accrue to my State and to her sister States, that such benefits will accrue to Louisiana, to Mississippi, and to North Carolina, as well as to Massachusetts and to Maine and to every other State in this great Union.

Believing this to be for the best interests of the American Republic, to be right in principle and morals, and to be for the best advancement of the people of Cuba, I feel it my duty as a Senator to vote in favor of this measure.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I suppose, as this is Saturday evening, no other Senator desires to speak at this hour. If not, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 14, 1903, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 12, 1903.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

I. William J. Buchanan, of New York, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Panama, to fill an original vacancy.

ASSISTANT TREASURER.

Thomas J. Akins, of Missouri, to be assistant treasurer of the United States at St. Louis, Mo., to succeed Bernard G. Farrar, whose term of office will expire by limitation December 23, 1903.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Edward E. Butler, of Tennessee, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Tennessee, to succeed Alonzo J. Tyler, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Fred W. Wight, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Waldoborough, in the State of Maine. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 12, 1903.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

Richard W. Tindall to be postmaster at Jesup, in the county of Wayne and State of Georgia.

MAINE.

Sidney G. Haley to be postmaster at Phillips, in the county of Franklin and State of Maine.

Guy W. McAlister to be postmaster at Bucksport, in the county of Hancock and State of Maine.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

John H. Bartlett to be postmaster at Portsmouth, in the county of Rockingham and State of New Hampshire.

Charles Eaton to be postmaster at Littleton, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire.

Natt. F. Roberts to be postmaster at Farmington, in the county of Strafford and State of New Hampshire.

NEW JERSEY.

George W. Cooper to be postmaster at Somerville, in the county of Somerset and State of New Jersey.

Henry R. Tatem to be postmaster at Collingswood, in the county of Camden and State of New Jersey.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William F. Heidenreich to be postmaster at Sheridanville, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania.

SENATE.

MONDAY, December 14, 1903.

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

Mr. ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE, a Senator from the State of Indiana; Mr. EDWARD W. CARMACK, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, and Mr. WILLIAM J. STONE, a Senator from the State of Missouri, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

CAPT. JOSEPH M. SIMMS.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Calendar the bill (S. 833) for the relief of Joseph M. Simms, captain, United States Revenue-Cutter Service (retired). A similar bill passed the Senate in the last Congress unanimously, and it will take only a moment.

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

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That Capt. Joseph M. Simms, United States Revenue-Cutter Service (retired), having been promoted "for meritorious acts of public service and wounds received in the United States service, as appears upon the public records of the volunteer service of the Army and Navy and of the Revenue-Cutter Service," shall hereafter receive the full retired pay of his said rank.

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

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

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

SPANISH TREATY CLAIMS COMMISSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 9th instant, copies of the announcements of the Commission on April 28, 1903, of the principles governing their action in making decisions upon demurrers, together with copies of various opinions delivered relative to such announcements; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the Baptist Church of Tullahoma, Tenn., v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented memorials of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, remonstrating against the ratification of the Cuban reciprocity treaty; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Hoopeston, 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. SCOTT presented a petition of the congregations of the Christian Church of West Virginia, 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. McCOMAS presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of the Second Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, Md., 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. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Whitefield, 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. LONG presented a petition of the Southwestern Grain and Flour Journal of Wichita, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Reformed Church of Whitewater; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Whitewater; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Whitewater; of the congregation of the Zion Lutheran Church, of Whitewater; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lecompton; of the Woman's Missionary Society of Iola; of sundry citizens of Burlingame and Reeder; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Osage City, and of the congregation of the United Brethren Church of Ottawa, all in the State of Kansas, 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.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1790) for the relief of Simon Regnier; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 1793) for the relief of John C. Brown; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented a paper signed by sundry citizens of Anthony and Harper counties, Kans., to accompany the bill (S. 1802) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Couch; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers and affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 1801) granting a pension to Mary J. Haas; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the affidavit of David Bennett, of Fort Dodge, Kans., praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Pensions to accompany the bill (S. 1806) granting an increase of pension to David Bennett.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1796) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Woodworth; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a paper signed by sundry citizens of Belle Plaine, Kans., to accompany the bill (S. 2267) granting a pension to Ruth E. Wright; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the affidavit of John M. Morgan, of Baldwin, Kans., praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions, to accompany the bill (S. 1792) granting an increase of pension to John M. Morgan.

Mr. CULBERSON presented a petition of the congregation of the Tabernacle Methodist Episcopal Church, of Houston, Tex., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. TALIAFERRO presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal, Christian, Presbyterian, and Baptist churches, all of De Land, in the State of Florida, 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. CLAPP presented a petition of the Missionary Society of the Merriam Park Presbyterian Church, of St. Paul, Minn., 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. BURROWS presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the American merchant marine; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Detroit, Grand Haven, Elk Rapids, and Whitewater, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hopkins, all in the State of Michigan, and of the Woman's Presbyterian Society for Home Missions of the District of Columbia, 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. McCREARY presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Louisville, Ky., 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. WARREN presented a memorial of the legislature of Wyoming, relative to the extension for a period of ten years the time within which desert lands may be segregated; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The State of Wyoming. Office of the secretary of state. United States of America, State of Wyoming, ss:

I, Fenimore Chatterton, secretary of state, of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed has been carefully compared with the original house joint memorial No. 1, and is a full, true, and correct copy of same and of the whole thereof.

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

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 21st day of February, A. D. 1903.

[SEAL.] FENIMORE CHATTERTON,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial No. 1, memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend for a period of ten years the time within which desert lands may be selected and segregated under the operation of section 4.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring): Whereas under the operation of section 4 of an act making appropriation for sundry civil expenses of Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes, approved August 18, 1894, relating to arid-land donations, and amended by acts of Congress approved June 11, 1896, and March 3, 1901, there has been segregated in the State of Wyoming 302,189.78 acres; and

Whereas great interest is now being taken in the reclamation of desert lands in this State; and

Whereas under present conditions the most feasible method of reclamation of desert lands is by the system inaugurated under this act; and

Whereas under the provisions of this act the period of time for the selection and segregation of such lands will expire August 18, 1904; Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to extend the time within which such lands may be selected and segregated for a period of ten years from August 18, 1904; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Congressional delegations from this State, with request that they urge such measure upon the attention of Congress.

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

Approved February 21, 1903.

DE F. RICHARDS, Governor.

Mr. WETMORE presented petitions of the congregation of the Embury Methodist Episcopal Church, of Central Falls; of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Newport; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Providence, and of the Woodville Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of North Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, 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. MILLARD presented a petition of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Minden, Nebr., and a petition of sundry citizens of Fairmont, Nebr., 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. BATE presented petitions of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Knoxville; of the congregation of the Shannondale Church, of Beverly; of the congregation of the Disciples of Christ Church and People's Tabernacle, of Knoxville; of the Missionary Society of the Bell Avenue Presbyterian Church, of Knoxville; of the Children's Mission Home of Knoxville, and of the Florence Crittenton Home Board of Knoxville, all in the State of Tennessee, 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 the congregation of the German Methodist Episcopal Church of Victor, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Presbyterian Church of Mediapolis, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Mediapolis, the Swedish Evangelical Lutheran Church of Mediapolis, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Fairfield, the United Presbyterian Church of Davenport, the Presbyterian Church of Kossuth, the Second Presbyterian Church of Davenport, the First Presbyterian Church of Davenport, the Home and Foreign Mission of the Presbyterian Church of Fairfield, and of sundry citizens of Washington, all in the State of Iowa, 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. HEYBURN presented a petition of the mayor and city council of Pocatello, Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation relative to ceded lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ALGER presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 2279) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Williams; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 2281) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Walich; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1395) granting a pension to Mary McGilvary; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE presented a memorial of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to extend the scope of the act for the suppression of lottery traffic, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 69, Iron Molders' Union, of Middletown, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill and also the anti-injunction bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Parnassus; of the Young Men's Christian Association of New Kensington; of the Woman's Club of Media; of sundry citizens of Gravity; of the congregation of the Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Lebanon; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church of Allentown; of the Central Methodist Episcopal Church, of Philadelphia; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Holland; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wyoming; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Mehoopany; of the congregation of the United Brethren Church of Lebanon; of the congregation of the Church of Intercession, of Philadelphia; of the Clay Public School, of Williamsport; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Lebanon; of the congregation of St. Mark's Reformed Church, of Lebanon; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lawrence County; of the congregation of the Park Avenue Baptist Church, of Scranton; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Media; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Oil City; of sundry citizens of Slippery Rock; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Delaware County; of the Epworth League of Worthington; of the congregation of St. Luke's Reformed Church, of Kittanning; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Greenfield; of the Christian Endeavor Society of the Presbyterian Church of Burgettstown; of sundry citizens of Starrucca; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Coudersport; of sundry citizens of Zelienople; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Mount Carmel; of sundry citizens of Evans City; of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian churches of Nicholson; of sundry citizens of McKeesport; of the congregation of the Central Presbyterian Church, of Erie; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lancaster, and of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Muddy Creek Forks, all in the State of Pennsylvania, 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. FRYE presented a petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Columbus, Ind., 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 memorials of Goethe Lodge, No. 4, Order of Sons of Hermann, of Stamford, Conn.; of Copernicus Conclave, No. 21, Order of Seven Wise Men; of Ascher Harmonie; of Alemania Singing Society; of Kutschen und Wagenbauer Unterstutzungs Verein; of Concordia Gesang Verein; of the Hermann Unterstutzungs Bund, and of the German Beneficial Union, District No. 165, all of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

HART FARM SCHOOL.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I present some papers relating to the Hart Farm School that are of interest to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I move that they be printed as a document and referred to that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 137) granting a pension to Hannah Kelly, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 898) granting an increase of pension to John B. Carter, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was re-

ferred the bill (S. 1705) granting a pension to Esther G. Wharton, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1772) granting an increase of pension to Louise K. Bard, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (S. 172) granting a pension to Elizabeth McClaren;

A bill (S. 11) granting a pension to John L. Sullivan;

A bill (S. 9) granting an increase of pension to David E. Burbank;

A bill (S. 1756) granting an increase of pension to Zebedee M. Cushman;

A bill (S. 473) granting an increase of pension to Byron D. Babcock;

A bill (S. 549) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Thomas;

A bill (S. 798) granting an increase of pension to James A. Templeton;

A bill (S. 1259) granting an increase of pension to John M. Stanyan;

A bill (S. 565) granting an increase of pension to James E. Barnard;

A bill (S. 190) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Bell;

A bill (S. 478) granting an increase of pension to Olive J. Bailey;

A bill (S. 112) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Hammond;

A bill (S. 1819) granting a pension to Charles P. Skinner;

A bill (S. 182) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Holt;

A bill (S. 1755) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Banks;

A bill (S. 484) granting a pension to Nancy Marsh; and

A bill (S. 1827) granting an increase of pension to Harris A. P. Lewis.

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

A bill (S. 1497) granting an increase of pension to Walter F. Chase;

A bill (S. 1913) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo E. Harrison;

A bill (S. 1826) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Cutts;

A bill (S. 471) granting an increase of pension to Silas Meserve;

A bill (S. 12) granting an increase of pension to Francis E. Chase;

A bill (S. 1825) granting a pension to Josephine L. Webber; and

A bill (S. 14) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Perry.

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

A bill (S. 339) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer H. Richardson;

A bill (S. 338) granting an increase of pension to Jane M. Watt; and

A bill (S. 847) granting a pension to John L. Beveridge.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1832) granting an increase of pension to George W. Herron, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (S. 1402) granting an increase of pension to William Paul;

A bill (S. 2125) granting an increase of pension to Marcus T. Caswell;

A bill (S. 959) granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Ranard;

A bill (S. 1491) granting an increase of pension to James A. Hoover;

A bill (S. 200) granting an increase of pension to Austin Almy;

A bill (S. 578) granting an increase of pension to John Bullamore;

A bill (S. 2078) granting an increase of pension to Hampton C. Watson; and

A bill (S. 215) granting a pension to Mary D. Perry.

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

A bill (S. 458) granting an increase of pension to Charles Beattie;

A bill (S. 589) granting an increase of pension to George W. McMullen;

A bill (S. 555) granting an increase of pension to Royal A. S. Kingsley;

A bill (S. 586) granting a pension to Annie H. Zoll;
 A bill (S. 929) granting an increase of pension to Charles Stermer;
 A bill (S. 456) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Pierce;

A bill (S. 744) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Gascoigne;

A bill (S. 1929) granting an increase of pension to George W. Spahr; and

A bill (S. 1429) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Paquin.

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

A bill (S. 1952) granting an increase of pension to John Monahan;

A bill (S. 1437) granting an increase of pension to Clarence E. Bullard;

A bill (S. 1543) granting an increase of pension to William W. Jackson;

A bill (S. 451) granting an increase of pension to William T. Conant;

A bill (S. 930) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Wiedemann;

A bill (S. 937) granting an increase of pension to Rudolph Sieblist;

A bill (S. 452) granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Bullock;

A bill (S. 745) granting a pension to John Swenson; and

A bill (S. 587) granting an increase of pension to Anson P. Williamson.

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

A bill (S. 821) granting an increase of pension to W. Neil Denison;

A bill (S. 99) granting an increase of pension to Joel C. Shepherd;

A bill (S. 78) granting a pension to E. C. Curtis; and

A bill (S. 368) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Wilcox.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 65) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Allen, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 367) granting an increase of pension to George W. Richardson, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 270) authorizing the Winnipeg, Yankton and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

REPORT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF INDIAN SCHOOLS.

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

Resolved, That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to print, from stereotype plates, with illustrations, 1,000 additional copies of the report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools for 1903, for the use of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER-GENERAL OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. DILLINGHAM on the 9th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, in paper covers, at the Government Printing Office, 5,500 additional copies of the annual report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration for the year ended June 30, 1903, with illustrations, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 2,500 copies shall be delivered to the Bureau of Immigration for distribution.

COLUMBIAN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1496) supplemental to the act of February 9, 1821, incorporating the Columbian College, in the District of Columbia, and the acts amendatory thereof, to report it favorably without amendment, and submit a report thereon. As it is extremely important that this bill be passed at an early day, I ask for its present consideration.

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

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act to incorporate the Columbian College, in the District of Columbia, approved February 9, 1821, and the amendatory act approved March 18, 1898, be, and the same are hereby, amended by repealing and striking out of the said charter the following words in lines 20 to 25 in section 1 of the said amendatory act of March 18, 1898, namely, "Two-thirds of said trustees, and also the president of the university, shall be members of regular Baptist churches; that is to say, members of churches of that denomination of Protestant Christians now usually known and recognized under the name of the regular Baptist denomination."

SEC. 2. That section 13 of the original charter of February 9, 1821, which provides "That persons of every religious denomination shall be capable of being elected trustees; nor shall any person, either as president, professor, tutor, or pupil, be refused admittance into said college, or denied any of the privileges, immunities, or advantages thereof, for or on account of his sentiments on matters of religion," be, and the same is hereby, reenacted and shall be hereafter in full force as a part of said charter.

SEC. 3. That power is hereby given to the board of trustees of said university to change the name of said university at any regular meeting by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the total number of members of the board, as prescribed by the charter. That upon such action being taken a certificate, under the seal of the university, stating the name adopted and the date when the name shall go into effect, not less than thirty days nor more than six months from the date of its adoption, together with the fact that said name has been adopted by said board, as herein prescribed, shall be filed in the office of the recorder of deeds, and thereupon, upon the date specified for the name to go into effect, the university shall be known and designated by the name adopted, and by said new name the said university shall be vested with and convey its real estate, hold, control, and administer endowments and gifts of money and property heretofore and hereafter made for the maintenance of its educational work and do and perform all acts which it now has the power to do under its said charter. Such change of name shall not in any other way change, affect, or modify in any degree the rights, privileges, obligations, and powers of the said university under the charter of February 9, 1821, and the amendatory acts thereto.

SEC. 4. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

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

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, one moment. There was so much confusion in the Chamber that though I tried to listen I did not get the whole scope of the bill. As I understand it from the reading, it removes the so-called sectarian feature of the institution, which I suppose was established under the auspices and patronage of the Baptist Church, and makes it a purely nonsectarian college. I so understood from the reading, and I ask the Senator if that is true?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Maine that four or five years ago the charter of this institution was amended, making it a sectarian institution. They now ask that that shall be repealed, and that they shall be permitted to operate under their old charter. It is simply that.

Mr. HALE. So that the original charter was nonsectarian?

Mr. GALLINGER. It was nonsectarian.

Mr. HALE. Now, another feature which I thought I discovered is that the name of the university may be changed, not subject to the approval of Congress, but by the act of the trustees. I ask the Senator whether that is what is covered by the provision, and whether he knows what is in contemplation as to the name of the institution?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say frankly, Mr. President, I do not know what is in contemplation. I simply know that Doctor Needham, who is at the head of the Columbian Institution, says there is great embarrassment constantly arising because of the similarity between the names "Columbian University" and "the Columbia University." He cited to me several instances where it has been a matter of considerable embarrassment, and he thought that the trustees in their discretion might desire at some future time to make a change in the name.

Mr. HALE. I had thought of that and supposed it to be the underlying reason for this change.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is.

Mr. HALE. The Senator does not know what name is contemplated?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not.

Mr. HALE. Those two features, then, cover the bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. They do, absolutely.

Mr. HALE. They desire a return to the nonsectarian feature, and the privilege of changing the name because it occasions embarrassment with another institution of almost the same title.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is all there is to it.

Mr. McCOMAS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CULLOM. I wish to say—

Mr. McCOMAS. I should like to ask a question, if the Senator from Illinois will pardon me.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope the Senator from Illinois will allow the Senator from Maryland to ask a question.

Mr. CULLOM. I will yield that the Senator may ask a question, but under the rule or arrangement we ought to go on with the discussion of the subject that is specially set aside for consideration. The Senator who is to speak to-day was not in his seat

a moment ago, and hence I consented that the bill might be taken up and put on its passage, if it would not lead to discussion.

Mr. MCOMAS. I will take but a moment.

Mr. CULLOM. I can not yield much longer.

Mr. MCOMAS. I was in favor of the bill and of a change to the nonsectarian feature, and I have no objection to the change now. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether it is likely in changing the name (for the power seems ample) the university may desire to call it the American University or the University of the United States, or such other name as Congress might hesitate in that connection to have accepted. Is the chairman quite confident that such is not the purpose?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, we have to trust to the good sense of the good men who are at the head of the institution. I did ask Doctor Needham that direct question as to the name "University of the United States," and he said they certainly would not adopt that name.

Mr. MCOMAS. I did not think they would, but I thought it might remove an objection to show that it is not contemplated.

Mr. HALE. I should want that thoroughly understood. Otherwise I should like to have the bill go over.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill goes to the Calendar.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire simply to say that I shall endeavor to call it up at an early day for consideration; and so far as the change of name is concerned I will see that a proper amendment is placed in the bill, so that the name will have to be agreed to by the Secretary of the Interior or some other competent official.

• BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 2464) granting an increase of pension to John Aylers; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 2465) to authorize the Montgomery and Autauga Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Alabama River near the city of Montgomery, Ala.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 2466) granting an increase of pension to Florence M. Metz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FOSTER of Louisiana introduced a bill (S. 2467) for the relief of the Citizens' Bank of Louisiana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 2468) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Ocala, Fla., and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2469) granting an increase of pension to Orville E. Campbell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2470) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Hazzard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 2471) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James H. Dennis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 2472) granting to railroads and water companies the right of way through public lands and reservations of the United States for reservoirs and pipe lines; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2473) to extend the time for the selection and segregation of public lands provided for by section 4 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

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

A bill (S. 2474) granting an increase of pension to Sister Mary Vincent;

A bill (S. 2475) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Wood; and

A bill (S. 2476) granting an increase of pension to John M. Brown.

Mr. MCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 2477) for the relief of Sarah C. Harsh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2478) for the extension of Seventeenth street northwest from Florida avenue to Columbia road;

which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2479) granting an increase of pension to James J. Lowden; 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. 2480) granting an increase of pension to William Hoar (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2481) granting an increase of pension to Harmon M. Billings (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2482) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Kurz (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2483) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Kibble; and

A bill (S. 2484) granting an increase of pension to Jason Dame.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 2485) to correct the military record of Isaac Thompson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 2486) to correct the military record of Peter Parker;

A bill (S. 2487) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Louis Quain;

A bill (S. 2488) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Shenevere (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2489) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Wright Farnsworth (with accompanying papers).

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

A bill (S. 2490) granting a pension to Naomi Green (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2491) granting a pension to Theresa B. Nash;

A bill (S. 2492) granting an increase of pension to George G. Tuttle (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2493) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Tichurst; and

A bill (S. 2494) granting a pension to George Hutton (with accompanying papers).

Mr. ALGER introduced a bill (S. 2495) to amend the naval record of Nathaniel P. Jacobs; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 2496) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer Wing; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2497) for the relief of Mary F. B. Grice; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2498) for the relief of Jean Michel Vendenhiem, a citizen of France residing in the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2499) to authorize the President to place the name of Archibald K. Eddowes on the retired list of the United States Navy with the rank of chief engineer, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2500) to correct the military record of John McKinley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2501) to correct the military record of Harrison Defibaugh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military 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. 2502) granting a pension to Robert W. Patrick (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2503) granting an increase of pension to Nathan B. Fowler (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2504) granting a pension to M. Kate Monteith (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2505) granting an increase of pension to John I. Fleming;

A bill (S. 2506) granting a pension to Susannah Ryan;

A bill (S. 2507) granting an increase of pension to Aaron B. Myers;

A bill (S. 2508) granting an increase of pension to Morris H. Jones;

A bill (S. 2509) granting an increase of pension to Abner B. Edson;

A bill (S. 2510) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Paul;

A bill (S. 2511) granting an increase of pension to Mary Douglas (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2512) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Stonaker (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2513) granting an increase of pension to Roxana S. Ker (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2514) to amend the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act for the suppression of lottery traffic through national and interstate commerce and the postal service, subject to the jurisdiction and laws of the United States;" which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (for Mr. CLAPP) introduced a bill (S. 2515) to extend the United States pension laws to participants in the battles of New Ulm and Fort Ridgely, Minn., in the Sioux war of 1862; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MILLARD introduced a bill (S. 2516) for the relief of Nye & Schneider Company; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

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

A bill (S. 2517) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Farr;

A bill (S. 2518) granting an increase of pension to Clarinda A. Spear (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2519) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Atwood (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2520) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Legro (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. FOSTER of Washington introduced a bill (S. 2521) to detach certain counties from the United States judicial district of Washington, and to create a new judicial district, to be called the southern district of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2522) for the relief of the trustees of the Free Church of Burlington, W. Va; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2523) for the benefit of officers who served over three years during the civil war and over thirty years since, and who have retired on account of disability incurred in the line of duty since the close of the Spanish-American war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2524) granting an increase of pension to James W. Griffiths; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2525) authorizing the purchase of sites for buildings for the accommodation of the Interior, Treasury, and War Departments of the United States, the District of Columbia, and for other public purposes, in connection with removing the Botanic Garden fence and improving the grounds, together with the development and encouragement of ramie fiber, silk, and flax preparation and manufacture and their production and profitable home market in the United States, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 2526) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Fort Stevens, in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2527) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Roberts; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DOLLIVER introduced a bill (S. 2528) granting a pension to Maggie D. Chapman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2529) granting a pension to Sarah Martin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2530) to authorize certain persons who have intermarried with Cherokees to sue for their interest in certain moneys of the tribe from which they were excluded; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2531) to provide an American register for the steamer *Beaumont*; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. KEAN introduced a bill (S. 2532) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Meckly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURTON introduced the following bills; which were sev-

erally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2533) granting an increase of pension to James H. Verner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2534) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Donald; and

A bill (S. 2535) granting an increase of pension to Joel Maxwell.

Mr. BURTON introduced a bill (S. 2536) for the relief of Elijah G. Steely; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2537) for the relief of C. E. Moore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 2538) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Thomas; which was read twice by title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2539) to create in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Roads, and to provide for a system of national, State, and local cooperation in the permanent improvement of the public highways; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a 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; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2541) relating to clerks to pay officers in the Navy; 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. 2542) granting an increase of pension to James E. Larkin;

A bill (S. 2543) granting an increase of pension to Ella B. Green; and

A bill (S. 2544) granting an increase of pension to Albert T. Severance (with accompanying papers).

Mr. HALE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2545) providing for the restoration to the navy list of certain officers, graduates of the United States Naval Academy, who have been heretofore honorably discharged under the act of Congress approved August 5, 1882; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2546) to amend the naval record of Charles H. Brigham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2547) for the relief of the owners and crew of the schooner *Ella M. Doughty*; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2548) granting an increase of pension to Emma McFarland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2549) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Jellison; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 2550) for the relief of Emile M. Blum; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2551) granting a pension to Elizabeth P. Gates; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 2552) for the relief of Amos Woodruff;

A bill (S. 2553) for the relief of the estate of Reese Brabson, deceased;

A bill (S. 2554) for the relief of William B. Bayless;

A bill (S. 2555) for the relief of William G. Tidwell; and

A bill (S. 2556) for the relief of Alexander Anderson (with accompanying papers).

Mr. CARMACK introduced a bill (S. 2557) granting a pension to Johniken L. Mynatt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2558) granting an increase of pension to Sallie H. Kincaid; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 2559) granting a pension to James Graham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DEPEW introduced a bill (S. 2560) for the relief of G. G. Martin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 23) amending section 1 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved March 3, 1903; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

PURCHASE OF CANAL PROPERTY IN PANAMA.

Mr. MORGAN. I offer a concurrent resolution which I ask may be read and printed, and go over under the rule.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), 1. That it is the right of Congress under the Constitution to be informed of and to consider and pass upon any contemplated purchase of any property, or claim of right, easement, or other interest in property in Panama from the New Panama Canal Company for and on account of the United States before such contemplated purchase is attempted to be consummated by any order or act of the President of the United States.

2. That such purchase from the New Panama Canal Company can not be lawfully made and consummated by the President or by the President and the Senate as the treaty-making power of the United States without the legislative consent of Congress.

3. That it is the duty of the department of the Government engaged in making such contemplated purchase, or in effecting the consummation thereof under or in virtue of any authority that is derived in whole or in part from any governing power on the Isthmus of Panama, to lay before Congress full information as to all the terms and conditions of such contract or purchase for its consideration and action before the same is attempted to be consummated by such department.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I ask that the resolution may be printed and go over under the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The rule applies to Senate resolutions alone. This is a concurrent resolution. Does the Senator desire to have it lie on the table subject to his call?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any objection to that request? The Chair hears none.

CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE.

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

Resolved, That the Rev. Edward Everett Hale be appointed Chaplain of the Senate, the appointment to take effect on the 1st day of January, 1904.

ASSISTANT IN DOCUMENT ROOM.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer a resolution, which goes necessarily to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I will state in offering it that it relates to the efficiency of the document room of the Senate, and I am informed by those having charge of the document room that it is essential to the conduct of the business there, for the convenience of Senators.

The resolution was read, and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to employ one additional assistant in the Senate document room, at a compensation of \$1,440 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

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 concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, December 19, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Monday, January 4, 1904; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. ALLISON, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, December 19, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Monday, January 4, 1904.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH CUBA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill known as the "Cuban bill."

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, entertaining as I do a profound respect for the wisdom of the Senate as a whole and a proper respect for the judgment of each individual Senator, I am compelled to distrust in some degree my own conclusion when it requires me to antagonize a measure which is supported by such a decisive majority of this body. Indeed, this feeling of unaffected and sincere diffidence is so strong that if the bill now under consideration appeared to me less than a most pernicious one, I would not occupy the time of the Senate in debating it, but would content my-

self with simply voting against it on the final roll call. But, sir, it seems to me so utterly indefensible from every point of view that if I should suffer it to pass without stating my objections to it, I would feel that, out of deference to my associates, I had failed in the full performance of my duty.

This bill is vicious both as a matter of law and as a matter of policy. It is vicious as a matter of law because it violates the wise and well-established constitutional principle that all revenue bills must originate in the House of Representatives, and it asserts the right of the President to initiate legislation of that kind. Then, sir, as if to compensate the House for the loss of its only exclusive and its most valuable privilege that body is invited to share with the President and the Senate the treaty-making power of this Government—the authors of this legislation seeming to suppose that they can atone for one breach of the Constitution by committing another.

As a matter of policy this legislation must be vicious, because, paradoxical as the statement may seem, it is repugnant alike to Republican and to Democratic tariff doctrine. It offends against the position of the Republican party by withdrawing from our only agricultural product susceptible of tariff protection a part of the advantage which it now enjoys, and exposes the American sugar farmer to the competition of the cheaper labor, the cheaper land, and the more favorable climatic conditions of Cuba. It also offends against the Republican claim that the chief concern of the protective tariff is the welfare of the American wage-earner, because it reduces the duty on cigars made by Cuban labor tenfold more than it reduces the duty on Cuban tobacco, out of which American labor can make exactly the same cigar.

It runs counter to our Democratic creed because it reduces the duty on raw sugar, which is purchased by a few manufacturers for the sake of the profit they can make in refining it, without making any reduction whatever on refined sugar, which is purchased as an article of wholesome and daily food for 80,000,000 consumers. It also contradicts our Democratic advocacy of freer trade by projecting into the island of Cuba a complicated system of discriminating and preferential tariff duties designed expressly and only for the purpose of protection.

These, Mr. President, are the charges which I prefer against this legislation, and I ask the patient attention of the Senate while I endeavor to sustain them with evidence and by argument.

The natural and orderly discussion in this body upon any measure involving both questions of law and questions of policy is for us to consider the questions of law first, and that is especially desirable in a case like this, where the question of law goes to the very power of Congress to do what has been proposed; because plainly if any Senator should decide in his own mind that we have no power to enact this legislation, it would then be wholly immaterial to him whether the legislation itself would be wise or otherwise. Observing this proper and natural order, I shall first address myself to the law question involved, and I begin by laying down three legal propositions.

My first proposition is that—

The House of Representatives alone has the right to originate revenue bills; and neither the President alone nor the President and the Senate jointly possesses that power.

My second proposition is that—

The Constitution commits the treaty-making power of this Government to the President and the Senate; and the House of Representatives has no right to approve or to disapprove a treaty.

My third proposition is that—

The President and the Senate, acting in conjunction with the House of Representatives, can not validate an invalid law or treaty; and that what is null and void from the beginning must remain null and void to the end.

HOUSE MUST ORIGINATE.

Mr. President, in declaring that all revenue bills must originate in the House of Representatives I merely repeat the very language of the Constitution, and it follows as a corollary from that that neither the President alone nor the President and the Senate acting together can initiate such a measure. Until I heard the speech delivered in this Chamber by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] on the 8th day of the present month I did not suppose that it would be necessary for me to refer to the debates of the Constitutional Convention to establish either the meaning or the purpose of that provision. I had supposed that the history of that provision was familiar even to the school children of this country and that its importance was universally admitted until I heard the Senator from Minnesota dismiss it in these remarkable words:

Let me suggest, sir, that there is absolutely nothing in the provision found in Article I of the Constitution that measures for revenue must originate in the House that bears any relation to the great matter of government, which was the subject under consideration when these various provisions were framed and adopted. It is purely and simply an administrative matter. That power might just as well have been vested in the Senate as in the House of Representatives.

Against that statement of the Senator from Minnesota I oppose

the statement of Elbridge Gerry, who was a distinguished and influential member of the Constitutional Convention from the State of Massachusetts, and who in addressing that Convention on this very point used these words:

Taxation and representation are strongly associated in the minds of the people; and they will not agree that any but their immediate representatives shall meddle with their purses. In short, the acceptance of the plan will inevitably fail, if the Senate be not restrained from originating money bills.

The Senator from Minnesota can not have forgotten that direct and positive statement of Mr. Gerry, nor can he have forgotten that George Mason—in my opinion the ablest Virginian of his generation, with the exception of Mr. Jefferson alone—concluded a severe arraignment of the Senate with the emphatic declaration that the purse strings of the Government should remain in the hands of the representatives of the people. When the Senator from Minnesota tells us that this provision is a mere matter of administration, without importance, I tell him that this was one question upon which George Washington changed his vote in the Constitutional Convention. He had first voted with Blair and Madison against the exclusive right of the House to originate revenue bills, but afterwards changed his vote, joining Randolph and Mason in favor of that exclusive right, and assigning as the reason for his change that without that provision the Constitution might be rejected by the several States.

Mr. President, surely I do not need to call these illustrious witnesses to prove that this provision was one of the compromises which rendered the Constitution acceptable, first, to the Convention which framed it, and afterwards, to the several States which adopted it. In the beginning, sir, there was a great, and at one time it seemed an irreconcilable conflict of opinion as to the representation of the several States in Congress. The larger States contended for a proportional representation based on numbers, and the smaller States contended for an equal representation, based upon the idea of State sovereignty.

After long and earnest discussion it was finally determined to meet the demand of the smaller States in this body and of the larger States in the House of Representatives. Accordingly it was provided that the representation of each State in the Senate should be equal, and that the representation of every State in the House of Representatives should be according to its population. As is usual in all compromises, this arrangement did not fully satisfy either side, and the larger States were only induced to accept it when it was coupled with the provision that the right to originate revenue bills should be exclusively vested in the House, where the representation was based upon population.

I believe, with General Washington, that without that provision the Constitution under which we live could never have been adopted, and, for one, I shall not palter with it in any double sense. I shall keep it in its spirit as well as in its letter.

A BILL IN THE SENATE.

While the Senator from Minnesota is perhaps the only one who has ever been bold enough to waive aside this constitutional provision as of no importance, he is not the first who has sought to destroy its effect. Other Senators before him have been impatient under its restraint, and have sought to refine it away by argumentative subterfuges. Half a century ago a Senator of splendid ability and of exalted character professed to believe that while a bill increasing taxes must originate in the House of Representatives, a bill reducing them might properly emanate from this body. In accordance with that view, Senator McDuffie, of South Carolina, introduced his famous bill repealing the Whig tariff act of 1842 and restoring the compromise tariff act of 1833. That bill was referred to the Committee on Finance; and that committee reported these resolutions:

Resolved, That the bill entitled "A bill to revive the act of March 2, 1833, usually called 'the compromise act,' and to modify existing duties on foreign imports in conformity with its provisions," is a bill for raising revenue within the meaning of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution, and can not therefore originate in the Senate: Therefore,

Resolved, That it be indefinitely postponed.

This report was submitted to the Senate on the 9th day of January, 1844, and it was made a special order for January 11. Other business of the Senate, however, intervening, the debate upon it did not begin until the 18th day of January, and continued at intervals and with some acrimony until the 31st of May. Of course Senators will perceive that the resolutions themselves present only the naked question of jurisdiction; and the chairman of the Committee on Finance, in opening the debate, confined himself closely to that single question. But when Senator McDuffie addressed the Senate, he entered upon a general discussion of the tariff question, thus provoking an answer in kind from Senators who supported the protective policy.

Many Senators frankly avowed that they were more anxious for a test vote upon the tariff question than they were for a test vote upon the question of jurisdiction, and Senator McDuffie himself at the close of the debate, and almost immediately preceding the vote, declared that there could be no useful purpose served by

voting on the committee's resolutions, because, said he, "the question of jurisdiction is one which I have not argued at any length." So anxious were they for a test vote upon the main question of the tariff that Senator Allen proposed an amendment striking out all after the word "That" in the first resolution and inserting the words—

the duties imposed on importations by existing laws are unjust, and oppressive, and ought to be repealed.

On this amendment Senator Evans, of Maine, who was then chairman of the Committee on Finance, demanded the yeas and nays, and the roll call resulted in 18 affirmative and 26 negative votes, the division here occurring plainly upon the line of the general tariff policy of the two parties. It was expecting much of human nature to hope that immediately following such a pronounced partisan division party lines would be obliterated and that the vote on these resolutions would be taken upon their own merits. And yet, sir, the vote upon these resolutions, though following immediately the vote upon the tariff question, shows that thirty-three Senators voted for the resolutions, denying the jurisdiction of the Senate, while only four Senators voted against them. The four Senators who voted in the negative were the two Senators from South Carolina, one Senator from North Carolina, and one Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

Without intending in the least to impeach the sincerity of Senator McDuffie, I venture to say that no intelligent man can read the entire proceeding without becoming convinced that the South Carolina Senator himself did not believe in the jurisdiction of the Senate, and that his sole and only purpose was to precipitate a tariff debate and to secure a test vote on that question. But, sir, whatever may have been the object of Senator McDuffie, the fact remains that the Senate pronounced an almost unanimous judgment that the House of Representatives alone can originate a bill reducing taxes.

I have heard it asserted, however, that there is a distinction between a bill, as in the case I have recited, and a treaty like that which we now have before us. There may be, Mr. President, a distinction; indeed, I think it would be easy to show that there is a distinction, but the distinction is in favor of the bill, which is the act of the House of Representatives, the President, and the Senate, and against the treaty, which is the act of the President and the Senate alone. But, sir, instead of spending my time in showing that this distinction would strengthen rather than weaken our argument, I think I can employ it more profitably in directing the attention of the Senate to the fact that the question arose in another instance over a treaty when the decision was precisely the same.

A TREATY.

In 1843 the President of the United States negotiated what is commonly known as the "Zollverein commercial treaty," and transmitted it to the Senate for its ratification. That treaty was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and from that committee, on the 14th day of June, Senator Choate, of Massachusetts, submitted a report in which he states the case against the President's right and power to negotiate a treaty of this kind so much better than I could hope to state it that I shall ask the Secretary to read it.

I commend this report to the careful attention of all Senators, but I especially commend it to the attention of the Senators from Massachusetts. I do not need to remind them that Rufus Choate was not a strict-construction Democrat, who insisted upon the cold letter of the Constitution. He was a Whig, and a leader in the party which had elected the President who had negotiated this treaty and urged its ratification. But over and above his political affiliations he was a profound lawyer, whose learning and eloquence are still cherished by the Massachusetts bar, even if his advice is not followed by the Massachusetts Senators.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

[Executive Journal, 1841 to 1845, page 333.]

Mr. Choate also made the following report:

That the Senate ought not to advise and consent to the ratification of the convention aforesaid.

In submitting this report, the committee do not think it necessary to say anything on the general object sought to be accomplished by the convention, or on the details of the actual arrangement; nor to attempt to determine, by the weight and measure of the reciprocal concessions, which Government, if either, has the best of the transaction. These objects have not escaped their notice, but they propose to confine themselves to a very brief exhibition of another and single ground, upon which, without reference to the particular merits of the treaty, they advise against its ratification.

The committee, then, are not prepared to sanction so large an innovation upon ancient and uniform practice in respect of the department of Government by which duties on imports shall be imposed. The convention which has been submitted to the Senate changes duties which have been laid by law. It changes them either ex directo and by its own vigor, or it engages the faith of the nation and the faith of the legislature through which the nation acts to make the change. In either aspect it is the President and Senate who, by the instrumentality of negotiation, repeal or materially vary regulations of commerce and laws of revenue which Congress had ordained. More than this, the executive department, by the same instrumentality of

negotiations, places it beyond the power of Congress to exceed the stipulated maximum of import duties for at least three years, whatever exigency may intervene to require it.

In the judgment of the committee, the legislature is the department of government by which commerce should be regulated and laws of revenue be passed. The Constitution, in terms, communicates the power to regulate commerce and to impose duties to that department. It communicates it, in terms, to no other. Without engaging at all in an examination of the extent, limits, and objects of the power to make treaties, the committee believe that the general rule of our system is indisputably that the control of trade and the function of taxing belong, without abridgment or participation, to Congress.

They infer this from the language of the Constitution, from the nature and principles of our Government, from the theory of republican liberty itself, from the unvaried practice, evidencing the universal belief of all, in all periods and of all parties and opinions. They think, too, that as a general rule, the representatives of the people, sitting in their legislative capacity, with doors open, under the eye of the country, communicating freely with their constituents, may exercise this power more intelligently, more discreetly, may acquire more accurate and more minute information concerning the employments and the interests on which this description of measures will press, and may better discern what true policy prescribes and rejects, than is within the competence of the executive department of the Government.

To follow, not to lead; to fulfill, not to ordain the laws; to carry into effect by negotiation and compact with foreign governments the legislative will, when it has been announced, upon the great subjects of trade and revenue; not to interpose with controlling influence, not to go forward with too ambitious enterprise—these seem to the committee to be the appropriate functions of the Executive.

Holding this to be the general rule upon the subject, the committee discern nothing in the circumstances of this case, nothing in the object to be attained or in the difficulties in the way of obtaining it, which should induce a departure from the rule. If Congress think the proposed arrangement a beneficial one, it is quite easy to pass a law which shall impose the rates of duty contemplated by it, to take effect when satisfactory information is conveyed to the President that the stipulated equivalents are properly secured.

Upon this single ground, then, the committee advise that the treaty be rejected.

Mr. BAILEY. That is sufficient. The remainder of it relates merely to its advantage or disadvantage.

Mr. STEWART. Would it interrupt the Senator from Texas if I were to ask him a question here?

Mr. BAILEY. Not at all.

Mr. STEWART. As I understand, this is a House bill, and I should like—

Mr. BAILEY. A House bill for what?

Mr. STEWART. A House bill relating to the revenue.

Mr. BAILEY. This bill itself says it is a bill "to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902."

Mr. STEWART. That I understand; but it is a House bill for that purpose, and there must be power somewhere to originate bills to raise revenue, and I understand the Constitution vests that power in the House.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEWART. And the fact that this is a revenue bill, originating in the House, seems to me to constitute a very strong argument in favor of its validity when passed. Now, I should like to ask the Senator this question: If the pending bill should pass the Senate and be signed by the President, would it be a law?

Mr. BAILEY. He would be a rash Senator who will undertake to say what will be decided by the Supreme Court. I take it that it would be decided there very much as it will be decided here. But I will say to the Senator from Nevada that if the House had met this question exactly in accordance with the language of the treaty I have not the shadow of a doubt that the Supreme Court would have held it unconstitutional and void; and therefore, the House, though merely intending to ratify the treaty, inserts matter in the bill, so as to give the court an opportunity to sustain it.

But, Mr. President, let us deal with objects rather than with words which conceal objects. The Senator from Nevada knows, as I know, that the whole purpose of this bill is to approve the treaty; and the only reason that it was ever introduced was that the treaty requires Congress to approve it before it becomes effective. Whatever the form of the bill, the purpose and intent of it is not to raise revenue, but simply to ratify a treaty which the President has negotiated.

Mr. STEWART. Can the courts inquire into the purpose and effect of the bill when that purpose and that effect are unexpressed on the face of it?

Mr. BAILEY. They can not. Under that unfortunate—no; I withdraw that word. I think it a fortunate rule of construction, because I would not concede to the courts of this country the right to look into the hearts and minds of Senators and Representatives and determine what motive controlled them. Therefore I will say that under the sensible rule of construction long ago adopted and steadfastly adhered to by the courts they can not inquire what was in the hearts and minds of Senators. But Senators know; and the Senator from Nevada, when he votes for this bill, votes for it because he wants to ratify a treaty made by the President with the Government of Cuba.

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator will allow me, I do not think it was necessary to put in that clause. I myself believe that the

President and the Senate could have made this treaty without reference to the House. I have not time to argue that.

Mr. BAILEY. I had hoped that all of the other side would adopt that view.

Mr. SPOONER. Why?

Mr. BAILEY. Because I might then persuade all of this side to vote right. [Laughter.] The President of the United States, however, agrees with the Senator from Nevada, because when he negotiated this treaty there was not a syllable in it requiring it to wait upon the approval of Congress.

Mr. STEWART. He must be a pretty good lawyer, then.

Mr. BAILEY. I have never heard him described as a lawyer. The Senator from Nevada knows more about him than I do, but I think I know enough about him to know that while he has spent many days and nights in the pursuit of lighter literature he has never known the drudgery of the law; and more is the pity for his country.

The vote was taken on a motion to table the treaty, and resulted in 25 yeas against 18 nays. The debate, if any, occurred in executive session and has not been reported. It is therefore impossible to say how many of the eighteen who voted against the motion to table intended by their votes to assert the right of the President to negotiate such a treaty and how many simply intended to protest against that summary and somewhat discourteous manner of defeating it.

A SECOND REFERENCE.

But, Mr. President, this vote of the Senate did not end the matter. The President, who had negotiated that treaty, was still insistent, and in his annual message to Congress the following December renewed his recommendation, and the treaty was again referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. That committee again considered it, and again reached the same conclusion on the law. The report on the second reference was prepared by Senator Archer, of Virginia, who differed slightly with Senator Choate as to the commercial advantages of the treaty. Senator Choate in his report had said they were not a compensation. Senator Archer in his report said as a purely commercial arrangement it was a desirable one. But upon the legal questions involved he pays the great Massachusetts Senator the compliment of repeating his argument against the power assumed by the President, and concludes his report with the statement that however desirable as a commercial arrangement the treaty might be, the functions which it performed belonged to Congress in its legislative capacity and not to the treaty-making power. He repeated those magnificent words of Choate that upon these questions it was the President's duty—

to follow, not to lead; to fulfill, not to ordain the law; to carry into effect by negotiation and compact with foreign governments the legislative will when it has been announced upon the great subjects of trade and revenue; not to interpose with controlling influence; not to go forward with too ambitious enterprise; these seem to the committee to be the appropriate functions of the Executive.

THE HOUSE SOMEWHAT SENSITIVE.

The House itself is somewhat sensitive on this subject, and it has manifested its sensitiveness by incorporating into the body of this bill a proviso, which reads as follows:

That nothing herein contained shall be held or construed as an admission on the part of the House of Representatives that customs duties can be changed otherwise than by an act of Congress originating in said House.

Which, being interpreted, means that the House consents this time, but must not be understood as promising to consent the next time. This mild protest, Mr. President, is in striking contrast with the aggressive way in which the House has asserted and vindicated its prerogative on former occasions.

In 1835 the Senate added to the Post-Office appropriation bill an item increasing certain rates of postage and sent it to the House for concurrence in its amendment. The House by an overwhelming majority refused to consider that item, and sent it back to the Senate with the suggestion that such an amendment would not be tolerated.

In 1837 an extraordinary session had been convened to meet an emergency confronting the country. As one means of meeting that emergency the Senate passed a bill authorizing the issuance of Treasury notes and sent it to the House, where it was promptly referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and as promptly reported back to the House from that committee. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee moved that the House resolve itself in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union to consider that bill. The motion prevailed, and the House went into Committee of the Whole. It took up the Senate bill, but before any progress had been made more than one Member objected that it was a revenue bill and could not originate in the Senate. Mr. Wise moved that the committee should rise and report that objection to the House. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee protested, because there was the greatest possible anxiety to pass the bill with the least possible delay; but notwithstanding all of this the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee

was compelled to yield, and upon his own motion the Senate bill was left unconsidered and the House took up its own bill on the same subject and with the same provisions.

In 1871 the Senate passed a bill repealing the tax on incomes and sent it to the House. Immediately the House adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That Senate bill No. 1083, to repeal so much of the act approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to reduce internal taxes, and for other purposes," as continues the income tax after the 31st day of December, 1869, be returned to that body with the respectful suggestion on the part of the House that section 7 of Article I of the Constitution vests in the House of Representatives the sole power to originate such measures.

That resolution was communicated in a due and orderly course to the Senate. The Senate insisted upon its bill and asked for a conference, and a conference was agreed to by the House. I shall not now review that controversy, though it is a very interesting one, but I desire to read in this connection and in this presence one or two short extracts from speeches delivered in the House.

Mr. Garfield, then a Member of the House, declared:

I wish to say merely that the House has never, at any time, so far as I can find, when the matter was challenged or called up, surrendered the right claimed in the resolution now pending, and if any House should ever make such surrender I should look upon it as a dark day for the liberties of the country.

Another most interesting contribution to that discussion was made by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], then a leading Member of the House, as he is now a leading member of the Senate. The Senator from Iowa said:

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the House. I only desire to say that whether this question be settled by the analogies of the British constitution and the customs of the British Parliament or whether it be settled in view of the compromises which were made when our own Constitution was established, it seems to me clear that by the letter and the spirit of the Constitution all bills directly affecting the subject of taxation, whether for the imposition or the remission of taxes, shall originate in the House of Representatives.

The Senate, however, asserting in that case a power which, with practical unanimity, it had denied itself in 1844, refused to yield, leaving the bill die in conference.

At the very next session of Congress the question again arose. This time the House passed a bill repealing the duties on coffee and tea and sent it to the Senate for its action. The Senate concurred with sundry important amendments, some reducing and others abolishing duties, and returned the bill to the House with the request that the House should concur in the Senate amendments. In response to that action the House adopted certain resolutions. Without reading them, I will say that they were practically the same as the resolutions adopted by the House on the income-tax bill episode and declared that the amendments of the Senate were in conflict with the Constitution and in derogation of the privileges of the House. My own judgment is that in this latter case the House was wrong. It had sent a revenue bill here, and the Senate in pursuance of its power had amended it.

The resolution of the House was referred to the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, from which committee Senator Carpenter, a great lawyer, submitted a report on the 24th day of April. In that report, though he maintains that the Senate was right in that particular instance, he concedes as no longer open to argument that a bill either increasing or reducing taxes is within the constitutional provision and must originate in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BACON. In what Congress was that?

Mr. BAILEY. It was in the second session of the Forty-second Congress.

But, Mr. President, if neither the Senate nor the House had ever spoken on this question; if there were no debates to enlighten and no precedents to guide us, the Constitution itself is so plain that no man who honestly desires to understand its meaning and to obey its commands ought to be led astray.

The President of the United States himself, in the beginning of this controversy, recognized that the orderly and constitutional way to secure this relief for Cuba, if relief it be, was through a bill originating in the House of Representatives. Twice, sir, in messages to Congress—once by a general message and again by a special message—he urged Congress to make these concessions. In accordance with his recommendations a bill was introduced in the House, reported, and passed that body. True enough, it did not pass in a form exactly pleasing to the President and his advisers, but their objections were not so much against those features of it which related to Cuba as to another feature of it which affected a certain great and special interest in this country. That bill gave Cuba all which this treaty concedes, but having given something to the Cubans, it sought to give something to the people of the United States, and it was that which provoked the hostility of the President and his friends. The bill reduced the duty on raw sugar which the sugar trust imported, and having done that, it then abolished the differential duty, which is the peculiar protection of the sugar trust.

It seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, a singular circumstance that American statesmen should reject a bill relieving the Cuban people, for whose relief they had so earnestly implored us, simply because that bill also carried some small measure of relief for the American people. But, sir, rather than take the chance of passing that bill with the amendment abolishing the differential in favor of the sugar trust, the President and his friends abandoned concessions by law, left that bill to perish in a committee of the Senate, removed the whole question from the jurisdiction of the lawmaking power, and undertook to deal with it by a treaty—a gross violation of the Constitution and an insolent affront to both Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, if the House of Representatives consoles itself for the surrender of its power to originate revenue bills with an intangible assurance that revenue treaties can not become effective until approved by it, it will find when it is too late to rectify its error that it has exchanged a substantial power for one more elusive than a shadow. Under such a proceeding as this, sir, the House not only loses its right to originate revenue bills, but it is denied the poor privilege of amending them. In saying this I do not refer to any rule of the House by which it is alleged that the right of amendment has been abridged. That is a matter of procedure entirely for the House and is not a proper subject for comment or criticism here. But aside from the rules of the House and looking at it in a broader way, every thoughtful man must know that in time, and in all time, as at this time, if the House is to deal with revenue treaties at all it will be confined to the simple right of saying yes or no. In the nature of things this must be true.

If the House should exercise its independent judgment and incorporate in the bill approving a treaty a provision contrary to the treaty itself, it would defeat the treaty; and it does not need any long experience in legislative affairs to know what would happen under such circumstances. A treaty having been negotiated by a President elected by a certain party, ratified by a Senate, and sent to the House for its approval, would become a matter of moral and political coercion upon a House elected by the same party; and if any doubt exists in any mind what course would be followed, I point to this particular instance.

The imagination of man can not conceive an instance where the House can ever have a greater provocation to withhold its approval than in this very case. It had passed a bill embodying its best judgment and conceding to Cuba what Cuba prayed for, but accompanying that concession with other provisions which it deemed important. And yet, Mr. President, after the House had passed the bill, and while it was pending in the Senate, this strenuous President of ours walks, as it were, into the legislative Chamber, silences the consideration of a bill raising revenue, and takes the whole matter under his own control.

The House ought to have answered the President's demand for the approval of this treaty by substituting the bill which it passed by an overwhelming majority for the bill which the President has pressed upon them. Yet, strange to say, this body of accomplished, enlightened, and brave representatives of the people, foregoing the independent judgment which they had exercised two years ago, have done the President's will. They seem to have forgotten how he invaded their privileges, and with the stripes of the Executive lash still throbbing upon their backs they have meekly passed under the Presidential rod. If they will do so in this case, where is the man who expects them to do otherwise in any other case?

They have the right, I grant you, under this system to disapprove. But how long will that right be recognized, even if it were a substantial one for the House to exercise? The Senator from Nevada has just announced to the Senate that it is in no wise necessary to submit a revenue treaty to the approval of the House; and I concur in the view that if the President can make the treaty and the Senate can ratify it it need not be submitted to the House.

HOUSE CAN NOT APPROVE A TREATY.

Whence does the House derive the power to reject or ratify a treaty; or, if the expression please you better, whence does it derive the power to approve or to disapprove a treaty? The House has no power over treaties. I perfectly understand, Mr. President, that in the case of many treaties there must be legislative action on the part of Congress before the treaties can be executed. To illustrate, if the President were to negotiate and the Senate were to ratify a treaty with Great Britain agreeing to pay to that Government the sum of \$10,000,000 in satisfaction of such claims as British subjects had lodged with their Government against the United States, that stipulation could not be fully complied with until Congress had appropriated the \$10,000,000 to discharge the obligation. That, however, does not come from any right or power of the House over a treaty. It comes from that other and that wise provision of the Constitution—which perhaps may hereafter be disregarded by the treaty-making power—that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury except in consequence of appropriations made by law." It is in obedience to that prohibition

that it becomes necessary for the House to act before certain treaties can be executed.

But, sir, if the United States were to make the treaty with Great Britain which I have just described, and Congress should refuse to appropriate the money, that would be a circumstance affecting the execution and not the validity of the treaty. The treaty would remain a valid and binding obligation on the part of this Government, to be fulfilled when the House would agree to an appropriation of the money.

Alexander Hamilton considered the exclusion of the House from the treaty-making power one of the wisest provisions in the Constitution; and I desire to lay before the Senate an extract from the seventy-fourth number of the Federalist. Before reading it, however, I expressly disclaim any agreement with the opinion he expressed concerning the House of Representatives; though a few more performances like this may justify before the country the opinion which he entertained concerning that body. Here is what Mr. Hamilton says:

The remarks made in a former number, which has been alluded to in another part of this paper, will apply with conclusive force against the admission of the House of Representatives to a share in the formation of treaties. The fluctuating, and, taking its future increase into the account, the multitudinous composition of that body, forbid us to expect in it those qualities which are essential to the proper execution of such a trust. Accurate and comprehensive knowledge of foreign politics—

Among other things which he says the House was not expected to possess—

a steady and systematic adherence to the same views—

How thoroughly this change within two years justifies that!— a nice and uniform sensibility to national character—

I venture to say that the House of Representatives is not second to the Senate in a sensibility for national honor—

decision, secrecy, and dispatch, are incompatible with the genius of a body so variable and so numerous.

Alexander Hamilton italicizes the word "secrecy" as one of the essential attributes of the treaty-making power; but secrecy is incompatible with the proper regulation of tariff duties in this great Republic. I confess I have no very great respect for diplomacy or diplomats. Long ago I accepted Talleyrand's definition of a diplomat as one who has been sent abroad to lie for the benefit of his country; and I am not willing to permit the taxation of our people to be regulated by such in secret conference.

There are, there have been, and there always will be national and international concerns which must be adjusted by men trained in the diplomacy of the world; but the levy of taxation does not belong to that class of questions. As a rule diplomats know more about social functions than they do about the justice of taxation; and they are more responsive to special interests than are the representatives of the people. I shall never consent that a body which sits behind closed doors shall determine what burdens are to be levied upon the consumption and the commerce of this Republic. Yet, Mr. President, that is precisely what we are asked to do when we are asked to sanction a treaty regulating our tariff duties.

WHAT IS THE OBJECT?

Mr. President, why shall the Constitution be set aside? Why shall the House be stripped, even with its own consent, of its ancient and valuable privilege? What useful and beneficent purpose is to be accomplished? If some imminent peril hung suspended over the Republic or if some great calamity had fallen upon our people, then I could understand that both Representatives and Senators in their eagerness to avert the one or to alleviate the other might not be too technical in their distinctions. But, sir, the Constitution is to be set aside, the House is to be shorn of its privilege, the Senate is to divide its authority in ratifying treaties, and all to accomplish a mere trade arrangement of no great consequence to anybody.

Of course, I am not ignorant of the fact that in the beginning the motive behind this legislation was not admitted to be a trade advantage. I am aware that in the beginning it was said that Cuba was suffering—starving—and that nothing but a freer admission of her products to the markets of this country could rescue her merchants and farmers from hopeless bankruptcy. From every quarter we were assailed with this false pretense. The President of the United States himself, without assuming entire responsibility for a description like that, communicated to Congress a message in which he declares that he had received from the American representative in Cuba a dispatch communicating an earnest appeal from President Palma, pleading that the legislation should be speedily passed to save his country from financial ruin.

General Wood, who, in addition to his other duties, titles, and promotions there, was the captain-general of this agitation, has himself declared in a magazine article that the most distressing conditions existed in Cuba. They sent committees to Congress and telegrams to all the generous of the land. In the pulpit,

through the press, and with every agency that could influence public sentiment, the effort was made to arouse public sympathy for Cuba and public indignation against the few of us who could not be clamored out of our convictions. Pictures of suffering, of helplessness, of bankruptcy were set before the public eye at every turn, and they were urged to despise the American who was so hard of heart that he would not respond to these touching appeals.

They wrought upon a sympathetic public until that public did demand the passage of a law. With the adjournment of Congress and with the investigation of the question, however, there came a clear understanding. Men representing Cuba were compelled to admit that the picture had been overdrawn. The truth was extracted from unwilling witnesses upon the stand by the committee of the Senate having charge of the investigation.

Then when this spasm of emotional benevolence had passed, when the paid attorneys of special interests could no longer deceive an overcredulous American people, they abandoned that argument. Up to that time they had said that this bill was a kindly office which, in charity, we owed the Cubans. Driven from that, they now proclaim it a commercial opportunity which, in avarice, we ought to embrace for our own advantage.

SUGAR TRUST THE BENEFICIARY.

I had some patience with the plea of charity, though I knew it to be ill founded in fact; but I have none with this plea of commerce, because I know the advantage falls where it is not deserved. We aver that the benefit of these concessions goes to the sugar and tobacco trusts of this country. Our friends on the other side say that it does not, and I allow them credit for all sincerity in saying it. My own judgment is that there is no difference between the two sides of this Chamber as a matter of honesty. I concede that they are as honest in saying that the benefit of this bill will inure to the Cuban farmer as I am in saying that it will inure to the tobacco and sugar trusts. Let the country decide between us upon the facts.

First, Mr. President, let us understand that almost the entire importation from Cuba into this country consists of sugar and tobacco. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who has charge of this bill, says that by its provisions the United States will lose \$6,000,000 annually in revenue. My own opinion is that the loss will be nearer \$8,000,000; but in order to avoid obscuring the issue by an argument over the details let us admit it to be only \$6,000,000. We know the Government loses that much. That is admitted on all sides. The disputed question is, Where does it go—into the coffers of the sugar and tobacco trusts, as we assert, or into the pockets of the Cuban farmers, as our adversaries declare? I believe I can conclusively prove that it goes into the pockets of the tobacco trust and the sugar trust, but I know that if I fail to prove that, I can prove that there is no justice in giving it to those whom our adversaries claim will receive it.

Mr. President, while the treaty reduces the duty on all forms of sugar, refined as well as raw, it is a matter of common knowledge that we import no refined sugar from Cuba, and therefore the reduction is entirely upon raw sugar. Who uses the raw sugar which is imported into this country from Cuba? There is but one answer; I almost offend the intelligence of the Senate by declaring what is so thoroughly known to everybody—that raw sugar is not the form in which the public consumes it, and that the sugar trust is practically the only buyer for it. Therefore, if you reduce or abolish the duty on Cuban sugar it is a reduction or an abolition in effect purely and only for the benefit of the sugar trust.

I maintain the old Democratic doctrine that the consumer pays the tax on every imported article, though I know that our Republican friends declare that the tariff is a tax which the foreigner pays for the privilege of trading in our markets. There is some difference among them upon that statement of their position, as there is an occasional difference among us as to our position. But the position, almost unchallenged, of the Democratic party is that the consumer pays the tax. If so, then, as the sugar trust is the consumer of raw sugar, the sugar trust must pay the tax. If the sugar trust pays the tax on the sugar when imported, does it not follow, as certainly as the night follows the day, that when you reduce the tax on raw sugar you relieve the sugar trust to that extent?

Every manufacturer in this land understands that when you levy a tax on his raw material you levy a tax upon his enterprise. Why does the shoe manufacturer in New England want the duty taken off of hides? Simply in order that he may reduce the manufacturing cost of his shoes, and in furtherance of that object the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has introduced in this body a bill to place hides on the free list. The Senator from Massachusetts desires to repeal the duty on hides in order to reduce the manufacturing cost of shoes, so that the shoe manufacturers of his State can compete for the shoe trade in the markets of the world. The Republican party perfectly understands this and acts upon it. When it lays a duty on wool which the woolen

manufacturer must import for use in his factory, it lays at the same time what they call a compensatory duty on woolen goods, the very purpose of which is to enable the woolen manufacturer to collect from the people who buy his woolen goods what he has paid to the Government on the importation of his wool.

A school of thought in the Democratic party, which was potent a few years ago, but which I think has passed forever, maintained the absurd doctrine that manufacturers ought to have their raw material admitted free of duty. And what was their argument? It was that if you will remove the duty from the manufacturers' raw material he can produce his goods at such a reduced cost that he can then take them into the markets of the world and conquer its trade. A very alluring kind of argument, I grant you; but when you come to analyze it it is worse than the Republican doctrine of protection, because the Republican doctrine does require everybody to pay something, and this Democratic doctrine of free raw material requires everybody except the manufacturer to contribute toward the support of the Government. The sole and only argument that ran through that free raw-material crusade in the Democratic party was that by removing the tariff from raw materials we would thus reduce the manufacturer's cost of his finished product. Now apply it. Reduce the tariff on raw sugar and you thus reduce the taxation which the sugar trust pays to the Government for the privilege of importing its raw material; and the difference between the cost of raw sugar now and the cost of raw sugar when the treaty becomes effective will go to the sugar trust.

The sugar trust knows perfectly well that it is to be the beneficiary of this legislation. Mr. Thurber testified unwillingly before a committee of the Senate that the president of the sugar trust had contributed \$3,500 toward that campaign of enlightenment, which they conducted partly with the money of Cuba, partly with the money of the United States, and partly with the contributions of the sugar trust. Does anybody believe that the American sugar trust is an eleemosynary institution? Does anybody believe that it gives the money which under the tariff differential it wrings from the labor of this land for the purpose of enlightening "leaders of thought?"

I have no complaint to make against the president of the sugar trust because he attempts by law to increase the profits of his business; nearly everybody else in this land is trying to do the same thing, but it is our duty to see that no man does it to the injury of the American people. Not only does the sugar trust understand that this legislation is in their interest, as was evidenced by their contribution, but that they understand it is also indicated by the fluctuations in their stock.

Mr. President, I do not mean to say that it is a conclusive argument that a law will benefit a certain corporation because the stock of that corporation rises in anticipation of that law. Men who gamble in stocks—and I use that word advisedly, for it is gambling pure and simple, and the greatest gambling hall in all this land is the white marble building in New York, which they call the stock exchange, where financial fakirs revel and speculate in the products and properties of industrious and enterprising people—are not always wise, but those who congregate there generally know their business. What has been the course of this sugar stock? Every time this bill is about to pass that stock goes up, and every time it is about to fail that stock goes down. When this Congress convened the price of that stock was around 110. Since then the sugar trust has paid a dividend, and yet with that dividend paid out of its earnings that stock is above 123. At a time when other great industrial stocks were falling in price and could find no buyers, this particular stock was steadily advancing, because it was believed by the buying public that the sugar trust would be largely benefited by this bill.

The Senator from Colorado handed me yesterday a circular advertisement by one of these stock brokers advising his customers to buy sugar stock, and it concludes in this wise:

With the additional benefits to be derived from this Cuban reciprocity bill and the sugar company's large accumulations of the best sugar lands in that territory, we can see no reason why the future course of the stock should not be toward a much higher range of prices, and we regard it as not an impossible thing for it to follow in the footsteps of the late deal in American Tobacco, which paid 100 per cent stock dividend after selling up to \$235, and even after its dividend again advanced to a new high record. We strongly advise the purchase of American Sugar common on any and all reactions.

Six million dollars from the Treasury of the United States into the overflowing coffers of the sugar trust and the tobacco trust, the stock of one having already risen above 200 cents on the dollar and the stock of the other promising soon to follow it. Yet, Mr. President, we are asked, first in the name of charity to the Cuban people and next in the name of our own commerce, to give this \$6,000,000 to enrich those who have stifled competition and driven their competitors into bankruptcy and despair.

But, Mr. President, I must not dwell too long upon this line of thought, because I desire to examine the claim of those who advocate the bill that its benefactions will go to the Cuban planters. Let us suppose that the \$6,000,000 which this Government

is to remit in taxes will go into the pockets of Cuban sugar planters and tobacco growers.

A BOUNTY TO CUBA.

Do they need it? There was a time when undoubtedly great distress prevailed in Cuba owing to the abnormally low price of sugar, and that was the ground upon which, when this bill was first reported to the House of Representatives, its passage was justified. The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of that body declared:

The provisions of the bill have been limited to the crop of this year and the next because of the recent action of the Brussels conference. This, it is expected, will end the bounty system on exported beet sugar on the 1st day of September, 1903. When this export bounty is removed sugar will return to its normal price. With this advance the Cuban planter would reap a profit of more than 50 per cent upon the cost of his crop, and tariff concessions on our part in that event will not be longer needed.

The payment of bounties on export sugar was discontinued by the governments represented in the Brussels conference after September 1, 1903, and sugar returned to a price of profitable production in Cuba. The cane lands of that island produce from 18 to 30 tons of cane to the acre—

Mr. FOSTER of Louisiana. They produce from 25 to 40 tons per acre.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Louisiana, who is incomparably more familiar with this subject than I am, says that those lands produce from 25 to 40 tons per acre. I have chosen to take the lowest estimate I have heard from anyone, and this makes an average production of 24 tons of cane to the acre. That cane produces over 220 pounds of sugar to the ton. Thus, the average acre of Cuban cane land produces over 5,280 pounds of sugar, which will sell in ordinary times for more than \$125.

Be it remembered that the lands are cheap and that the labor necessary in the cultivation of a cane crop is limited. A crop grown upon cheap land, which needs only to be planted once in nine years, and which, with moderate cultivation, will produce a revenue of over \$100 an acre, is not an industry that calls for a gift from the Treasury of the United States. Sir, the concession in this bill alone of 33 cents on every hundred pounds of sugar means a gift of \$18 per acre from the Government of the United States for every acre of Cuban land devoted to the production of sugar.

I well remember that when a Republican Congress incorporated in its tariff law a bounty to the sugar growers of our own country all Democrats denounced it, and properly so, as both unjust and unconstitutional. At that time the State of Texas was utilizing some portion of its unfortunate citizens, who had come there from other States and been sent to the penitentiary for their crimes, in the production of sugar. The legislature passed a bill authorizing our officers to receive the money due to the State as bounty upon the sugar which we had produced; but our governor was wise enough and brave enough to veto the legislature's bill, and declared that the taint of such a dollar should never touch the treasury of Texas. That money was left in the Treasury of the United States; it has never been and never will be accepted by our State. And yet some Senators who here and elsewhere have denounced a bounty to American farmers are freely giving it to Cuban planters. Eighteen dollars an acre to people whose acres average three times as much as American farmers realize from their cotton or their grain lands!

THE TOBACCO TRUST ALSO PROFITS.

What is true of sugar is equally true of tobacco. As the American sugar trust is practically the only customer Cuba has for her sugar, so the American tobacco trust is practically her only customer for tobacco. Until within the last two years or less the cigar trade of Cuba was practically controlled by two corporations, an American and an English corporation, the English corporation at one time controlling about 60 per cent and the American corporation controlling about 40 per cent. Finally these two corporations, realizing that combination was more profitable than competition, combined, and I will ask the Secretary to read a statement in reference to the tobacco trade from a Government publication entitled "Commercial Cuba in 1903."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETTUS in the chair). In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Nearly three years ago the Henry Clay and the Bock & Co., large cigar manufacturing concerns, effected a consolidation of interests and bought up a number of other factories. The capital was English. American capital, some \$6,000,000 in amount, sought a similar consolidation through an organization known as the Habana Commercial Company. This absorbed a large number of the factories which had not been taken in by the Henry Clay-Bock combination. Both of these organizations paid very high prices for the concerns which they purchased. During the month of May last (1902) there was incorporated under the laws of New Jersey a combination known as the Habana Tobacco Company. It is a branch of the so-called "Tobacco Trust," and its capitalization provides for \$30,000,000 of common stock, \$5,000,000 of preferred stock, and \$10,000,000 in bonds. This organization takes over the Henry Clay-Bock combination, the Habana Commercial Company, and the Cabanas factory, thus giving it control of much the greater part, and practically all of the important part, of the Cuban cigar and cigarette trade.

Mr. BAILEY. Thus, Mr. President, we have, upon the authority of a Government publication, the statement that this combination now controls "practically all of the important part of the Cuban cigar and cigarette trade." That this is true has not been and can not be successfully denied, and yet under the provisions of this bill the reduction upon Cuban cigars will be more than \$12 per thousand. Even if that \$12 a thousand went to the Americans who smoke cigars I should resist the reduction, because the American who smokes a Habana cigar is amply able to pay high taxes to the Government, and the cheaper cigars which men of moderate means and men of narrow circumstances are compelled to smoke do not come from Cuba, and therefore could not be affected by this reduction.

Twelve dollars and a half is what this bill concedes to the importers of Cuban cigars in this country, and those importers, a gigantic trust, controlling, according to the testimony of a Government publication, practically our entire importation. Within the last month it has been well-nigh impossible to buy Cuban cigars in any quantities in New York, because the men who control their importation have been waiting for the passage of this bill. If the benefit was going to the Cubans and if the importers were going to pay the Cubans as much after the bill passes as before, there would have been no good business reason for waiting. But those importers are wiser than Senators in Congress; and I will digress far enough to say that it is no reflection upon a Senator to say that in matters of trade the trader is his superior. Those cigar dealers know that they will get the benefit of this reduction, and they have simply desisted from the importation of Cuban cigars until the duty on them has been reduced, so that the twelve dollars and a half per thousand will go to increase their already enormous profits.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST LABOR.

But while the reduction on the cigars will be \$12.50 per thousand, the Republican tariff law, which this treaty seeks to amend, is so constructed that the reduction will be less than a dollar and a half upon a quantity of tobacco sufficient to make a thousand cigars. Our Republican friends have long misled American laborers into the belief that protection is of the most supreme importance to them, and I am not willing to charge that the Republican leaders have been insincere in this statement. I am willing to grant that they have been sincere in saying it, however mistaken they may have been in thinking it. But I shall have a right hereafter to doubt them if they refuse now to follow their argument. Under your tariff policy you have built up a cigar-manufacturing business in certain cities, although you have built it up by compelling the people who smoke cigars to contribute, by larger prices, to the laborers who have made them. That, however, was a contribution from the American citizen who smokes to the American citizen who works, and did not seem a gross and irreparable hardship. But here and now you have falsified your constant profession and your former practice by reducing the duty on the material to be used by the American laborer, less one-tenth of the reduction which you make upon the product of the laborers of another country.

Mr. President, I will ask the Secretary to read resolutions adopted by a cigar makers' union in the city of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas the Cuban reciprocity bill now before the Senate proposes a reduction of the duty on cigars amounting to \$12.50 per thousand, while the duty on the amount of tobacco sufficient to make a thousand cigars is to be reduced only \$1.05, which means a decrease of \$11.35 in the protection now afforded to American labor; and

Whereas this measure which has just passed the House of Representatives discriminates in favor of the tobacco trust while it threatens the working wages of 100,000 men and women employed in the cigar industry in the United States; be it

Resolved, That the Central Federated Union of New York, representing 200,000 organized working men and women, protest against this measure as a piece of rank trust legislation aimed at the living of the 500,000 people who depend upon the cigar-making industry of this country, and we demand of the Senate of the United States the rejection of that part of the Cuban reciprocity bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent immediately to the United States Senate and to the President of the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. In verifying the statements of those resolutions I did not find my calculations to agree exactly with the figures given there. Those resolutions state the reduction as only \$1.05, while I made it, as I now recall, something like \$1.25. But the fact remains that at worst or, if you prefer the expression, at best the reduction on the product finished by Cuban labor is more than ten times as great as the reduction on the material to be used by American labor, and that, too, by a party which iterates and reiterates that it advocates and maintains a protective tariff in the interest of the American workingman. I do not believe that there is a Republican in this Senate who, if confronted with the

naked proposition of reducing the duty on a raw material to be used by American labor one-tenth of what he was asked to reduce the duty on the finished product made by the labor of another country, would support it. But when it is put forward by the President and covered up by soft phrases, they support it without the least remonstrance.

I can not comprehend how any sincere friend of American labor can vote to reduce the duty on a product made by the laborers of other countries by a greater per cent than he would reduce the duty on the material out of which American laborers can produce the same article. That, Mr. President, is precisely what this bill does; and I have wondered if those who negotiated it understood its effect. If, however, you excuse this rank injustice against the labor of the country upon the score of ignorance, you make an unanswerable objection to the regulation of tariff duties in the secrecy of diplomatic correspondence by those who know more about the fashions of the rich than they do about the interests of the poor.

These two articles, tobacco and sugar, comprise substantially the entire Cuban commerce into this country, and I repeat that in respect to them the concession is all to the manufacturer and none to the people. It is not even pretended that the remission of the duty on raw sugar will reduce the price of refined sugar; but, on the contrary, the admission that it would not has been distinctly made. Indeed, our friends on the other side could not consistently claim that it would reduce the price of sugar to the consumers of this country, because that argument would refute their other argument that the benefit is going to the people of Cuba; and they have at least maintained their consistency by admitting that this reduction enures in no wise to the benefit of the American sugar consumer.

JEFFERSON'S RECIPROCITY.

Mr. President, I have heard it declared in this Chamber—and it has also been declared elsewhere—that Thomas Jefferson was the first apostle of reciprocity, and under the authority of his great name all Democrats have been commanded to support this legislation. But, sir, I affirm that in all the voluminous writings of that immortal Democrat there is not a line which, when read in connection with its context and properly understood, can justify that claim. The quotation which has been relied on to prove that Mr. Jefferson was an advocate of reciprocity is taken from his famous report upon the restrictions on American commerce and navigation made in response to a resolution of the House of Representatives asking the Secretary of State for certain information. After detailing at some length the restrictions upon our commerce and navigation, Mr. Jefferson says:

Such being the restrictions on the commerce and navigation of the United States, the question is in what way they may be best removed, or modified, or counteracted. As to commerce, two methods occur: 1. By friendly arrangement with the several nations with whom these restrictions exist. 2. By the separate act of our own legislatures for countervailing their effect.

Before reading from the argument of Mr. Jefferson enforcing his suggestion that a friendly arrangement is better than countervailing restrictions—a view in which Democrats will universally concur—I beg the Senate to remember that no unfriendly regulation against our commerce now exists in Cuba, and therefore this is not a situation where either Mr. Jefferson's suggestion of a friendly arrangement or of countervailing restrictions can apply. After stating the two methods by which restrictions on our commerce might be removed, modified, or counteracted, Mr. Jefferson advances what is in reality an argument for freer trade with all nations; or, where that is unobtainable, freer trade with any nation willing to enter into such an agreement. He says:

Instead of embarrassing commerce under piles of regulating laws, duties, and prohibitions, could it be relieved from all its shackles in all parts of the world, could every country be employed in producing that which nature has best fitted it to produce, and each be free to exchange with others mutual surpluses for mutual wants, the greatest mass possible would then be produced of those things which contribute to human life and human happiness; the numbers of mankind would be increased, and their condition bettered.

Would even a single nation begin with the United States this system of free commerce, it would be advisable to begin it with that nation, since it is one by one only that it can be extended to all. When the circumstances of either party render it expedient to levy a revenue, by way of impost, on commerce, its freedom might be modified, in that particular, by mutual and equivalent measures, preserving it entire in all others.

Mr. Jefferson lays down for our guidance in dealing with these restrictions this rule:

Where a nation imposes a high duty on our products it may be proper for us to do the same by theirs, first burdening or excluding those productions which they bring here in competition with our own of the same kind.

Mr. President, if any advocate of this bill can show me that Cuba has restricted or prohibited the importation of our products, then, sir, I will cheerfully join with him in following the advice of Thomas Jefferson first to affect a friendly arrangement, or failing in that better way of relieving our commerce, I will then agree to meet restriction with restriction and prohibition with prohibition. But, sir, so far from it being true that Cuba now

discriminates against our commerce by high duties, the contrary is the fact; and instead of attempting to secure by this treaty an equality of trading privileges, we are discriminating in favor of Cuba here and are contracting for Cuban discrimination in our favor there—the very conduct which Mr. Jefferson has said would justify retaliation on our part against other nations, and which must therefore justify other nations in retaliating against us.

No friend of this bill has given as his reason for supporting it that Cuba's duties against our imports are too high; and it is a matter of common knowledge, sir, that they are now lower than the rates imposed by our own law. It is not pretended that the purpose of this bill is to reduce Cuban duties against our imports, and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, with a candor which does him credit, has said in his speech to the Senate that the passage of this bill will compel the Cuban Government to increase its tariff duties. He said in opening this debate:

But there are a number of causes why Cuba's revenue concessions are so small and ours so large. In the first place her tariff is very much lower than ours. In fact, as soon as this treaty goes into effect she must raise her tariff on a great many articles, of course the United States retaining our 20 to 40 per cent lower rates of duty than any other nation in the world. Illustrating the difference in the two tariffs, our average ad valorem duty on Cuban products amounts to over 84 per cent. Cuba's average ad valorem duty on American products amounts to but 30 per cent.

Wonderful forbearance! We concede 20 per cent; we require Cuba to concede from 25 to 40 per cent; and yet the amiable chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations describes our concessions of 20 per cent as "so large" and Cuba's concessions of 25 to 40 per cent as "so small."

DEMOCRACY AND RECIPROCITY.

But, Mr. President, I have been told that even if Mr. Jefferson did not advocate reciprocity except under certain conditions which do not exist in this case, it is nevertheless true that reciprocity must be a Democratic doctrine, because it tends to freer trade. That statement has been repeated so often and with such emphasis that some men have accepted it as a traditional Democratic tenet, and there is serious danger that our party may be placed in a false position on this question. I desire for one moment only—because one moment will suffice—to reason with my Democratic associates upon this proposition; and I believe that a due reflection upon it will satisfy all of them that it is a mistake for anybody to contend that reciprocity is necessarily a Democratic policy.

I can easily conceive circumstances under which a Democrat might feel it to be his duty to vote for a bill originating in the House of Representatives, and mitigating the injustice of a protective tariff by providing for reciprocal exchanges on a basis of freer trade. But, sir, with an ideal Democratic tariff law upon our statute books I can not conceive a state of circumstances under which I could vote for a reciprocity bill. What I mean by that is this: An ideal Democratic tariff law would be one in which every duty was fixed at the lowest rate consistent with the revenue necessities of the Government, and under such a law how could a Democratic Congress find it possible to make concessions to any nation? With every duty fixed at the lowest rate consistent with the needs of the Government, if Congress should pass a bill reducing some of those duties, it would be compelled to pass a second bill increasing others, and thus the harmony of the whole system would be disturbed, its equality would be destroyed, and inequality would be introduced. Those who imported some articles would be permitted to pay less than their just rate of taxation, while those who imported other articles would be compelled to pay more than their just rate.

Mr. President, while a reciprocity bill can have no place under an orthodox Democratic tariff system, if this were a bill reducing the duty on Cuban imports into this country in return for a reduction of Cuban duties on our imports into that country, I might cordially support it as an improvement upon the existing law. But, sir, that is not the proposition with which we have been called upon to deal. Instead of reciprocating freer trade with freer trade, this is a bill to reciprocate protection with protection. It concedes 20 per cent of our protection against Cuban products in this country, in order to secure a protection of 40 per cent for our products in that country; and all that can be predicated of it with any certainty now is that whether the duties against our products hereafter shall be higher or lower than they were before this bill becomes effective, they shall still be lower than the duties levied against the similar products of other nations. Willing as I might be to vote for a bill exchanging freer trade with Cuba, I can not vote to exchange protection with them and still call myself an advocate of freer trade.

Senators have spoken of this bill as lowering our tariff wall, but they have not spoken accurately. It does not lower our tariff wall the breadth of a single hair except at the one point where Cuban goods are admitted. At that place it may be fairly said

that we take off a single brick, and leaving out for the moment the discrimination against other nations, it might be claimed with some fair show of reason that this is desirable as far as it goes. But, sir, the whole prepossession of a Democrat in favor of it disappears when he learns by an examination of the treaty that in taking down a single brick at a single place in the tariff wall of this country we are adding two bricks to every inch of the tariff wall with which Cuba is surrounding herself. In other words, Mr. President, we are simply reducing our protection at a single point here in order to obtain a greater protection at all points over there. It is not an exchange of freer trade; it is an exchange of protection; and while I would cheerfully exchange protection for freer trade, I will not exchange a small protection for a greater one.

Some of the more enthusiastic supporters of this policy seem to think that they have sufficiently answered all that has been said, and all that can be said, on this subject when they claim with a sort of mysterious air that in voting against this bill we are voting to continue the rates of the Dingley Act. That, sir, does not deserve to be dignified by the name of an argument. The Republican party could propose many bills reducing the high rates of the present Republican tariff law which I would deem it my duty to oppose. If, sir, the Republican majority in the House of Representatives should send us a bill reducing the present Republican tariff upon silks and champagne would any Democratic Senator feel constrained to support that bill because it makes a reduction in the duties levied by the Dingley Act? If we were asked to vote for a bill reducing the duty on hides without any reduction in the duty on shoes and other leather products, what answer would the Democrats of the Senate make to that proposition? Mr. President, it underestimates the intelligence and patriotism of a Democrat to tell him that he must vote for any bill amending a Republican tariff law without reference to its constitutionality or its justice.

THIS BILL ESSENTIALLY PROTECTIVE.

Mr. President, the human mind could not contrive a measure more essentially protective than the one before us. It is the essence of protection, applying that hurtful doctrine of commercial restriction at once to Cuba and to the United States. I have here the treaty, and I desire to call attention to some of its provisions. In the eighth article we find this stipulation:

The rates of duty herein granted by the United States to the Republic of Cuba are and shall continue during the term of this convention preferential in respect to all like imports from other countries, and in return for said preferential rates of duty granted to the Republic of Cuba by the United States it is agreed that the concession herein granted on the part of the said Republic of Cuba to the products of the United States shall likewise be, and shall continue, during the term of this convention, preferential in respect to all like imports from other countries.

A preferential duty is, as its very name implies, a protective duty; and this treaty itself speaks of it as a protection in article 10 when it declares:

The protection herein granted to the products and manufactures of the United States, etc.

Yet I am told that an agreement stipulating for preferential duties, and described in the words of the agreement itself as a protection, must be in line with our Democratic advocacy of freer trade. Democratic Senators, I put it to you, if you vote for a bill to protect American manufacturers in Cuba how can you consistently denounce a bill that protects American manufacturers in our own country? I am aware that in one case the extortion is practiced against our own people while in the other case it is practiced against the Cubans, but that is only a different application of it and not a different principle. If protection is an economic fallacy in the United States it is an economic fallacy in Cuba, and you have no right to mar the record of the Democratic party by voting for a bill to apply the doctrine of protection to a helpless and neighboring people, thus provoking other countries to apply it to us and our products.

For years Democratic statesmen have warned our friends on the other side and have warned the commercial interests of this country that our own protective tariff was breeding a spirit of retaliation in the minds of other nations. Our warnings have not been heeded, but they are being justified. Already some great nations have discriminated against some of our products, and others are contemplating such action, and in the face of it all we are now asked to add another and a stronger provocation to those already on our statute books.

The mere fact that we have levied taxes for the purpose of excluding the citizens of other nations from trading in our markets is of itself a strong and constant temptation for them to levy duties intended to prevent our citizens from trading in their markets. We have even gone beyond that point, and against those articles from nations which seek to stimulate their commerce by export bounties we have levied a countervailing import duty equal to their export bounty, and this is especially applied

to sugar. Not content with giving our Cuban customers the advantage of this countervailing duty in addition to their cheaper carriage charges, we are now urged to further supplement those advantages as against our German friends and customers by giving Cuba a preferential reduction of 20 per cent on her sugar. Hereafter, and when this bill becomes a law, the German who comes to exchange his sugar for our shoes will be told at the custom-house that he must pay 20 per cent more for the privilege of bringing his sugar into our markets than his Cuban competitor pays. Can it be a matter of just surprise if German self-respect, combined with German interest, resents this discrimination against their country? If it should happen that German statesmen answer our discrimination against their sugar by a like discrimination against our meat products, what explanation will Senators offer to their complaining constituents? Mr. President, in commercial affairs neither nations nor individuals receive good for evil. They generally, and very justly, receive according as they give.

What a spectacle do we present to the world in demanding an open door in the Orient for our trade when we are striving to close every door in the Western Hemisphere? If we negotiate treaties to keep other people from trading with this New World, how shall we complain if the Old World applies to us among them the same rule which we have applied to them amongst us? Reciprocity of the right kind might lead to better conditions than the present protective tariff, but a reciprocity which stipulates for discriminating and preferential duties is protection run mad, and a Democrat who supports it stultifies his party and himself.

Mr. President, these grave offenses against the principles of sound government and of the Democratic party are condoned in order that Democratic Senators may say to their constituents that they have made a new market for cotton cloth, for cattle, for flour, and for wheat. Of course there are other articles upon which the tariff is reduced. The first reductions are in Schedule A; and it reduces the tariff on whiskies and brandies. Oh, charitable benefaction! An inexperienced and struggling people engaged in the painful and difficult task of establishing their self-government must have their cheaper whisky and cheaper brandy! It is fit that they shall also have the cheaper sugar to sweeten it!

I hope Senators from our Southern States will analyze the benefits of this bill to their people. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] says that as to two of the only three agricultural products which will find a market in Cuba we do not need any concession. Describing the reductions article by article and line by line, that Senator says:

Flour of wheat. We supply the entire Cuban market, amounting to \$2,231,000. We supply also her entire import of corn, amounting to a million dollars.

So far as obtaining a greater part of the Cuban market in flour and corn is concerned, it was unnecessary to have any concession at all; but this 30 per cent concession will go into the pockets of our millers.

Giving up the revenues of the Government in order to put 30 per cent of Cuban tariff duties in the pockets of our millers; and yet I am told that that is in accord with Democratic policy. The Senator further says:

Cuba gives us a 40 per cent concession on rice.

The Senator must know that the United States to-day does not produce enough rice for its own consumption, and is compelled to import large quantities to meet the demands of our own people. I believe, and I confidently hope, that the time will come when the marshes and lowlands of Texas and Louisiana will become great rice fields; but that time has not come, and it will not come within the five years during which this convention is to last, and consequently the Cuban concession on rice is of no importance.

The expectation is, and they lay great stress upon it, that Cuba will afford a market for certain cotton goods produced by our Southern cotton mills. I am myself inclined to believe that we can increase our trade with Cuba in that respect. I believe that for a time at least that trade may grow, but while the cotton manufacturer is reaping some small profit from the Cuban trade we are stimulating in Cuba a competitor against the Southern cotton farmer. Those who imagine that the cotton-cloth trade with Cuba is the only Southern interest or injury involved in this legislation know little about the agricultural possibilities of that island. Again referring to this Government publication entitled "Commercial Cuba in 1903," I beg especially the Senators from Southern States to hear this:

Cotton is a plant indigenous to Cuba, but it has not been cultivated there to any great extent. It is claimed that the conditions are most favorable for its production on a large scale in the island, and in some quarters the inception of an important Cuban cotton interest is being seriously canvassed. In fact, during the present season a successful yield of several thousand bales of sea-island cotton has been secured in Puerto Principe. The subject is treated somewhat at length in the accompanying report by the United States consul-general at Habana.

The same stimulus which you administer to Cuba in order to make a market for the southern manufacturer's cotton goods must also stimulate the cultivation of cotton to compete against the southern farmer. Looking at the question from the narrow and selfish interests of our Southern States, what profit is it that you encourage the development of Cuba in order to make a market for a few of your cotton goods when the encouragement results in the production of a large quantity of cotton, thus reducing the price of the cotton grown by southern farmers?

Not only has that argument been addressed to the selfish interest of the Southern cotton manufacturer, but it has been made with peculiar force to those of us who represent cattle-growing States. Just after the Spanish evacuation of Cuba, when the island had been desolated and its live stock had perished in that dreadful guerrilla warfare, the cattlemen of Texas sold many cattle to people who purchased them for shipment to Cuba. These gentlemen, unusually intelligent about their business, fondly but blindly imagined that this trade would continue, and they began, I presume, in response to that campaign of education among "the leaders of thought" to deluge me with letters stating that the cattle interests of Texas were vitally concerned in this Cuban market, and urging me to support this reciprocity treaty.

I had the frankness to say to these gentlemen, as I trust I shall always have the frankness to say to the people who honor me with their confidence, that even if it did serve the cattle interests of Texas I could not be induced to support this measure, because it was vicious in spite of any particular good that might come to our people. Upon a further examination of the question, of course, I soon discovered the folly of the men who were seeking to open a market which they could supply in a few months and which, being supplied, would in a few years compete against them.

The truth is, Mr. President, it is extremely doubtful if any State in this Union affords such excellent advantages for cattle raising as can be found in the island of Cuba. In addition to her mild climate, her grasses are succulent and perennial. They have no winter there to wither the earth's vegetation, as we have even in our Southern States, and cattle of every kind can be maintained at a minimum cost throughout the entire year.

I made this statement to one gentleman, who very promptly and very pertinently asked me why it was they had never been able to build up a live-stock industry of any consequence in that island. I answered him then, without having read what I now intend to read, that it was due to the course of the Spanish Government in pursuing with systematic vigilance her determination to allow Cuba to produce nothing but sugar and tobacco.

I now read again from the Government publication entitled "Commercial Cuba in 1903"—and by the way, Mr. President, while I am sure all Senators have read it, if they will take the time to read it through carefully they will find that this publication seems to have been prepared expressly to support this reciprocity policy. This document contains the following statement:

However numerous may have been the live stock in Cuba in the most prosperous times under the old régime, the capacity of the island for grazing purposes has never been seriously tested. Mention has been frequently made heretofore of the vast tracts of natural pasturage of superb quality in the Cuban uplands, and these are supplemented by large areas of artificial or cultivated pasturage in the farms and plantations, all of which offer unusual advantages to cattle raisers and for the successful care of all kinds of live stock. Grasses are abundant all the year round, and so is water, obtainable from the numerous streams. The palm trees, of which there is a multitude in all parts of the island, yield a berry which is peculiarly grateful to hogs, and as these berries are to be found everywhere in immense numbers the raising of hogs becomes an easy matter to the Cuban farmer.

A little preceding that statement comes the verification of what I said about the determination of Spain to confine the soil and energy of Cuba to the production of sugar and tobacco. This publication says:

The abundance of good grasses for pasturage in the island naturally turned the thoughts of the first colonists to the raising of live stock, and for two centuries or more this was the main activity among the settlers, so far as the domestic market was concerned, although no live stock was exported and tobacco remained the leading export. Spain's persistence in imposing grievous taxes on all domestic animals had nearly ruined this otherwise flourishing industry before the last revolution broke out. Horses were taxed \$55 apiece; mules, \$32; oxen, \$22; cows, \$10; hogs, \$7.

Mr. President, if Spanish greed was compelled to levy a tax like this in order to restrict the live-stock industry of that island, how long will it afford a market for our cattle when these taxes are removed and the growth and multiplication of live stock encouraged? Already, so the reports of the agricultural department of that island disclose, the island is practically restocked, and Cuba will be selling live stock to the world before she is ever compelled to buy again in any considerable numbers.

Mr. President, I am not only detaining the Senate beyond its own patience, but I find my throat unequal to the task of continu-

Imports into the United States from Cuba for four years preceding the reciprocity treaty of 1891.

1888	\$49,315,087
1889	52,190,623
1890	53,801,595
1891	61,714,395
Total	216,961,700
Or an average of \$54,240,447.	

Exports to Cuba for the same time.

1888	\$10,053,560
1889	11,691,311
1890	13,084,415
1891	12,224,888
Total	47,054,174

Or an average of \$11,763,543.
Average balance of trade against United States, \$42,476,905.

Commerce of the United States with Cuba from 1851 to 1903.

Year ending June 30—	Domestic exports from United States to Cuba.	Imports from Cuba into United States.		
		Free.	Dutiable.	Total.
1851	\$5,239,276	\$322,154	\$16,385,759	\$16,707,913
1852	5,803,196	277,870	17,307,746	17,585,616
1853	5,773,419	220,375	18,327,288	18,547,633
1854	8,228,116	382,529	16,615,252	16,997,781
1855	7,607,119	285,292	18,156,400	18,441,852
1856	7,193,035	386,102	24,025,646	24,411,745
1857	9,379,582	335,051	44,217,911	44,612,962
1858	11,673,167	513,332	22,246,839	22,760,171
1859	11,217,208	594,675	32,094,915	32,689,598
1860	11,747,913	357,887	32,065,873	32,423,760
1861	9,461,082	308,815	30,334,038	30,642,853
1862	9,071,781	536,745	23,400,684	23,937,429
1863	13,707,148	281,713	23,787,452	24,069,165
1864	18,203,817	429,826	36,574,707	37,004,533
1865	18,847,502	336,300	29,094,056	30,090,356
1866	14,994,546	295,799	37,230,200	37,525,999
1867	14,171,835	382,304	38,014,222	38,396,526
1868	15,255,843	259,441	49,515,263	49,774,704
1869	12,643,955	320,285	56,656,106	56,976,491
1870	13,061,662	148,773	53,628,335	53,777,108
1871	14,300,496	211,638	57,323,287	57,534,925
1872	13,168,958	251,623	67,012,732	67,264,415
1873	15,231,039	409,614	76,668,111	77,077,725
1874	19,537,981	721,854	84,706,243	85,428,097
1875	15,586,658	322,778	64,204,939	64,587,717

Commerce of the United States with Cuba from 1851 to 1903—Continued.

Year ending June 30—	Domestic exports from United States to Cuba.	Imports from Cuba into United States.		
		Free.	Dutiable.	Total.
1876	\$13,746,058	\$295,864	\$55,712,002	\$56,007,866
1877	12,748,003	265,682	65,562,713	65,828,395
1878	11,365,013	193,103	56,708,229	56,901,332
1879	12,294,829	294,933	63,354,723	63,649,656
1880	10,924,633	555,627	54,867,391	55,423,019
1881	10,999,276	519,390	62,484,014	63,003,404
1882	11,775,073	656,042	69,794,010	70,450,652
1883	14,537,918	785,829	64,758,705	65,544,534
1884	10,562,880	1,484,638	55,696,859	57,181,497
1885	8,719,135	1,796,049	40,530,044	42,306,038
1886	10,020,879	1,765,751	49,345,029	51,110,780
1887	10,138,930	2,033,205	47,482,229	49,515,434
1888	9,724,124	2,066,379	47,252,708	49,319,087
1889	11,297,198	2,405,425	49,735,198	52,130,623
1890	12,669,509	2,761,711	51,039,880	53,801,591
1891	11,929,605	26,044,502	35,669,893	61,714,395
1892	17,022,411	66,140,855	11,790,836	77,961,671
1893	23,004,094	66,049,869	12,657,137	78,706,506
1894	19,855,237	67,418,289	8,259,972	75,678,261
1895	12,523,260	17,684,765	35,186,494	52,871,259
1896	7,312,348	2,074,763	37,942,987	40,017,730
1897	7,599,757	1,270,059	17,136,756	18,406,815
1898	9,253,894	270,000	14,956,477	15,223,477
1899	17,247,352	1,031,713	24,377,115	25,408,828
1900	25,236,808	1,854,373	29,517,331	31,374,704
1901	24,100,453	2,691,587	40,731,501	46,423,088
1902	25,012,109	2,644,017	32,050,667	34,694,684
1903	20,140,132	3,114,807	59,827,983	62,942,790

Revenues and expenditures of Cuba from 1898 to 1903.

[From data compiled by the Bureau of Insular Affairs, War Department, Washington, for the years 1898-1902; since May 20, 1902, from official records of the Cuban Government.]

Year.	Revenues.	Expenditures.
July 18, 1898-June 30, 1899	\$7,961,823.55	\$5,793,738.98
July 1, 1899-June 30, 1900	17,385,898.38	15,661,093.67
July 1, 1900-June 30, 1901	17,160,580.61	17,645,427.84
July 1, 1901-May 19, 1902	14,708,802.07	16,401,480.76
May 20, 1902-December 31, 1902	9,729,448.85	8,102,587.90
January 1, 1903-June 30, 1903	8,197,940.09	8,229,250.72

^a Unofficial.

Quantity of sugar consumed in the United States from 1877 to 1901.

[Data furnished by Messrs. Willett & Gray, New York.]

Calendar year.	Refined product of sugar imported. ^a	Domestic product—					Total.	Consumption per capita.
		Manufactured from imported molasses. ^a	Of cane.	Of maple.	Of beet.	Of sorghum and other.		
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Pounds.	
1877	606,750	25,500	89,000	12,000	446	1,554	745,250	
1878	649,872	40,000	71,000	11,000	223	1,377	773,472	
1879	663,196	44,900	112,000	10,000	357	1,443	831,896	
1880	805,045	50,617	88,822	10,000	357	1,943	956,784	
1881	836,261	39,949	127,367	9,000	629	-----	1,012,306	
1882	973,720	64,456	76,572	20,000	446	-----	1,134,694	
1883	1,021,956	40,722	142,297	18,500	536	-----	1,224,011	
1884	1,068,090	50,000	135,243	25,000	737	313	1,309,383	
1885	1,122,345	47,259	100,876	25,900	600	1,400	1,298,380	
1886	1,232,755	72,613	135,158	18,000	754	-----	1,459,280	
1887	1,213,791	62,274	85,394	20,000	255	-----	1,381,714	
1888	1,270,629	58,840	167,814	20,000	1,640	360	1,519,283	
1889	1,193,761	49,715	153,909	22,000	2,400	689	1,416,474	
1890	1,257,292	53,282	136,503	25,000	2,800	1,500	1,476,377	
1891	1,614,580	21,320	221,951	15,030	5,400	570	1,888,851	
1892	1,597,306	30,000	204,064	9,500	12,000	500	1,853,370	
1893	1,623,872	20,000	235,886	10,500	16,000	500	1,905,758	
1894	1,700,635	15,000	271,236	5,000	20,443	300	2,012,714	
1895	1,572,438	15,000	324,506	7,500	30,000	300	1,949,744	
1896	1,670,963	603	243,220	5,000	40,000	300	1,960,086	
1897	1,715,607	150	310,537	5,000	39,684	-----	2,070,978	
1898	1,708,937	1,700	252,812	5,000	34,453	-----	2,002,902	
1899	1,844,642	5,200	160,400	5,000	62,826	-----	2,078,068	
1900	1,950,014	7,647	174,450	5,000	82,736	-----	2,219,847	
1901	1,932,330	17,977	292,150	5,000	124,859	-----	2,372,316	

^a Leading refiners state that little or no sugar is manufactured from domestic molasses; also that in refining there is only about 2 per cent waste of original weight. Messrs. Willett & Gray, New York, state that of the sugar consumed in 1899 only about 53,934 tons were unrefined.
^b Includes 300,070 tons Hawaiian, 66,279 tons Porto Rican, and 5,100 tons Philippine.

Summary tables of the production and consumption of cane sugar, 1884 to 1894.
[Compiled mainly from information supplied by Messrs. Rueb & Co., London, England.]
[In gross tons of 2,240 pounds.]

Countries.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.	1888.	1889.	1890.	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.
Java	338,866	396,372	328,577	398,831	370,973	353,104	365,798	456,615	485,135	458,300	455,595
Dutch and French Guiana	7,289	4,530	6,283	8,458	6,207	7,508	8,113	7,867	8,000	8,000	8,000
Cuba	560,934	631,967	731,723	648,588	656,719	547,792	675,233	819,780	981,200	761,900	968,750
Manila	122,325	203,490	181,148	173,918	184,567	218,843	147,524	166,460	160,000	160,000	160,000
Porto Rico	98,665	70,000	63,914	81,355	60,087	62,466	58,167	47,345	69,405	49,360	59,700
Brazil	268,335	190,000	249,821	270,692	230,384	120,000	175,407	153,006	190,900	207,500	267,180
Martinique	49,370	38,786	30,199	39,532	39,434	35,965	35,036	32,376	19,472	32,725	33,975
Guadeloupe	55,257	41,131	36,678	54,940	48,544	45,173	46,430	48,112	46,935	41,650	41,997
Reunion	37,800	37,973	34,732	31,389	32,031	25,418	36,165	39,410	39,685	35,500	36,885
Louisiana	128,443	94,375	127,958	90,562	167,814	162,294	143,745	219,415	163,700	217,470	233,570
Egypt	37,587	45,035	51,700	48,283	42,075	32,742	26,715	46,410	57,490	57,700	75,075
Mauritius	120,539	127,540	114,198	102,398	124,073	132,171	124,564	130,251	111,880	70,400	134,875
British India	82,749	54,349	59,253	48,606	51,437	51,687	60,592	50,991	55,000	55,000	55,000
Natal	17,172	16,000	13,250	9,060	6,005	7,129	7,044	7,800	15,808	19,369	20,401
Australia	59,969	87,245	87,000	107,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Jamaica	29,868	25,361	25,000	28,756	25,014	22,359	30,273	30,000	28,375	26,300	27,985
Barbados	53,722	56,200	40,780	61,895	63,108	57,226	76,082	44,345	54,850	62,550	61,046
Trinidad	61,875	64,634	49,175	69,140	55,777	49,940	54,083	46,104	48,575	45,800	49,890
British Guiana	125,322	96,058	111,856	134,875	108,076	103,867	103,113	119,289	114,880	109,771	104,502
Peru	6,529	31,719	35,000	30,000	35,000	30,000	40,000	40,000	44,750	63,000	66,660
Hawaii	63,948	76,496	92,050	101,712	115,307	125,450	120,686	126,000	125,000	134,675	137,600
Total of above countries.	2,327,084	2,390,161	2,470,295	2,533,040	2,522,442	2,295,541	2,434,837	2,747,556	2,921,300	2,720,570	3,098,686
Fiji					17,254	23,000	15,497	20,859	17,202	17,000	17,000
Minor British West India possessions and British Honduras											
China	56,921	44,387	44,518	51,617	51,162	53,004	50,653	44,123	46,784	42,161	42,088
Japan	113,613	93,657	86,586	118,000	61,506	60,130	57,944	52,530			
Mexico			34,500	30,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	45,000			
Argentina	20,000	25,280	28,000	33,000	33,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	180,000	180,000	180,000
Haiti	6,529	15,484	12,269	11,948	17,083	17,415	21,230	21,000			
Danish West Indies	9,277	12,257	11,130	13,074	14,285	14,835	9,354	9,790			
Other foreign cane-growing countries	12,107	11,421	15,552	10,058	9,073	8,536	8,308	9,043			
Total from cane-growing countries	2,547,531	2,592,647	2,702,850	2,805,735	2,795,805	2,572,461	2,697,823	2,984,901	3,165,286	2,959,731	3,437,774
Europe	2,360,314	2,545,889	2,137,351	2,728,810	2,451,950	2,785,844	3,670,782	3,695,568	3,455,744	3,399,583	3,840,256
Total	4,907,845	5,138,536	4,840,201	5,534,545	5,247,755	5,358,305	6,368,605	6,680,469	6,616,030	6,359,314	7,278,030

^a Estimated.

^b Exports.

Consumption of sugar per capita in Europe and in the United States, years ending July 31, from 1889 to 1900.

[From Licht's Journal of Sugar Manufactures, August, 1899; data for the United States from the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1900.]

Countries.	1889-89.	1889-90.	1890-91.	1891-92.	1892-93.	1893-94.	1894-95.	1895-96.	1896-97.	1897-98.	1898-99.	1899-1900.
	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.
Austria-Hungary	19.6	16.1	15.0	16.0	17.2	16.6	19.8	19.6	18.2	17.8	18.3	17.6
Belgium	21.2	21.3	21.6	21.3	21.1	21.7	31.3	22.7	23.1	23.1	23.2	23.3
Bulgaria	4.0	4.2	4.1	5.2	6.1	7.1	8.6	5.0	6.6	5.5	6.6	6.7
Denmark	38.3	39.0	41.0	43.6	43.5	43.0	42.3	46.7	47.6	48.8	47.8	54.8
France	25.3	28.5	28.7	30.5	27.9	27.8	30.6	28.4	32.8	30.9	33.0	37.0
Germany	11.7	22.9	24.0	23.6	22.9	23.7	26.8	31.3	26.3	30.2	30.7	33.9
Greece	10.6	10.3	10.1	8.6	7.4	7.3	10.7	5.9	6.0	6.2	6.5	7.2
Italy	8.9	8.0	7.9	7.2	8.3	7.1	5.1	6.0	6.1	6.3	6.2	6.1
Netherlands	17.9	25.0	27.7	26.3	23.6	25.6	11.0	25.6	25.5	34.4	28.9	32.5
Portugal and Madeira	12.1	12.5	13.8	12.4	12.5	13.1	13.7	12.8	13.8	14.2	12.8	14.7
Roumania	4.9	5.1	3.9	3.9	4.5	4.1	6.7	6.7	7.1	7.2	7.8	7.8
Russia	10.2	9.9	10.0	10.3	11.0	11.1	11.0	10.1	11.8	12.6	12.9	14.0
Servia	4.7	8.7	8.8	3.8	4.2	4.3	6.3	4.3	4.8	4.7	5.1	5.3
Spain	8.8	9.2	9.3	11.1	12.4	12.5	4.0	10.9	9.4	8.1	12.3	10.6
Sweden and Norway	21.1	21.9	22.5	24.1	23.7	24.8	45.4	30.1	33.2	40.7	34.7	38.2
Switzerland	30.0	32.4	32.9	31.3	31.6	42.3	29.7	44.2	31.5	52.1	56.8	60.3
Turkey	6.0	6.4	8.1	9.3	7.6	7.2	4.0	7.8	7.2	7.1	7.7	8.0
United Kingdom	73.2	77.8	78.7	80.7	77.4	84.8	79.1	87.5	86.1	91.3	88.4	91.6
Total Europe	19.9	21.9	22.2	22.6	22.0	23.3	24.6	24.3	24.1	25.4	25.7	27.1
United States ^a	51.8	52.8	66.3	63.8	64.4	66.7	63.4	62.5	64.8	61.5	62.6	65.2
Total	24.5	26.4	27.6	28.9	28.0	29.4	30.3	29.6	30.4	30.6	32.0	33.0

^a Calendar year.

Production of beet sugar in the principal and other European countries from 1835 to 1900.

[From Jules Belot: Le Sucre de Betterave en France 1800-1900.]

Crop year.	France.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Russia.	Belgium.	Holland.	Other countries.
	Metric tons.	Metric tons.	Metric tons.	Metric tons.	Metric tons.	Metric tons.	Metric tons.
1827-28	2,600						
1828-29	4,000						
1829-30	5,500						
1830-31	7,000						
1831-32	9,000						
1832-33	12,000						
1833-34	20,000						
1834-35	30,000						
1835-36	40,000						
1836-37	35,000	1,408					
1837-38	48,968	7,677					
1838-39	39,000	8,157					
1839-40	23,000	12,659					
1840-41	27,000	14,205					
1841-42	31,000	15,740					

Production of beet sugar in the principal and other European countries from 1843 to 1900—Continued.

Crop year.	France.	Germany.	Austria-Hungary.	Russia.	Belgium.	Holland.	Other countries.
	Metric tons.	Metric tons.	Metric tons.	Metric tons.	Metric tons.	Metric tons.	Metric tons.
1843-43	30,000	7,736					
1843-44	29,000	13,308					
1844-45	36,000	12,968					
1845-46	41,000	15,153					
1846-47	54,000	20,120					
1847-48	64,000	26,841					
1848-49	39,000	35,857					
1849-50	62,000	42,873					
1850-51	75,000	53,248					
1851-52	69,000	63,068					
1852-53	75,000	84,832					
1853-54	77,000	71,000	25,000	19,000	12,000		
1854-55	45,000	79,000	25,000	22,000	11,000		
1855-56	92,000	87,000	30,000	21,000	11,000		
1856-57	83,000	104,000	35,000	17,000	15,000		
1857-58	152,000	121,000	60,000	15,000	20,000		
1858-59	133,000	144,000	70,000	20,000	22,000		
1859-60	126,000	146,000	80,000	14,000	23,000		
1860-61	101,000	127,000	80,000	22,000	20,000	1,000	
1861-62	146,000	128,000	90,000	30,000	19,000	1,000	
1862-63	174,000	138,000	90,000	40,000	22,000	2,000	
1863-64	108,000	151,000	100,000	50,000	30,000	3,000	1,000
1864-65	149,000	171,000	130,000	70,000	25,000	4,000	1,000
1865-66	274,000	186,000	130,000	60,000	34,000	6,000	1,000
1866-67	217,000	201,000	150,000	110,000	50,000	7,000	1,000
1867-68	225,000	165,000	120,000	150,000	48,000	10,000	1,000
1868-69	211,000	208,000	140,000	100,000	42,000	12,000	2,000
1869-70	280,000	217,000	180,000	130,000	46,000	13,000	3,000
1870-71	289,000	263,000	220,000	140,000	60,000	16,000	3,000
1871-72	337,000	186,000	210,000	170,000	94,000	19,000	5,000
1872-73	408,000	263,000	230,000	220,000	90,000	26,000	5,000
1873-74	397,000	291,000	240,000	210,000	62,000	31,000	8,000
1874-75	451,000	256,000	220,000	180,000	90,000	24,000	7,000
1875-76	462,000	358,000	280,000	210,000	105,000	31,000	7,000
1876-77	245,000	291,000	250,000	240,000	69,000	22,000	6,000
1877-78	336,132	381,000	350,000	292,000	62,000	26,000	7,000
1878-79	432,636	430,000	390,000	273,000	92,000	27,000	7,000
1879-80	277,911	415,000	420,000	300,000	75,000	24,000	8,000
1880-81	330,869	573,000	510,000	277,000	89,000	28,000	9,000
1881-82	393,268	622,000	440,000	290,000	95,000	25,000	9,000
1882-83	425,193	849,000	490,000	319,000	108,000	29,000	12,000
1883-84	473,675	961,000	470,000	358,000	139,000	40,000	15,000
1884-85	294,035	1,147,000	650,000	405,000	115,000	40,000	21,000
1885-86	285,216	838,000	370,000	525,000	68,000	25,000	24,000
1886-87	466,553	1,024,000	550,000	472,000	118,000	37,000	30,000
1887-88	375,280	953,000	400,000	441,000	122,000	38,000	29,000
1888-89	446,563	978,000	515,000	520,000	125,000	36,000	30,000
1889-90	754,781	1,261,000	730,000	526,000	173,000	50,000	37,000
1890-91	639,454	1,332,000	778,000	544,000	205,000	72,000	80,000
1891-92	616,263	1,198,025	774,498	560,000	180,000	37,000	80,000
1892-93	554,768	1,230,834	733,057	450,000	166,000	65,000	90,000
1893-94	548,198	1,336,001	824,005	647,000	220,000	72,000	108,000
1894-95	747,989	1,827,973	1,044,575	601,000	240,000	80,000	157,000
1895-96	659,606	1,637,057	781,685	717,000	220,000	103,000	163,000
1896-97	742,827	1,821,223	927,890	720,000	280,000	156,000	190,000
1897-98	811,185	1,844,399	821,633	730,000	234,000	126,000	169,000
1898-99	781,975	1,722,429	1,041,768	750,000	204,000	152,000	140,000
1899-1900	805,000	1,730,000	1,120,000	900,000	300,000	180,000	275,000

Production of beet sugar (in tons) in European countries in five-year periods from 1863-64 to 1899-1900.

1863-64	343,000	1883-84	2,456,675
1868-69	715,000	1888-89	2,650,563
1873-74	1,239,000	1894-95 ^a	4,698,538
1878-79	1,752,635	1899-1900 ^a	5,370,000

^a Six-year period.

Sugar crops of the world from 1895 to 1904.

[Estimated by Messrs. Willett & Gray, New York.]
[In gross tons of 2,240 pounds.]

	1894-95.	1895-96.	1896-97.	1897-98.	1898-99.	1899-1900.	1900-1901.	1901-2.	1902-3.	1903-4.
United States:										
Louisiana	317,306	237,720	282,009	310,447	245,511	132,000	275,000	290,000	300,000	240,000
Porto Rico	52,500	50,000	58,000	54,000	53,826	35,000	80,000	100,000	85,000	95,000
Hawaiian Islands	131,698	201,632	224,220	204,833	252,507	258,521	321,461	300,000	375,000	375,000
Cuba, crop	1,040,000	240,000	219,500	314,009	345,290	308,543	635,856	875,000	980,000	1,130,000
British West Indies:										
Trinidad, exports	56,641	53,000	53,000	53,000	53,430	41,000	50,000	50,000	45,000	49,000
Barbados, exports	32,343	47,800	52,178	47,835	45,789	50,000	60,000	60,000	31,000	35,000
Jamaica	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	27,000	27,000	30,000	30,000	18,772	17,000
Antigua and St. Kitts	20,000	24,000	29,000	25,000	22,000	18,000	25,000	25,000	18,000	19,000
French West Indies:										
Martinique, exports	29,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	31,630	30,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	33,000
Guadeloupe	43,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	39,330	30,000	35,000	35,000	38,000	40,000
Danish West Indies—St. Croix	7,000	8,000	13,008	13,000	12,000	12,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
Haiti and Santo Domingo	38,000	50,000	48,800	48,000	50,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
Lesser Antilles, not named above	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	12,000	13,000
Mexico, crop	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	50,000	78,000	93,000	95,000	115,000	125,000
Central America:										
Guatemala, crop			8,000	9,000	11,000	12,000	9,000	9,000	10,000	10,000
San Salvador, crop	500	500	3,000	4,000	4,500	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Nicaragua, crop	500	500	500	1,500	3,750	4,000	3,500	3,500	4,500	4,000
Costa Rica, crop			200	500	750	1,000	1,500	1,500	4,000	4,000
South America:										
British Guiana (Demerara), exports	95,919	105,000	99,789	106,070	82,000	80,000	95,000	95,000	121,570	125,000
Dutch Guiana (Surinam), crop	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	13,000	13,000
Venezuela						2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Peru, exports	68,000	68,000	71,735	105,463	61,910	100,381	105,000	105,000	140,000	140,000

Sugar crops of the world from 1895 to 1904—Continued.

	1894-95.	1895-96.	1896-97.	1897-98.	1898-99.	1899-1900.	1900-1901.	1901-2.	1902-3.	1903-4.
South America—Continued:										
Argentina, crop	90,000	130,000	165,000	110,000	72,000	91,507	114,252	115,000	130,000	84,000
Brazil, crop	275,000	225,000	210,000	195,000	154,495	192,700	190,000	215,000	187,500	237,000
Total in America	2,343,407	1,572,152	1,069,989	1,727,657	1,732,700	1,567,652	2,235,569	2,516,000	2,726,342	2,854,000
Asia:										
British India, exports	50,000	50,000	28,000	20,000	10,000	10,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Siam, crop (consumption 30,000 tons) ..	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
Java, crop	486,061	603,259	498,434	531,201	689,281	721,993	710,120	765,000	842,812	880,000
Japan (consumption 170,000 tons, mostly imported) ..						2,000				
Philippine Islands, exports	180,000	240,000	202,000	178,000	93,000	62,785	52,000	70,000	90,000	125,000
China (consumption large, mostly imported) ..										
Total in Asia	723,061	900,259	735,434	736,201	790,281	803,778	784,120	857,000	947,812	1,020,000
Australia and Polynesia:										
Queensland	91,712	75,000	100,774	97,916	164,241	123,269	92,554	117,000	76,626	93,800
New South Wales	35,000	35,000	31,000	23,000	28,000	15,500	19,000	19,000	21,000	20,000
Fiji Islands, exports	27,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	34,000	31,000	33,000	33,000	35,500	50,000
Total in Australia and Polynesia	153,712	140,000	161,774	153,916	226,241	169,789	144,554	169,000	133,126	163,800
Africa:										
Egypt, crop	90,000	92,000	100,000	80,000	87,900	98,500	94,880	95,000	90,000	90,000
Mauritius	115,000	145,000	152,677	121,693	136,487	157,025	175,267	145,000	150,349	175,000
Réunion	35,300	44,700	45,082	31,483	37,781	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
Total in Africa	240,300	270,700	297,759	233,176	312,168	290,525	305,147	275,000	275,349	300,000
Europe—Spain	20,000	20,000	8,000	8,000	25,000	33,215	32,000	33,000	28,000	28,000
Total cane-sugar production (W. & G.) ..	3,480,470	2,909,111	2,872,956	2,859,050	3,095,450	2,864,959	3,502,300	3,850,000	4,110,622	4,365,800
Europe beet-sugar production (Licht) ..	4,792,530	4,285,429	3,916,586	4,831,774	4,932,101	5,518,048	6,068,994	6,710,000	5,521,839	5,850,000
United States beet-sugar production (W. & G.) ..	20,443	30,000	37,536	40,399	32,471	72,944	76,859	150,000	195,463	233,000
Grand total cane and beet sugar	8,293,443	7,224,540	7,827,078	7,731,223	8,110,022	8,455,951	9,648,243	10,710,000	9,827,961	10,848,400

Estimated increase in the world's production, 620,839 tons in 1903-4.

Production of sugar in Cuba and the insular possessions of the United States, 1863 to 1903.

Year.	Cuba.	Porto Rico.	Hawaii.	Philippine Islands.	Year.	Cuba.	Porto Rico.	Hawaii.	Philippine Islands.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.		Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
1863.....	799,000	72,787		74,981	1886.....	731,723	76,408	96,528	185,799
1869.....	776,000	80,372		68,818	1887.....	646,578	95,537	94,090	179,149
1870.....	775,000	100,496		78,214	1888.....	658,719	59,137	105,307	185,808
1871.....	597,000	101,672		87,466	1889.....	590,333	62,401	108,110	218,926
1872.....	761,000	88,144		95,526	1890.....	632,368	57,248	133,824	147,526
1873.....	846,000	86,254		89,337	1891.....	819,760	50,401	122,772	106,414
1874.....	681,000	70,621		103,861	1892.....	976,789	41,204	119,034	246,941
1875.....	718,000	85,126	11,196	126,198	1893.....	815,894	43,000	147,689	261,518
1876.....	572,000	63,178	11,640	130,861	1894.....	1,054,214	45,890	136,913	194,319
1877.....	505,550	56,850	11,418	122,868	1895.....	1,094,264	50,000	201,600	240,000
1878.....	539,600	76,050	17,157	118,141	1896.....	219,500	54,000	224,200	197,000
1879.....	680,700	68,591	21,884	134,089	1897.....	314,000	54,000	204,800	165,000
1880.....	547,000	51,662	28,386	181,520	1898.....	345,200	53,800	252,500	93,000
1881.....	489,900	55,881	41,870	210,161	1899.....	308,540	35,000	258,520	62,780
1882.....	600,350	78,800	50,971	153,247	1900.....	635,850	80,000	321,490	52,000
1883.....	484,970	76,408	50,940	212,718	1901.....	875,000	100,000	300,000	70,000
1884.....	569,900	95,337	63,712	122,925	1902.....	980,000	85,000	375,000	100,000
1885.....	631,967	87,554	76,495	203,491	1903.....	1,250,000	95,000	420,000

Progress of the United States in its material industries, 1800 to 1902.

Year.	Receipts.				
	Total deposits.	Depositors in savings banks.	Total net ordinary. ^a	Customs.	Internal revenue.
1800.....			\$10,848,749	\$9,080,334	\$809,397
1810.....			9,884,214	8,583,909	7,431
1820.....		8,636	17,840,670	15,005,612	106,261
1830.....		38,085	24,844,117	21,922,391	12,161
1840.....		78,701	19,480,115	13,499,502	1,682
1850.....		251,354	43,592,889	39,668,686
1851.....		277,148	52,555,039	49,017,568
1852.....		308,863	49,846,816	47,339,327
1853.....		365,538	61,587,032	58,931,866
1854.....		396,173	73,800,341	64,224,190
1855.....		431,602	65,350,575	53,025,794
1856.....		487,986	74,056,699	64,022,864
1857.....		490,428	68,965,313	63,875,905
1858.....		538,840	46,655,396	41,789,621
1859.....		622,556	52,777,108	49,565,824
1860.....		603,870	56,054,600	53,187,512
1861.....		684,487	41,476,299	39,582,126
1862.....		787,943	51,919,261	49,056,398
1863.....		887,006	112,094,946	69,059,642	37,640,788
1864.....		976,025	213,412,971	102,316,153	109,741,134
1865.....		980,044	322,031,158	84,928,261	209,464,215
1866.....		1,067,061	519,949,564	179,046,652	309,228,813
1867.....		1,188,202	462,846,680	176,417,811	266,027,537
1868.....		1,310,144	376,434,454	164,464,600	191,087,589
1869.....		1,466,684	337,188,256	180,048,427	158,356,461
1870.....		1,630,846	395,959,834	194,538,374	184,899,756
1871.....		1,902,047	374,431,105	206,270,408	143,098,154

Progress of the United States in its material industries, 1800 to 1902—Continued.

Year.	Receipts.				
	Total deposits.	Depositors in savings banks.	Total net ordinary. ^a	Customs.	Internal revenue.
1872		1,992,925	\$364,604,230	\$216,370,287	\$130,642,178
1873		2,185,832	322,177,674	188,089,523	113,729,314
1874		2,293,401	239,941,091	163,103,834	102,409,785
1875	\$2,114,551,800	2,259,864	284,020,771	157,167,722	110,007,494
1876	2,128,547,128	2,368,650	290,066,585	148,071,985	116,700,732
1877	2,025,441,208	2,395,314	281,000,642	130,956,493	118,630,408
1878	1,878,434,270	2,400,785	257,446,776	130,170,680	110,581,625
1879	1,940,701,712	2,268,707	272,322,137	137,250,048	113,561,611
1880	2,306,986,680	2,335,582	333,523,501	186,522,065	124,009,374
1881	2,009,518,492	2,528,749	390,782,293	198,159,676	135,264,386
1882	2,755,938,053	2,710,354	403,525,250	220,410,790	146,497,595
1883		2,876,438	308,287,582	214,703,497	144,720,369
1884		3,015,151	348,519,870	195,067,490	121,586,073
1885		3,071,495	323,690,706	181,471,939	112,498,726
1886		3,158,950	336,439,727	192,905,023	116,805,936
1887	3,255,772,134	3,418,013	371,403,278	217,236,893	118,823,391
1888	3,458,266,965	3,838,291	379,266,075	219,091,174	124,296,872
1889	3,751,514,133	4,021,523	387,050,050	223,832,742	130,881,514
1890	3,998,973,105	4,258,893	403,080,983	229,668,585	142,603,706
1891	4,232,059,335	4,533,217	392,612,447	219,522,205	145,686,249
1892	4,630,490,156	4,781,905	354,937,784	177,452,964	153,971,073
1893	4,586,213,170	4,830,599	385,819,629	203,355,017	161,027,624
1894	4,638,931,485	4,777,687	297,722,019	131,818,531	147,111,233
1895	4,872,065,276	4,875,519	313,390,075	152,158,617	143,421,672
1896	4,888,069,119	5,065,494	326,976,200	160,021,752	143,762,865
1897	5,196,847,530	5,251,132	347,721,705	176,554,127	146,688,574
1898	5,927,489,998	5,385,746	405,321,335	149,575,062	170,900,641
1899	6,675,471,743	5,687,818	515,960,620	206,128,482	273,437,162
1900	7,464,719,145	6,107,083	567,240,852	233,164,871	295,327,927
1901	8,535,053,136	6,358,723	587,685,338	238,585,456	307,180,664
1902	9,315,193,912	6,666,672	562,478,233	254,444,708	271,880,122

Year.	Expenditures.					Total number of pensioners.	Imports of merchandise.		Exports of merchandise.	
	Total net ordinary. ^b	War.	Navy.	Interest on public debt.	Pensions.		Total.	Per capita. ^c	Total.	Per capita. ^d
1800	\$7,411,370	\$2,560,879	\$3,448,716	\$3,402,601	\$64,131	\$91,252,768	\$17.19	\$70,971,780	\$13.37
1810	5,311,082	2,294,324	1,654,244	3,163,671	83,744	85,400,000	11.80	66,757,970	9.22
1820	13,134,531	2,630,362	4,387,990	5,151,004	3,208,376	74,450,000	7.71	69,691,669	7.22
1830	13,229,533	4,767,129	3,239,429	1,912,575	1,393,297	62,720,956	4.87	71,670,735	5.57
1840	24,139,920	7,095,267	6,113,897	174,598	2,603,562	98,258,706	5.76	123,698,932	7.25
1850	37,165,990	9,087,025	7,904,725	3,782,393	1,866,886	173,509,526	7.43	144,875,726	6.23
1851	44,054,718	12,161,965	8,880,581	3,696,761	2,293,377	210,771,429	8.78	188,915,259	7.87
1852	40,389,955	8,521,506	8,918,842	4,000,298	2,401,859	207,440,338	8.36	166,984,231	6.73
1853	44,078,156	9,910,498	11,067,790	3,665,833	1,753,306	263,777,265	10.30	203,439,232	7.94
1854	51,967,528	11,722,283	10,790,096	3,070,927	1,232,695	297,803,794	11.27	237,043,704	8.97
1855	56,316,198	14,648,074	13,327,085	2,314,465	1,477,612	257,808,708	9.46	218,039,503	8.03
1856	66,772,528	16,036,161	14,074,835	1,953,822	1,296,230	310,432,310	11.05	281,219,423	10.01
1857	68,041,144	19,153,151	12,651,695	1,593,265	1,310,381	348,428,342	12.05	293,823,760	10.16
1858	72,390,437	25,679,122	14,053,265	1,652,056	1,219,768	268,338,654	8.85	272,011,274	9.14
1859	66,355,950	23,154,721	14,690,928	2,637,650	1,222,223	331,333,241	10.83	292,902,051	9.57
1860	60,056,755	16,472,203	11,514,650	3,144,121	1,100,802	353,616,119	11.25	333,576,057	10.61
1861	62,616,056	23,001,531	12,387,157	4,084,157	1,064,600	8,636	289,310,542	9.02	219,553,833	6.85
1862	454,379,897	389,173,562	42,640,353	13,190,345	852,170	8,159	189,356,677	5.79	190,670,501	5.83
1863	694,004,576	603,314,412	63,261,235	24,729,701	1,078,513	14,791	243,335,815	7.29	203,964,417	6.11
1864	811,283,679	690,391,049	85,704,964	53,685,422	4,985,474	51,135	316,447,283	9.30	158,837,588	4.67
1865	1,217,704,199	1,090,690,400	122,617,424	77,395,090	16,347,621	85,986	238,745,580	6.87	166,029,303	4.78
1866	385,954,731	283,154,676	43,285,632	133,067,625	15,635,550	129,722	434,812,036	12.26	348,859,522	9.84
1867	202,947,734	95,224,416	31,034,011	143,781,592	20,936,552	153,183	395,761,096	10.44	294,506,141	7.73
1868	229,915,088	123,246,649	25,775,503	140,424,046	23,782,387	169,643	357,436,440	9.33	281,952,899	7.29
1869	190,436,255	78,501,991	20,000,758	130,694,243	28,476,622	187,963	417,536,379	10.45	286,117,667	7.29
1870	164,421,507	57,655,675	21,780,230	124,235,498	28,240,202	198,686	435,958,408	11.03	392,771,768	9.77
1871	157,583,828	35,799,592	19,431,027	125,576,593	34,443,895	207,495	520,223,684	12.65	442,320,178	10.83
1872	153,201,836	35,372,157	21,249,810	117,357,840	23,533,403	232,299	623,565,077	13.80	444,177,566	10.55
1873	180,488,637	46,323,128	23,526,257	104,750,688	29,359,427	238,411	642,133,210	15.91	522,479,922	12.12
1874	194,118,985	42,313,237	30,932,587	107,119,815	29,038,415	236,241	557,403,242	13.26	586,233,040	13.31
1875	171,529,848	41,120,646	21,497,626	103,033,545	29,453,216	234,821	533,035,436	11.97	513,442,711	11.36
1876	164,857,813	38,070,889	18,963,310	100,243,271	28,257,366	232,137	490,741,190	10.29	540,384,671	11.64
1877	144,209,993	37,082,738	14,959,995	97,124,512	27,963,752	232,104	451,823,126	9.49	602,475,222	12.72
1878	134,463,452	32,154,148	17,365,301	102,500,875	27,137,019	223,698	437,051,532	9.21	694,865,769	14.30
1879	161,619,935	40,425,661	15,125,127	105,327,949	35,121,452	242,755	445,777,775	8.99	710,439,441	14.29
1880	169,060,082	38,116,916	13,596,985	95,757,575	56,777,174	250,802	667,954,746	12.51	835,683,658	16.43
1881	177,142,838	40,466,461	15,686,672	85,508,741	59,059,230	268,830	642,064,628	12.68	902,377,348	17.23
1882	186,904,233	43,570,494	15,032,046	71,077,307	61,345,154	285,697	724,639,574	13.46	750,542,257	13.97
1883	206,248,006	48,911,383	15,283,437	59,160,131	66,012,574	303,658	723,180,914	13.05	823,839,402	14.98
1884	189,547,866	39,429,603	17,232,601	54,578,378	55,429,228	324,756	667,697,638	12.16	740,513,003	13.20
1885	208,840,679	42,670,578	16,021,080	51,386,256	56,102,267	345,125	577,527,329	10.32	742,189,755	12.94
1886	191,902,993	34,324,153	13,907,888	50,580,146	63,404,864	365,783	635,436,136	10.89	679,524,890	11.60
1887	220,190,903	38,561,026	15,141,127	47,741,577	75,029,102	406,007	692,319,708	11.65	716,183,211	11.98
1888	214,938,951	38,522,436	16,926,438	44,715,007	80,288,500	452,557	723,957,114	11.88	695,954,507	11.40
1889	240,965,131	44,435,271	21,378,809	41,001,484	87,624,779	489,725	745,131,652	12.10	742,401,375	11.92
1890	261,637,203	44,582,838	22,006,206	36,099,284	106,936,855	537,944	789,310,400	12.55	857,828,654	13.50
1891	317,825,549	48,720,065	23,113,896	37,547,135	124,415,951	676,160	844,916,196	13.28	884,480,810	13.66
1892	321,645,214	46,895,456	29,174,139	23,378,116	134,588,663	876,068	827,402,462	12.50	1,090,278,148	15.61
1893	356,213,562	49,641,773	30,136,084	27,294,392	159,357,558	969,012	866,400,922	12.73	847,665,194	12.98
1894	339,683,874	54,567,930	31,701,294	27,841,406	141,177,285	969,544	654,694,622	9.41	892,140,572	12.85
1895	325,217,268	51,804,579	28,797,796	30,978,030	141,305,229	970,524	731,969,965	10.61	807,538,155	11.51
1896	316,794,417	50,830,921	27,147,732	35,385,023	139,434,001	970,678	779,724,674	10.81	882,603,538	12.29
1897	327,983,049	43,950,288	34,561,546	37,791,110	141,053,165	976,014	764,730,412	11.02	1,050,933,556	14.42
1898	405,783,527	91,992,000	58,823,104	37,535,050	147,452,369	963,714	616,049,654	8.05	1,231,482,330	16.59
1899	565,175,255	229,841,254	63,942,985	39,893,925	139,394,929	991,519	697,148,489	9.22	1,227,023,202	16.20
1900	447,553,458	134,774,768	55,953,078	40,160,333	140,877,316	993,529	849,941,184	10.88	1,394,483,082	17.90
1901	477,624,374	144,615,697	60,506,978	32,342,979	139,323,622	997,735	823,172,165	10.58	1,487,764,991	18.81
1902	442,082,813	112,272,216	67,803,128	29,108,045	138,488,530	999,446	903,320,948	11.43	1,381,719,401	17.49

^a "Net ordinary receipts" include receipts from customs, internal revenue, direct tax, public lands, and "miscellaneous," but do not include receipts from loans, premiums, or Treasury notes, or revenues of Post-Office Department.

^b "Net ordinary expenses" include expenditures for War, Navy, Indians, pensions, and "miscellaneous," but do not include payments for interest, premiums, or principal of public debt, or expenditures for postal service.

^c Based on total imports prior to 1866, after that on imports for consumption only.

^d Based on total exports prior to 1866,

Mr. TELLER. I have also a statement in relation to the Cuban finances taken from the message of President Palma to the Cuban Congress, November 1, 1902. I ask that that also may be inserted. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The statement referred to by the Senator will be printed in the RECORD in the absence of objection.

The paper referred to is as follows:

CUBAN FINANCES.

[Extracts from President T. Estrada Palma's message to the Cuban Congress, November 1, 1902.]

I fulfill with true satisfaction the duty imposed upon me under section 5 of article 68 of the constitution in presenting to Congress the project of the general budget of the nation for the fiscal year of 1903. * * *

In the project which I have the honor to submit to Congress the endeavor has been to establish the greatest economy in accord with the manifestations which I made in my programme of the 7th of September, 1901, in which I expressed the necessity of organizing the Republic as modestly as was possible, so as to avoid difficulties and embarrassments for lack of foresight, for which reason we should carefully combine the organization of the public services, as well as their allowances of funds, adjusting them to the capacity of the island in the matter of income, and resting upon actual data and never upon flattering hopes.

As a consequence of that purpose the expenses have been limited to the necessities which are a charge upon the State in conformity with the laws and provisions regulating the public services and in accordance with one of the clauses of the appendix of our constitution in what relates to the land and marine sanitary service.

The general summary of the project is as follows:

REVENUES.	
Customs.....	\$14,781,000.00
Tax on beverages.....	1,200,000.00
Consular fees.....	250,000.00
Internal revenue.....	500,000.00
Communications (posts and telegraphs).....	420,000.00
Properties and dues of the State.....	119,800.00
Various sources.....	243,200.00
Total.....	17,514,000.00
EXPENSES.	
Legislature.....	413,319.68
Executive:	
Presidency.....	85,700.00
Department of state and justice.....	310,396.00
Department of government.....	4,529,998.00
Department of finance.....	1,801,117.88
Department of public instruction.....	3,721,790.84
Department of public works.....	2,923,011.82
Department of agriculture, industry, and commerce.....	165,319.50
Total.....	13,537,334.04
Judiciary.....	949,314.00
Grand total.....	14,899,967.72
Surplus.....	2,614,032.28

Deducting from \$14,899,967.72 the amount of the expenses in the accompanying project the amount of the services newly created—i. e., Congress, the Presidency, the consular corps, and the increase of the rural guard—amounting to \$1,457,947.68; also the amount of the contracts entered into by the military government, which the actual Government has to carry out, aggregating \$1,085,271.38, it would result that the expenses for the services before established would amount only to \$12,356,748.66, or \$7,157,855.21 less than the sum of the disbursements in the past fiscal year of 1901 to 1902, without making any reduction in the services of sanitation and charities and others of not less importance. These sums compared with those of the last three years present the following results:

Year.	Income.	Expenses.	Surplus.	Deficit.
1899 to 1900 ^a	\$17,385,905.80	\$15,601,453.06	\$1,694,452.74	
1900 to 1901 ^a	17,154,329.28	17,644,991.81		\$490,662.53
1901 to 1902 ^b	18,791,473.21	19,514,603.87		723,130.66
1903 ^c	17,514,000.00	14,899,967.72	2,614,032.28	

^a Data from the report of the Secretary of War of the United States of America.

^b Data from the report of the general treasurer of the island.

^c Estimated.

Mr. TELLER. I have another statement here which I do not desire to put in the RECORD at this time, but I wish to call the attention of the Senate to it. It is a statement made from the Willett & Gray publication of New York. A careful examination of this statement shows that in eight months there was received by independent purchasers of sugar from the world 128,124 tons, and that the refiners of sugar received 1,084,494 tons. I simply want to show that sugar is practically bought and consumed by the refiners. Though bought by the importer, it must ultimately go to the refiner, because there is no other way for the importer to dispose of the sugar. It is barely possible that some small part of that might have been refined sugar and might have been sold on the market.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, I did not intend to participate further in this discussion, but a thought occurred to me in listening to that part of the very able and exhaustive speech of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] where he referred to the dangers that would come to this country from the productive power of the island of Cuba.

We have heard in this debate that Cuba might raise citrus fruits and tropical fruits and vegetables to an extent that would seriously interfere with our Southern States, especially Florida, and with California. We have heard also from the Senator from Texas that Cuba might become a factor in the raising of cotton to such an extent as to affect materially the Southern planters who are engaged in the production of cotton.

It has been stated repeatedly here by Senators from many States that Cuba would raise sufficient sugar to swamp the cane-sugar and beet-sugar interests of the United States.

We heard also this afternoon that Cuba has the capacity to support, and will probably support, a sufficient number of cattle to render the raising of cattle by the States and Territories now engaged in that business an unprofitable occupation. If all this be true, then Cuba is the most remarkable country on the face of the globe.

Cuba has 44,000 square miles, and twenty-nine States of the American Union have from a half to three times as many square miles. New York has 47,620 square miles; Pennsylvania has more square miles than Cuba, and so have North Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. All the Northwestern States have one-third to one-half, and two of them twice as many more square miles; and Texas, which is to suffer so severely in her cotton and in her cattle production by what Cuba may do under the stimulus of this tariff, has 262,290 square miles, as against 44,000 square miles for Cuba.

Sir, it seems to me that if all these predictions can be realized, then in the 44,000 square miles of Cuba is to be a production of cotton, of cattle, of sugar, of cereals, and of citrus fruits which will wipe out of existence about 2,000,000 square miles in the United States.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I made the statement the other day that Cuba would produce sugar enough practically to supply the world's consumption. In the official statement of the Government of the United States the amount of sugar raised this year is put down, in the different publications, all the way from 1,130,000 tons to 1,250,000 tons—I do not know which is right—and the statement is that that quantity of sugar is raised on from 400,000 to 450,000 acres. The statement is also made by the Government that there are 5,000,000 acres more of just as good sugar land as the land now being cultivated with sugar. The Government also in this statement, from which the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] read and which I have not had time to look up because I did not think this question was coming up here again, asserts that Cuba can raise 6,000,000 tons of sugar. There are about 10,000,000 tons raised in the world. So that, Mr. President, I do not think the statement as to the amount of sugar is exaggerated, because if you take the 5,000,000 acres of additional land in Cuba which are adapted to the cultivation of sugar, and estimate the sugar that they would produce in proportion to the quantity produced on the 450,000 acres now used for sugar cultivation, the total amount would almost equal the present world's product.

What the Senator from New York said about cattle is undoubtedly true. Since the war Cuba has bought nearly a million cattle. She did not buy very many of them from the United States; she bought most of them from South America, because the cattle from that country are especially adapted to the Cuban climate and are healthier than the cattle that went from the United States, although, of course, cattle may be imported from the United States into Cuba. Before the war Cuba had something over two and a half million head of cattle, and, as the Senator said, they had a large number of horses also; I do not remember how many. They had raised cattle under very serious embarrassments, because Spain did not intend that they should raise cattle, for cattle could not very well be exported to Spain, and Spain intended to confine the products of Cuba practically to sugar and tobacco.

The Senator speaks about citrus fruits. If anybody will go to Cuba he will find what I found down there. I found the orange growing wild in the woods. In Florida I also found oranges growing wild in the woods, but they are not edible oranges. They are not poisonous, but they are not pleasant to the taste, because they are bitter. But in Cuba oranges grow wild and are sweet. They have not been cultivated in the island for many years because of the same difficulty, the treatment of Spain, and probably because of the high duty imposed by this country on the importation of oranges. Cuban oranges are not as good as the California oranges, which have been cultivated for many years; but I was told in Cuba that by grafting the California orange upon the wild orange they would be able in five years at least to produce a very great number of oranges. It is not out of reason, Mr. President, to say that the reduction of the tariff will stimulate orange growing in Cuba, and I believe that they can compete with California to-day, with the present tariff, if they choose to do so. I have been in California and have there seen oranges

raised. I went into an orange grove in California where I found gas pipes extending all over the orange orchards, and they were prepared to light the gas whenever frost was likely to come. They frequently lose their groves in California because of frost, but there never has been any frost known in the island of Cuba, so far as I know.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, the point I was making is simply this: It was addressed to the alarming speeches as to what will occur from the productive power of the island of Cuba. Here is a territory which has nearly 4,000 less square miles than the State of New York, and yet the assertion is gravely made by Senators that this territory, which is so much less in area than New York, can impair, if not ruin, the productive industries in four or five great lines of States, each of which is from one to three times as large as the island of Cuba and possesses soil, climate, and every quality necessary to competition in the line of its production. It seems to me to be a reductio ad absurdum.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I observed in the speech of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]—and I have looked it up to see if I was correct about it—some remarks he made in regard to Chinese labor in which I think he must have overlooked the facts as they are. The Senator from Colorado said:

As it stands to-day Cuba may import Chinamen or Japanese or any other Asiatic servile labor that they see fit in any numbers they may wish.

Under the military government of the United States our laws excluding the Chinese were put in force—in fact, were enacted there under that government, and have been adopted by the present Government of Cuba. In other words, our laws about the Chinese are in force in the island to-day—

Mr. TELLER. I think differently.

Mr. LODGE. Unless they have been repealed very lately.

Mr. TELLER. I think not. I want to show the Senator that Chinamen are now going into Cuba, if I can turn to the matter—

Mr. LODGE. I made some inquiry in regard to it, and I will show the Senator the law in a moment. I have sent for it.

Mr. TELLER. I knew that was the law, but I find the statement here that some Chinamen have gone there this year.

Mr. LODGE. Under our law some Chinamen may come into the United States.

Mr. TELLER. I do not believe that law is in force in Cuba.

Mr. LODGE. Our law was adopted there. The only information I was able to get—and I will say that I might have got it in greater detail, but I have not had the time—was from the Cuban minister, who informed me that the law of Cuba to-day is exactly the same as our law about the exclusion of the Chinese; that it had not been changed in any way, and that no Chinese labor could be imported. That is my authority for making the statement, and I assume that the Cuban minister knew about the action of his own Government.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I can not say as to that, but I find that some Chinamen are coming in. There are some Chinamen there now in large numbers—20,000 of them.

Mr. LODGE. There were Chinamen there before, but the Cuban minister told me that no Chinese labor could be imported, for the Cuban law on that subject is the same as our law.

Mr. TELLER. I want to say that I got this information from a gentleman who came from Cuba during the last month. I may be mistaken.

Mr. LODGE. I have given the Senator my authority.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] naturally thinks the State of New York is the greatest State in the Union because it has the greatest population. Having been born, brought up, and educated there, I do not wish to say anything to disparage that claim, but I think the Senator understands the difference between a tropical climate and its production and a temperate climate and its production. A good deal, at least, of the State of New York is not yet cultivated, and probably never will be. The document which I hold in my hand, published by the Government of the United States, and which, I suppose, is not intended to misrepresent the possibilities of Cuba, declares that Cuba is capable of supporting a population of 15,000,000. I do not imagine the Senator from New York will claim that the State of New York can support 15,000,000, for she can not support now the population she has of 7,000,000 and over without the assistance of our Western States in furnishing her with food. She buys a good part of the food we raise in the West—meat, flour, and all sorts of food products.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] has been spoken of as desiring to speak to-day, I wish to say that I am informed by that Senator that he is not now prepared to speak, and will not be until to-morrow. If there is no other Senator desiring to speak, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the con-

sideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 15, 1903, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 14, 1903.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Fred Butler, of Colorado, to be receiver of public moneys at Leadville, Colo., his term having expired April 21, 1903. (Reappointment.)

Daniel J. Foley, of Eureka, Cal., to be receiver of public moneys at Eureka, Cal., vice James F. Thompson, removed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John A. Thornton, of Louisiana, to be collector of customs for the district of Teche, in the State of Louisiana. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS.

ALASKA.

William B. Sampson to be postmaster at Skagway, Alaska, in place of William B. Sampson. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

CONNECTICUT.

Edmund E. Crowe to be postmaster at South Norwalk, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in place of Edmund E. Crowe. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

George E. Scofield to be postmaster at Greenwich, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in place of George E. Scofield. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

Rufus H. Seymour to be postmaster at Ridgefield, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in place of William C. Barhite. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

IDAHO.

George E. Hovey to be postmaster at Burke, in the county of Shoshone and State of Idaho, in place of Arthur C. Cogswell, resigned.

ILLINOIS.

William E. Cummings to be postmaster at Highwood, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois, in place of William E. Cummings. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

Thomas S. Green to be postmaster at Gardner, in the county of Grundy and State of Illinois, in place of Thomas S. Green. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

William Hawley to be postmaster at Dundee, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois, in place of Chauncey H. Parmely. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

David Herriott to be postmaster at Morgan Park, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, in place of David Herriott. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1903.

Horace H. Peaslee to be postmaster at Naperville, in the county of Du Page and State of Illinois, in place of Samuel Mather. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Richard R. Puffer to be postmaster at Odell, in the county of Livingston and State of Illinois, in place of Richard R. Puffer. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Harry E. Spear to be postmaster at Polo, in the county of Ogle and State of Illinois, in place of Harry E. Spear. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

INDIANA.

John C. Row to be postmaster at Osgood, in the county of Ripley and State of Indiana, in place of John C. Row. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

IOWA.

Cornelius C. Platter to be postmaster at Red Oak, in the county of Montgomery and State of Iowa, in place of Cornelius C. Platter. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

Charles A. Reynolds to be postmaster at Harlan, in the county of Shelby and State of Iowa, in place of Charles W. Rhinesmith. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Lovett E. Sherwood to be postmaster at Shellrock, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa, in place of Lovett E. Sherwood. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

KANSAS.

Joseph S. Stone to be postmaster at Burrton, in the county of Harvey and State of Kansas, in place of Joseph S. Stone. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

KENTUCKY.

Thomas Boggess, jr., to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Boyd and State of Kentucky, in place of Thomas Boggess, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1903.

George W. Hutcheson to be postmaster at Lawrenceburg, in the county of Anderson and State of Kentucky, in place of George W. Hutcheson. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1903.

Ethel E. Johnson to be postmaster at Vanceburg, in the county of Lewis and State of Kentucky, in place of Ethel E. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1903.

Will P. Scott to be postmaster at Dawsonsprings, in the county of Hopkins and State of Kentucky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1903.

MICHIGAN.

Charles H. Baird to be postmaster at Holly, in the county of Oakland and State of Michigan, in place of Charles H. Baird. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Charles A. Cline to be postmaster at West Branch, in the county of Ogemaw and State of Michigan, in place of Charles A. Cline. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Archibald K. Dougherty to be postmaster at Elk Rapids, in the county of Antrim and State of Michigan, in place of Archibald K. Dougherty. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

Loren A. Sherman to be postmaster at Port Huron, in the county of St. Clair and State of Michigan, in place of Loren A. Sherman. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Hamilton A. Macklem to be postmaster at Marlette, in the county of Sanilac and State of Michigan, in place of George Weyer. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

William McGillivray to be postmaster at Oscoda, in the county of Iosco and State of Michigan, in place of William McGillivray. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Gerrit Van Schelven to be postmaster at Holland, in the county of Ottawa and State of Michigan, in place of Gerrit Van Schelven. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

MINNESOTA.

Charles W. Paige to be postmaster at Dawson, in the county of Lac qui Parle and State of Minnesota, in place of Charles W. Paige. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

Raleigh M. Pope to be postmaster at Mora, in the county of Kanabec and State of Minnesota, in place of Newlon H. Danforth, resigned.

Charles F. Searle to be postmaster at Milaca, in the county of Millelacs and State of Minnesota, in place of Charles F. Searle. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

MISSISSIPPI.

Irene F. Elliott to be postmaster at Okolona, in the county of Chickasaw and State of Mississippi, in place of Irene F. Elliott. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

John R. Matthews to be postmaster at Wesson, in the county of Copiah and State of Mississippi, in place of John R. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

MISSOURI.

J. W. S. Dillon to be postmaster at Grant City, in the county of Worth and State of Missouri, in place of Jerry F. Okey, resigned.

MONTANA.

Lawrence Hauck to be postmaster at Philipsburg, in the county of Granite and State of Montana, in place of Lawrence Hauck. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Lewis W. Davis to be postmaster at East Jaffrey, in the county of Cheshire and State of New Hampshire, in place of Lewis W. Davis. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

NEW YORK.

Stephen P. Barker to be postmaster at Richfield Springs, in the county of Otsego and State of New York, in place of Stephen P. Barker. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

George T. Eveland to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Delaware and State of New York, in place of George T. Eveland. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

Alonzo E. Hadley to be postmaster at Springville, in the county of Erie and State of New York, in place of Alonzo E. Hadley. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Charles C. Johnson to be postmaster at Antwerp, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York, in place of Charles C. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Elbert E. Makepeace to be postmaster at Alexandria Bay, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York, in place of Elbert E. Makepeace. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Aloysius McArdle to be postmaster at Victorhill (late West Seneca), in the county of Erie and State of New York, in place of Aloysius McArdle. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Lillian I. Pearsall to be postmaster at Sea Cliff, in the county of Nassau and State of New York, in place of Lillian I. Pearsall. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

Willard F. Sherwood to be postmaster at Hornellsville, in the county of Steuben and State of New York, in place of Willard F. Sherwood. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Orlando W. Sutton to be postmaster at Bath, in the county of Steuben and State of New York, in place of Orlando W. Sutton. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

OHIO.

Chandler W. Carroll to be postmaster at St. Clairsville, in the county of Belmont and State of Ohio, in place of Chandler W. Carroll. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

Andrew J. Heinlein to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Belmont and State of Ohio, in place of Andrew J. Heinlein. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

Robert C. Stewart to be postmaster at Toronto, in the county of Jefferson and State of Ohio, in place of Martin B. Edwards, jr. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

OKLAHOMA.

Elta H. Jayne to be postmaster at Edmond, in the county of Oklahoma and Territory of Oklahoma, in place of Elta H. Jayne. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Thomas J. Palmer to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Grant and Territory of Oklahoma, in place of Thomas J. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

William T. Ellis to be postmaster at Salem, in the county of McCook and State of South Dakota, in place of William T. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

O. H. La Craft to be postmaster at Clark, in the county of Clark and State of South Dakota, in place of George G. Jennings. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

TENNESSEE.

William O. Douglas to be postmaster at Jellico, in the county of Campbell and State of Tennessee, in place of William O. Douglas. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1903.

TEXAS.

Henry T. Vaughan to be postmaster at Mart, in the county of McLennan and State of Texas. Office became Presidential October 1, 1903.

VERMONT.

Martha W. Arnold to be postmaster at Bethel, in the county of Windsor and State of Vermont, in place of Martha W. Arnold. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

Henry G. Blanchard to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Orleans and State of Vermont, in place of Henry G. Blanchard. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

VIRGINIA.

S. W. Tardy to be postmaster at Buenavista, in the county of Rockbridge and State of Virginia, in place of Joseph W. Waddy, removed.

WEST VIRGINIA.

William H. Glover to be postmaster at Terra Alta, in the county of Preston and State of West Virginia, in place of William H. Glover. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

WISCONSIN.

John F. Gillmore to be postmaster at Durand, in the county of Pepin and State of Wisconsin, in place of John F. Gillmore. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

William H. Dobson to be postmaster at Newcastle, in the county of Weston and State of Wyoming, in place of Elmer E. Waite. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 14, 1903.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles M. Moses, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Portland and Falmouth, in the State of Maine.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

Henry T. Sutherland to be postmaster at Sterling, in the county of Logan and State of Colorado.

Edward L. Trounstone to be postmaster at Walsenburg, in the county of Huerfano and State of Colorado.

Charles T. Wade to be postmaster at Buena Vista, in the county of Chaffee and State of Colorado.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

Frederick W. Galer to be postmaster at Nowata, in the Cherokee Nation, Indian Territory.

IOWA.

Simon D. Breuning to be postmaster at Ackley, in the county of Hardin and State of Iowa.

Charles F. Le Compte to be postmaster at Corydon, in the county of Wayne and State of Iowa.

Edward Madigan to be postmaster at Clarksville, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa.

Edward A. Snyder to be postmaster at Cedar Falls, in the county of Blackhawk and State of Iowa.

Benjamin C. Wise to be postmaster at Cascade, in the county of Dubuque and State of Iowa.

KANSAS.

Harry C. Achenbach to be postmaster at Clay Center, in the county of Clay and State of Kansas.

Jacob B. Boyer to be postmaster at Baxter Springs, in the county of Cherokee and State of Kansas.

Henry W. Conrad to be postmaster at Independence, in the county of Montgomery and State of Kansas.

Robert T. Jellison to be postmaster at Belleville, in the county of Republic and State of Kansas.

A. L. Utterback to be postmaster at Caney, in the county of Montgomery and State of Kansas.

MARYLAND.

M. W. Thomas to be postmaster at Chestertown, in the county of Kent and State of Maryland.

MICHIGAN.

Burton F. Browne to be postmaster at Harbor Beach, in the county of Huron and State of Michigan.

William P. Stiles to be postmaster at Coopersville, in the county of Ottawa and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

Justin Berkin to be postmaster at Morris, in the county of Stevens and State of Minnesota.

Frank Dillingham to be postmaster at Granite Falls, in the county of Yellow Medicine and State of Minnesota.

John Frisch to be postmaster at St. Charles, in the county of Winona and State of Minnesota.

Mons Hauge to be postmaster at Benson, in the county of Swift and State of Minnesota.

Eilert Koefod to be postmaster at Glenwood, in the county of Pope and State of Minnesota.

Fred E. Wheeler to be postmaster at Appleton, in the county of Swift and State of Minnesota.

MISSOURI.

Charles Casper to be postmaster at Belton, in the county of Cass and State of Missouri.

William J. Godt to be postmaster at New Haven, in the county of Franklin and State of Missouri.

VERMONT.

Harlow C. Ayer to be postmaster at Richford, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont.

Henry J. Fisher to be postmaster at Morrisville, in the county of Lamoille and State of Vermont.

Charles E. Hall to be postmaster at Swanton, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont.

Edward J. Tyler to be postmaster at Enosburg Falls, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont.

WISCONSIN.

Wilbur H. Bridgman to be postmaster at Stanley, in the county of Chippewa and State of Wisconsin.

Emile C. Duval to be postmaster at West De Pere, in the county of Brown and State of Wisconsin.

August J. Seeman to be postmaster at Boscobel, in the county of Grant and State of Wisconsin.

George W. Burchard to be postmaster at Fort Atkinson, in the county of Jefferson and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, December 14, 1903.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House and recess.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, December 19, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian January 4, 1904.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COMMUTATION OF RATIONS FOR MIDSHIPMEN.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provision under the heading "Supplies and Accounts," in the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1903, for "Provisions, Navy," shall not be so construed by the accounting officers of the Treasury as to deprive midshipmen on sea duty of the benefit of commuted rations as provided by section 1577 of the Revised Statutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to hear some statement relative to the matter.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I ask that the Clerk read the letter of the Secretary of the Navy.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 9, 1903.

SIR: For many years past annual provision has been made for the payment of all midshipmen (naval cadets) of commuted rations, to which they are entitled under section 1577 of the Revised Statutes, the appropriation for this purpose being made in naval appropriation acts under the heading "Supplies and Accounts," subheading "Provisions, Navy." In the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat., 679), for example, such appropriation was made in the following terms:

"For * * * commuted rations for officers on sea duty (other than commissioned officers of the line, Medical and Pay Corps, and chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief sailmakers, chief carpenters) and midshipmen * * * \$3,500,000."

In the corresponding provision in the current naval appropriation act, approved March 3, 1903 (32 Stat., 1180), however, a comma follows the words "chief carpenters," and the words "and midshipmen" were included within the marks of parenthesis; in view of which it has been held by the Comptroller of the Treasury that, so far as this act is concerned, midshipmen on sea duty can not be paid commutation of rations, having been placed with respect thereto on the same footing as the other classes of officers excepted from the benefit of the appropriation.

There is reason to believe that it was not the actual intention of Congress thus to deprive midshipmen on sea duty of commuted rations, but that the placing of the second mark of parenthesis after the word "midshipmen" was due to a typographical error. I therefore respectfully request that, for the purpose of remedying this apparent defect, there be embodied in the urgent deficiency bill the following provision, viz:

"The provision under the heading 'Supplies and accounts,' in the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1903, for 'Provisions, Navy,' shall not be so construed by the accounting officers of the Treasury as to deprive midshipmen on sea duty of the benefit of commuted rations as provided by section 1577 of the Revised Statutes."

For your information in connection with the consideration of this subject, I herewith inclose copies of the following papers, viz: Letter of the clerk to Naval Committee, House of Representatives, dated March 12, 1903, addressed to the Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts; letter of the Paymaster-General of the Navy, dated March 14, 1903, addressed to the Secretary of the Navy; letter of the Assistant Comptroller of the Treasury, dated April 20, 1903, addressed to the Secretary of the Navy, with indorsements thereon; letter of the Acting Secretary of the Navy, dated October 1, 1903, addressed to the Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

Very respectfully,

W. H. MOODY, Secretary.

Hon. JAMES A. HEMENWAY,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1903.

SIR: 1. In the naval appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1904, appropriation "Provisions, Navy," the first clause is as follows:

"For provisions and commuted rations for the seamen and marines, which commuted rations may be paid to caterers of messes, in cases of death or desertion, upon orders of the commanding officers, commuted rations for officers on sea duty (other than commissioned officers of the line, Medical and Pay Corps, and chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief sailmakers, chief carpenters, and midshipmen), and commuted rations stopped on account of sick in hospital and credited to the naval hospital fund."

2. This is identical with the estimate submitted and with the similar clause in the appropriation bill for the current year, except in the placing of the last of the two marks of parenthesis, namely:

"For provisions and commuted rations for the seamen and marines, which commuted rations may be paid to caterers of messes, in cases of death or desertion, upon orders of the commanding officer; commuted rations for officers on sea duty (other than commissioned officers of the line, Medical and Pay Corps and chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief sailmakers, chief carpenters) and midshipmen, and commuted rations stopped on account of sick in hospital and credited to the naval hospital fund."

3. The effect of the phraseology first quoted above is apparently to deprive midshipmen on sea duty of the commutation value of the ration. The House Naval Committee having shown no intention while the bill was under consideration and during the hearings to change the law in this respect, there is reason to suppose that the change in position of the second parenthetical mark is simply a typographical error.

4. The change having been made, however, the question of its effect is raised for consideration. Accordingly, attention is invited to the following:

Section 1577, Revised Statutes, provides that—
"Midshipmen and naval cadets in the Navy shall be entitled to one ration, or to commutation therefor."
and this has been the unvarying rule since the passage of the act. There would seem to be no doubt that under the section quoted midshipmen will be

entitled each to a ration in kind during the coming fiscal year, whether ashore or at sea, and also that all those not on sea duty will be entitled to commutation therefor; but the question remains with regard to the midshipmen on sea duty: Under the phraseology of the appropriation bill for 1904 are they deprived of the usual commutation for rations?

5. The attested official original of the bill on file in the State Department has been examined, and the bill as printed (copy inclosed) agrees therewith in regard to the appropriation now under discussion.

6. Reference to the Comptroller of the Treasury is suggested, with request for an early decision on the subject herein presented, in order that timely publication to the service at large may be made.

Respectfully,

A. S. KENNY,
Paymaster-General, United States Navy.

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, April 20, 1903.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

SIR: I have by your reference a letter to you from the Paymaster-General of the Navy of date March 14, 1903, with the accompanying papers, relating to the appropriation "Provisions, Navy," under the heading of "Supplies and accounts" contained in the naval appropriation act of March 3, 1903, making appropriations for the fiscal year 1904. My decision is requested as to whether said appropriation will be available for the payment of commuted rations to midshipmen on sea duty.

The particular provision of said act which gives rise to the question is as follows:

"For provisions and commuted rations for the seamen and marines * * * commuted rations for officers on sea duty (other than commissioned officers of the line, Medical and Pay Corps, and chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief sailmakers, chief carpenters, and midshipmen), and commuted rations stopped on account of sick in hospital and credited to naval hospital fund * * * ." (32 Stat., 1190.)

The act of July 1, 1902, making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes (32 Stat., 679), contains the following appropriation under the heading of "Supplies and accounts":

"For provisions and commuted rations for the seamen and marines * * * commuted rations for officers on sea duty (other than commissioned officers of the line, Medical and Pay Corps, and chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief sailmakers, chief carpenters) and midshipmen, and commuted rations stopped on account of sick in hospital and credited to the naval hospital fund * * * ."

It will be observed that in said act of July 1, 1902, the words "and midshipmen" are outside of and immediately follow the words included in the parentheses, while in the act of March 3, 1903, the words "and midshipmen" are included as part of the words inclosed in the parentheses, and there appears a comma between them and the words "chief carpenters," which immediately precede them; and it will be further observed that the act of March 3, 1903, is a later act than the act of July 1, 1902.

I am of opinion that the act of March 3, 1903, is not ambiguous and that the words therein employed expressed the will of Congress and must be permitted to perform their legitimate functions in the ascertainment of that will. Congress intended by the words used in the above provision of said act to place midshipmen with respect to commuted rations while on sea duty on the same footing, so far as said appropriation is concerned, with commissioned officers of the line, Medical and Pay Corps, and chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief sailmakers, and chief carpenters.

All papers transmitted by you are herewith returned.

Respectfully,

L. P. MITCHELL,
Assistant Comptroller.

[First indorsement.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT, April 22, 1903.

Referred to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts for its information, in connection with its letter (No. 70416) of the 14th ultimo, and return.

The Bureau will so prepare its estimates for the fiscal year 1904-5 as to give midshipmen commutation for the ration which they are at present allowed, but which, owing to the provisions of the act of March 3, 1903, they shall not, in the fiscal year 1903-4, have received, and will, upon the reassembling of Congress, prepare and submit for the consideration of the Department an estimate to be embraced in the urgent deficiency bill, giving them such ration for the fiscal year 1903-4.

MOODY, Secretary.
S. C. L.

[Second indorsement.]

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS, September 24, 1903.

1. Respectfully returned to the Department.
2. The Bureau's estimate for "Provisions, Navy," for the fiscal year 1904-5 has been prepared and submitted, as indicated in the first clause of paragraph 2 of the first indorsement. With reference to the current fiscal year, no additional appropriation is necessary, all that is required being that Congress shall correct, by resolution or a clause in one of the appropriation bills, either "deficiency" or "naval," the typographical error by which the words "and midshipmen" were included in the parenthetical clause of the appropriation act for the present year. It is therefore suggested that recommendation be made to the proper committees of Congress for a relief act in the manner indicated, to the effect that "the typographical error by which the words 'and midshipmen' were included in the parenthetical clause of the appropriation 'Provisions, Navy,' for the fiscal year 1904, act approved March 3, 1903, shall not be construed by the accounting officers of the Treasury so as to deprive midshipmen on sea duty of the benefit of commuted rations as provided by section 1577, Revised Statutes."

H. T. B. HARRIS,
Paymaster-General, United States Navy.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 1, 1903.

SIR: Receipt is acknowledged of the Bureau's indorsement (2d, 70416) of the 24th ultimo, in which it is suggested that the failure of midshipmen to receive commutation of rations under the current naval appropriation act be remedied, not by a deficiency appropriation, but by legislation to the effect that the accounting officers shall not, because of the typographical error under the head of "Provisions, Navy," in said act, whereby midshipmen were included among those not entitled to commutation of rations, so construe the act as to deprive midshipmen on sea duty of the benefit of commuted rations as provided by section 1577 of the Revised Statutes.

The suggestion of the Bureau is approved, and the Department will at the proper time make recommendation to Congress accordingly.

Very respectfully,

H. C. TAYLOR,
Acting Secretary.

The CHIEF OF THE
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1903.

SIR: In the examination of the naval appropriation act for 1904 I find on page 16 of public document No. 160, under the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, "Provisions, Navy," line 7 of the item, a parenthesis after the word "midshipmen." This parenthesis should be after the word "carpenters," line 6.

If you will examine the estimates you will find the provision submitted by the Department as I have herein indicated.

An error was made in printing, as I have examined the copy for the printer and find same as the Department estimates.

You will observe the effect of the language as now printed in that it would deprive the midshipmen of rations—a proposition that was neither considered by the committee nor Congress.

Kindly bring the matter before the proper officials in the near future so that the midshipmen may not suffer through an error.

Very respectfully,

FRED. B. WHITNEY.

Rear-Admiral A. S. KENNY,
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts,
Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, what is the proposition?

Mr. HEMENWAY. It is this: By a typographical error which occurred in the naval appropriation bill the midshipmen are cut out of commutation money, amounting to about a hundred dollars a year, which was evidently not intended to be done.

Mr. MADDOX. Does this provide for correcting that?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The allowance is authorized by law, and this provision cutting them out of it was a mistake. The boys need their money for Christmas.

Mr. MADDOX. I could not hear a word, there was so much confusion.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I should like to ask the gentleman what the change will be if the so-called error is eliminated? What difference is it with it in and with it out?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The money is provided and has been provided in the past. It is authorized by statute law. Simply by a typographical error they are cut out of it this year, and the reason for now coming in with this provision is because the urgent deficiency bill will not pass before the holidays and these boys will be left without their money for Christmas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HEMENWAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state to the House that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON], chairman of the Committee on Territories, represents to the Chair that it is desirable that the Delegate from Hawaii be appointed as a member of that committee. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KALANIANAOALE] will be appointed as a member of the Committee on Territories.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6758.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6758, being the bill making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VAN VOORHIS] is recognized.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the House is in Committee of the Whole considering the annual appropriations for the stipend which our Government gives to those men who sacrificed their limbs and their health in the service of their country that this Union might be preserved. I do not know whether it was this idea that suggested itself the other day to the gentleman from Arkansas, whose mind seemed to become very much agitated at what he termed as the secession of a State belonging to the country of Colombia, but he felt moved in the spirit to criticize the action of the Administration in control of

our Government, and more particularly that branch in control of its foreign affairs, for what he deemed to be a gross violation of propriety, both of conduct and international law.

The gentleman in the beginning of his remarks disavowed that he spoke for his party, and said that he spoke but in his individual capacity. It is difficult for the gentleman, as the ranking representative of the minority on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to disassociate himself from his party. He is its mouthpiece on such questions, and he can not help very well but speak for them. But it is emphasized in the fact that later in his remarks he distinctly said that he wished to acquit himself and his party. I wish to quote him correctly.

My purpose now is to acquit myself and my party of the wrongful act by which its attainment is sought to be accomplished.

Mr. Chairman, the acme of patriotism as recognized throughout the world, so far as the relation of one's country toward foreign nations, is, "My country, right or wrong;" and I submit that an individual or a party who undertakes to criticize the foreign negotiations or the conduct of his Government in that regard should be very sure of standing on solid ground in the criticism, and that they are not caviling at the conduct of their country for mere political advantage.

It is a fact greatly to be deplored that the composition of our Government seems to be such that domestic politics enters into the influence on its foreign policy. A nation whose intercourse with her sister states is liable to be changed or reversed in the course of four years is greatly hampered in her negotiations. There is lacking that promise of perpetuity in her contracts which other nations have a right to expect and which may make them halt in binding themselves perpetually to a compact which the former nation may, through a political revolution, be compelled to rescind. It is one of the few strong points in the imperial form of government that a foreign policy can be laid down and pursued without fear of interruption or change by domestic political interference. This is best illustrated in the foreign policy of Russia, who, come what hindrance may, pursues her set foreign policy with a steady persistence whose force finally becomes irresistible, and I commend it to the minority party of our country, be it of what political complexion it may in the future, that it is the part of wisdom to restrain political criticism and to follow that policy which seems to be the best for our country in its relations with the outside world.

More than that, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman admitted, and his party indorses the position, that the construction of the canal across the Isthmus is not only worthy of consummation but must be absolutely accomplished. Why, the very object, the very purpose that the gentleman and his party indorses is about being accomplished in the most expeditious, the most satisfactory way, owing to some change in the affairs, beyond reasonable hope of the greatest enthusiast. Not only are they not satisfied with the accomplishment of the main object, but, forsooth, they must criticize the way in which it is accomplished. It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that it is carrying criticism far beyond legitimate grounds in the conduct of our Administration, which represents the entire country in its relation to foreign countries.

I propose, Mr. Chairman, to look into some of the reasons that the gentlemen offers as to why this is dishonorable conduct. Surely that is strong language, and when he acquitted himself of its use he only did so against individuals, and said that he brought no charge against individuals of dishonorable conduct in the management of these affairs, but he did not withdraw the charge that the course of our Administration brought dishonor upon our Republic.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] advances two propositions: First, that in order to recognize the new Government in its de facto existence, it must absolutely have achieved its independence. On this ground the gentleman from Arkansas is entirely correct.

There can be no question but that the Republic of Panama had actually achieved its independence; no question as to the size of the territory or any question of duration of time comes into this question of international law. Panama had actually occupied the territory with the consent of its citizens. At Panama the Colombian soldiers actually joined with the insurrection in the establishment of the new Republic, and at Colon there were 450 troops, quite a sufficient force to put down any insurrection in that city, or even to meet the forces of the United States to maintain the power of the parent Government, to have shown if they meant to maintain their sovereignty over this portion of the territory; and what did they do? They got on a ship and calmly sailed away.

I will not refer to the methods so common in South American countries, which was a much more potent factor than any alleged act on the part of the United States. But we are informed that the general took away the snug little sum of \$8,000, and his troops refused to embark on the ship until he had divided with them.

That was the potent factor that took away these troops from Colon, and not any act or influence on the part of the United States Government.

Mr. Chairman, the second proposition of the gentleman was that there must be an undoubted ability on the part of the newly formed Republic to maintain independence. The gentleman will find no such maxim laid down by the writers of international law. He was obliged, in order to find authority for that statement, to go back to the insurrection of the Spanish provinces against their mother country of Spain. He cited somebody's messages and opinions of the statement of that period in control of our country.

Mr. Chairman, the situation at that time was entirely different from what it is now. The Republic of the United States was not then in a position to take a strong action in regard to that matter. It was a great question, which involved all the South American colonies, which had been in rebellion a long time. Spain still contended that she was endeavoring to put down the rebellion and reestablish her authority. Her forces did not march away and resign the territory to the peaceful occupation of the new republic. The situation was entirely different.

The gentleman and his party are not always up-to-date on public questions which come before this Congress or the nation at large for discussion. I have been very much hampered in my investigation of this subject, as I only returned to the city last Saturday and, unfortunately, the libraries of the State Department and the Congressional Library were closed, and I could not get access to the authorities; but in my hurried search this morning I came across two authorities, one of the most recent English authorities on international law, which says:

Independence should be so construed that it may be reasonably expected to be permanent; reasons of policy control, however—

That is from Hall, page 89, fourth edition, the latest authority on English international law. I will now quote from one of the most recent authorities, a name that stands preeminent, not only in military science, but also as a writer on constitutional and international law in our country—Major-General Halleck. He says (Vol. I, third edition, p. 84):

A question of policy and prudence only, which each State must determine for itself—the manner and recognition of new governments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if there ever was an occasion when the question of policy should be brought in it is surely in regard to the recognition of Panama. For centuries the idea has been in the mind of man to build a canal across the Isthmus to connect the great waterways of the Pacific and the Atlantic Ocean. For years our country has been desirous of accomplishing that end. For years the project has been delayed by various obstacles, both physical and international; by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and other causes which have prevented the consummation of that project. In the meantime the Panama company came in and obtained the right from Colombia to build the canal and undertook to do so, with the disastrous results that we all know.

Now, what has been the policy of our Government in regard to this question? The gentleman stated in his remarks that our Administration was open to criticism, because it was not acting in obedience to the law; that this House had passed unanimously a bill for the construction of a Nicaraguan canal and had sent it over to the Senate, where it had been changed so as to provide for a route via Panama. That statement, Mr. Chairman, needs some modification. It is true that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported to this House a bill for a canal by the Nicaragua route; but the gentleman entirely omitted the fact that after the bill was reported, and before the knowledge was brought to either the distinguished chairman of the committee or the committee itself, the French company, that had all along refused to name any price at which they would sell their canal, suddenly made the offer to sell, at the appraised value of our own Commission all the rights of that canal for \$40,000,000.

In the debate on that bill I submitted the proposition, which I supported by a few remarks, that it struck me it would be a business proposition that under these new conditions we should consider the offer of the French company.

An amendment was offered, for which 102 votes were cast, that it was the part of business prudence and wisdom to consider the offer of the French company. After that amendment was defeated, it is true, the bill passed here unanimously, for everybody was and has been in favor of a canal. The bill as passed by the House went to the Senate, with this notice from the House that the sentiment of the House was unanimous here as to the advisability of constructing a canal. The Senate took up the question and sent the bill back to the House amended, owing to the amended report of the Isthmian Canal Commission, who at once, when the conditions were changed, stated frankly that their report was made subject to the condition that the French would offer no price whatever; that, therefore, they had reported in favor of a Nicaraguan canal; but as soon as this offer was made

the Commission at once changed its opinion and reported to the United States Senate absolutely that physically, economically, from an engineering standpoint, and from almost every other standpoint—the shortness of the hours for passage, the reduced number of locks—that on almost every point the considerations were in favor of the Panama route. And for these reasons the Senate adopted that provision and returned the bill to the House, where it was passed.

Why, Mr. Chairman, some portions of the gentleman's speech sounded almost like an argument in favor of a Nicaraguan canal instead of the Panama route. But the Congress of the United States has determined that the route should be via Panama; and the President was given a reasonable time in order to carry that out.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman went on further to say that the Colombian Congress having repudiated the treaty the President was at once bound to proceed to construct a canal by the Nicaraguan route.

Mr. DINSMORE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. DINSMORE. The gentleman has stated that the President was given "reasonable time" in which to effect an agreement by which the canal should be built across the Panama route. I would like him to state to the House what the President was to do under the law in case of failure, after a "reasonable time," to effect that agreement with the Colombian Government. What, according to the provision of law, was the President required to do in that case?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I state frankly that it was provided that in case of a failure of the negotiations with Panama within a reasonable time the President was to proceed to build a canal by the way of Nicaragua. The very choice of the words, "a reasonable time"—and they were chosen after mature judgment—was for the purpose of putting the President in such a position that if the project of a Panama Canal should fail he should then be obliged to build a canal by way of Nicaragua. To that extent the language used in the law was imperative; the President was to have no option. But it was necessary that the President should exercise the greatest judgment and wisdom, so that when Colombia had rejected the treaty, and when at once a new opportunity arose for carrying out the mandate of Congress, the law should be carried out and the Panama route maintained. Conditions had changed; and I am glad to say the opportunity has so far improved that in the judgment of many, including myself, the President would have been criminally wrong if he had tried to evade the mandate of Congress and not construct this canal by the way of the Panama route.

Why, sir, in the minds of the enthusiasts for this canal the only point of dispute, the only question for serious consideration, was that Colombia professed that under her constitution she could not give the right of sovereignty to the strip of land over which the canal was to pass. And here, unexpectedly, owing to the changed conditions by the establishment of this new Republic breaking away from Colombia, we had the opportunity longed for in our fondest hopes of getting the absolute sovereign control of the land through which the canal is to pass.

Why, Mr. Chairman, through all the negotiations and through all the projects in respect to this canal it has come about—nobody knows exactly how, but beyond the utmost expectations—that the conditions are far better and far superior, with the canal passing through this new Republic, with the strip of land entirely under our control, with sovereignty over and with the right to protect and fortify the two ends of the canal, than it would otherwise have been, and that we have gained more than we could possibly hope for.

The next criticism of the gentleman was as to the suddenness of the birth of the Republic of Panama. Mr. Chairman, we all have experiences in life as we go along in the public service, and it so chanced that I had one in regard to the birth of a republic. Why, sir, the suddenness of the birth of the Republic of Brazil is to be counted by hours as against days which were consumed during the birth of the Republic of Panama. The birth of the Republic of Brazil happened in this way, and I shall recite to the House the incidents as they occurred. One day at about 1 o'clock I saw the Emperor, Dom Pedro, drive in his carriage to the station at Petropolis to go down to Rio Janeiro, for there had been some reports of disturbances there. When we received the afternoon papers that evening the Republic was established, the Government installed, the cabinet named, and the Emperor a prisoner in the royal palace.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the gentleman think that we want to follow the example of Brazil or any of those South American countries that we have been taking care of and protecting by virtue of the Monroe doctrine for nearly a century?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Why, we can not follow the example of Brazil—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. We can follow the example of Satan or anyone else at any time.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. We could not follow the example of Brazil, for Brazil was following the example of the Republic of the United States in throwing off the monarchical form of government and entering into the family of republics of America, thereby wiping out the last vestige of royalty which existed on the Western Hemisphere. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman admit or deny that if we had not assisted them they could have achieved this so-called independence which he talks about?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I would only say to the gentleman—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Just answer the question yes or no. Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I will answer the gentleman. I will only say that I don't know whether he was in the Hall at the beginning of my remarks—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes, I was.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Then if he had been listening he would have heard that Panama needed no assistance from anybody. The recognized forces that were to enforce the sovereignty of the parent country sailed away. They made no attempt to enforce the power of Colombia over the new Republic. The soldiers in Panama joined the ranks. The soldiers at Colon sailed away and left the territory in undisputed possession of the new Government.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. They sailed away after our officers had voluntarily left their ships and taken their repeating guns and turned them on these forces which came up, and told them that if they did not leave they would be fired on immediately, and after that these men thanked our officers and men for voluntarily leaving their ships and doing what they did. In addition to that, Colonel Black, of the Navy, at the time the flag was raised, was accorded the honor and high privilege of first raising the flag of the new Republic of Panama.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee, with his usual patriotism, is paying the highest compliment to the marines of the United States that anybody could possibly pay.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do not lay it to the marines. They were ordered to do what they did.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Tennessee is very fond of making speeches, but he can not make them entirely in my time. As I said, the gentleman is paying the greatest compliment to the United States marines that could possibly be paid. I believe we had at the outset about 150 marines on shore, put there to protect American property, and I hope as long as this country sustains a navy that its men will be employed in that righteous occupation. Yet the gentleman means to say that the 150 marines, with their officers, intimidated 450 Colombian troops, with five brigadiers and three native major-generals, and I don't know how many more officers, informing them that they must leave their country or that they would be forced to do so. Why, the absurdity of the proposition is plain to everyone except the gentleman from Tennessee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to go back, we were viewing the Emperor of Brazil driving to the station with the purpose of going and possibly by his presence putting down the insurrection. As I said, when we received the evening papers of that day the Republic was actually in existence. That was on the 15th of November. I succeeded in getting a dispatch off to that great statesman James G. Blaine, reciting the facts that had taken place.

The cable was then closed against foreign communications. On the 17th I sent a dispatch to Mr. Blaine:

The imperial family sailed to-day. Government de facto with ministry established. Perfect order maintained. Important we acknowledge first.

On the 19th, as soon as the cable was opened, Mr. Blaine replied:

You may maintain diplomatic relations with the Provisional Government of Brazil.

I would like to call the attention of our Democratic friends in this connection to the reason why I stated that it was important that we recognize first. I felt it proper that the first Republic of our hemisphere should be the first to acknowledge the establishment of the new Republic. I wished to open trade relations with Brazil and get the good will of that country. We did get the good will of that people, and Mr. Blaine negotiated a reciprocity treaty with Brazil with 25 per cent reduction in the tariff in our favor, the like of which we will never get again with that country or with any other South American state. And I would remind gentlemen who in the recent debate have said on that side of the

Chamber that they supported the reciprocity treaty with Cuba because it was one step toward their favorite doctrine of free trade, the moment the Democratic party came into power Grover Cleveland repealed that treaty, and we will never get another one so favorable.

Therefore you can see why it was important to give prompt recognition to the new Government. So our Administration was justified in recognizing this new Republic of Panama, because the great canal for which this country is morally responsible to the world must be constructed. Here was an opening and a chance to do it, and our great, farseeing Secretary of State, who stands to-day the peer of any man engaged in the diplomatic service of the world, was too clever and too wise, too farseeing, not to take advantage of the occasion which enabled that little Republic to be the pathway for the construction of this canal, which is to change the commerce of the world, in which we have so great an interest.

The recent recognition of the Republic of Brazil is not the only example of the promptitude of our Government in such events. The provisional government of the new Republic of France was proclaimed on the morning of February 25, 1848, and recognized by Mr. Rush, the American minister, on the 28th, three days thereafter, and at the close of the Franco-Prussian war on the proclamation of the Republic by Gambetta on the 4th of September, Mr. Washburne, our minister at Paris, was authorized to recognize the Republic, and did so on September 6, on the second day. So anxious was our Government to recognize the provisional government that three cables were sent on the same day authorizing recognition if the new Government was "in possession and control," thus defining, so far as our country was concerned, the conditions for the legal and proper recognition of a new form of government.

The gentleman from Arkansas attempted to cast the imputation that our Government, in spite of its official denial, was aware of the proposed insurrection in Panama, if not having aided and abetted in its institution, and in proof of that allegation quoted the dispatch of Acting Secretary Loomis, dated November 3, which was as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 3, 1903.
(Sent 3.40 p. m.)

Uprising on Isthmus reported. Keep Department promptly and fully informed.

LOOMIS, Acting.

As it antedated a cable from our consul at Panama, Mr. Ehrman, as follows:

PANAMA, November 3, 1903.
(Received 8.15 p. m.)
Situation is critical.

No uprising yet. Reported will be in the night. Situation is critical.
EHRMAN.

The former dispatch was sent on receipt of the news brought by a representative of the Associated Press, who came to the State Department and announced an outbreak on the Isthmus of Panama, and anyone reading the dispatch of Mr. Loomis will readily see that it seeks information and does not convey it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to our policy toward Colombia when the treaty with that country was under consideration. Her whole course of conduct in regard to these negotiations has been shameful.

There is no other word to apply to it. When we began to negotiate and protocols were made with Nicaragua and Costa Rica, which we had to do in order to balance them against Colombia, seven millions was the price she asked for a right of way over the Isthmus of Panama. She then "bluffed" us up to \$10,000,000, and, with that liberality which characterizes our country, rather than keep the negotiations longer delayed we agreed to give the ten millions. The treaty was negotiated by her authorized agent and our President, confirmed by the Senate, and was sent to the Congress of Colombia for ratification.

Now comes in a very peculiar piece of history in regard to the negotiations for this canal. The Congress began to dicker and say that we should pay fifteen or twenty millions, then they began to dicker with the French company and say that they would never ratify the treaty unless the French company paid to Colombia a part of the forty millions the company was to get from us, and they went on quarreling among themselves; but that is no new feature with the Governments of our South American Republics when any money is to be paid. The first thing that is to be settled is as to which of the political parties is to control; and I am credibly informed that the politicians in Colombia were quarreling among themselves as to who was to handle this money; and, while doing so, they allowed the time to slip by until it was too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I wish the gentleman would yield me further time.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. I yield the gentleman fifteen minutes more time.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Now, Mr. Chairman, the proceedings in the institution of the Republic of Panama was a common thing in that region. If anyone will take the trouble to look into the various revolutions in the several states composing what was or used to be the Republic of New Granada, he will see a part of it became Venezuela, a part of it became Colombia, and the other part Costa Rica. But gentlemen who examine the history of those countries will see that Panama has been an unwilling member for many years.

The fact is that all of the revenues of the country of Colombia are gathered at the ports of Panama and Colon. The interior of Colombia, except the high grounds around Bogota, produce very little that adds to the wealth of the country. The result has been that all the money so raised in Panama was sent up to Bogota, and there Congress appropriated the money, not principally for the benefit of the Isthmus of Panama, where it was raised. On the contrary, there has been one long complaint in Panama that she did not receive her just proportion of the revenues which were raised in her ports. The supreme moment came when the construction of this canal was proposed. Everyone knows that if you take that canal away from Panama she is ruined. If you go to Nicaragua her revenues cease, her sale of supplies to passengers and traffic will be over, and she will sink down to that state from which she has a right to free herself if she can.

Panama watched with great interest the proceedings on the ratification of the canal treaty at Bogota, and she sent word distinctly and plainly to that Congress what she would do if that treaty was not ratified. It was in pursuance of that resolution of her people and that firm determination that she would not be treated in this way any longer by the central Government at Bogota, that when the treaty failed she rebelled, as she had a right to do, and set up an independent government. It was not so sudden as some of our friends have alleged. It was a long thought-out matter, and the best proof of that is that when the time came the people were ready, and the best proof that it was justified is that all her people, without exception, made the officers who represented the parent Government at Bogota join in the revolution, and only turned out the representatives of the parent Government who held the offices at Panama and Colon.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have gone over most of the ground. I have not been able to cite as many authorities as I would like for two reasons. Yesterday the libraries were closed, and I only returned to the city on Saturday afternoon. In conclusion, I wish to say that it is a dangerous thing to criticize any Republican Administration. Our party represents the spirit and progress and the advance of this Republic which, under its guidance, has been great throughout the past year. The gentlemen who represent the party on the other side of the Chamber seem to take great delight in obstruction. As I said in the opening part of my remarks, they can not even allow things to go through that they want themselves. They must say, "Oh, but you didn't do it in the right way."

But, Mr. Chairman, we have done it in the right way, under the guidance of a President who will take care of this country, who has guided it in the right way; and we have done it under the guidance of a Secretary of State who, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] said, learned his lesson at the feet of Lincoln, and who, with his great ability, has arisen from the office of private secretary of the President to be the secretary of the nation. [Applause.] So long as he is at the helm we need not meddle and try to find fault. He will guide us, as he has done, against all the ablest diplomats in Europe. [Applause on the Republican side.] He stands that high that not a power in Europe will take a step on any question that involves the whole relations of the world without first asking the opinion and advice and what will be the action of the Secretary of State.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican party will be maintained in power, and it will go on and construct this great waterway, and there will be no act in the Administration of Theodore Roosevelt that will cause in the future greater gratitude and greater renown to himself and his party than seizing this legitimate opportunity, within the strict limits of international law, to construct this great waterway that is going to unite the vast oceans whose trade will bear the products of the American people to the doors in the East, and will enable us to go on in that period of prosperity which has been instituted in recent years by the laws enacted by the Republican party. [Applause on the Republican side.] And, unless I am mistaken, Mr. Chairman, judging from the intelligence and patriotism of the American people, this prosperity of our country will be allowed to continue under the able leaders for future ages to come. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and leave to print a speech made by President Roosevelt on the proper attitude of our Government in international affairs.

There was no objection.

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AT ROCHELLE, ILL., JUNE 3, 1903.

MY FRIENDS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS, MEN, WOMEN, AND CHILDREN OF ROCHELLE: It is a real pleasure to be here to-day. I must say first, as ever, a word of special greeting to the veterans of the great war who have turned out to see me, then a word of greeting to the children. As you know, I believe in children, and as I like your stock and want to see it kept up, I want to say that I am pleased to see that the children seem all right in quality and in quantity. To them I have got just this one word to say: I believe in play and I believe in work. Play hard while you play, and when you work don't play at all. [Applause.] That is fairly good advice for the elders also.

It is always a fortunate thing when one is able to illustrate doctrine by example. Now, I am not in the habit of saying what I do not think, on the stump or off the stump, so you can take my words at face value when I congratulate the people in this district in having in public life the kind of public servant who raises immensely by his presence the tone of all public service—Congressman HITT. [Applause.] Congressman HITT has served for years at the head of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. That kind of service is indispensable to the nation; but it offers few chances of doing anything that will, particularly locally, attract the attention of the district; and sometimes I fear that the very fact that a man is of immense use in Congress to all the United States fails to get him quite the recognition that he should get from that portion of the United States which votes for him at elections. Therefore I want to thank you and congratulate you, the people of this district, for having had a standard of public service in your minds which has made you continue Mr. HITT in Congress. You have set a good example in the highest type of self-government to the rest of the nation.

In dealing with our foreign affairs my feeling is that we ought to act just about as we like to see a man act in private life. The man who brawls, who boasts, who threatens, who bullies, is always a disagreeable and usually a worthless member of a community; and if, in addition to boasting and threatening, when he is taken up he fails to make good, he becomes wholly contemptible. The man we like to see as a fellow-citizen is the man who does not brag or bully, who is quiet, but who holds his own, who is not going to permit himself to be insulted or wronged, is not going to wrong others, is not going to talk about wronging others, but is going to see that they do not wrong him. That is just the attitude that I wish always to see taken by America in international affairs. It is a poor thing to talk boastfully and insultingly of other nations. It does not do any good. It does harm. It is a poor thing, above all, to take a position from which we may have to recede. Let us always speak courteously of other powers, never insult them, but when we have made up our minds that a given policy is demanded by the interest and honor of the United States, say so and then make our words good by deeds. [Applause.] Don't you think that is middling good common sense? [Cries of "That is right!"] I want an adjunct to our foreign policy also. I want the United States Navy built up and kept built up. I think that foreign powers are inclined to deal fairly with us and to mean well by us, but I think it helps them out if we have a good navy. [Applause.]

The fact that a man behaves himself and is also able to hold his own is a good provocative of courtesy among others. Don't you think so? I think so. To quote a proverb that always appeals to me, that I have quoted before: "Speak softly and carry a big stick; you will go far." The United States Navy is Uncle Sam's big stick; and it behooves each one of us to see to it that there is no let up in the building and the keeping in fine shape of that Navy. I am not speaking for a navy for purposes of war; I am speaking for the Navy for the purpose of keeping the peace. The Navy is the surest guaranty against war. It is the best insurance in favor of peace; and, furthermore, if we have a thoroughly good navy then (what I earnestly hope shall not in our day happen) should there be a war we can rest assured that we will come out of it handing on to our children undimmed the flag whose luster shed such glory upon our fathers in the days of the civil war. [Cheers and applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I now yield one hour to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I wish to invoke the attention of this Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union while I discuss a means of relief I have proposed for the tobacco growers of the United States, to do which in the last Congress, March 22, 1903, I introduced a measure entitled "A bill for the relief of tobacco growers." H. R. 12909, but no action was taken thereon. In view of the fact that the evils that I undertook to remedy by this measure are still in existence, oppressing our tobacco growers, at the extra session of this Congress I introduced, November 19, 1903, the first and second sections of my former bill, hoping that by undertaking to cure a portion of these evils we may succeed during the present session of Congress in securing some remedial legislation "for the relief of tobacco growers."

The first section of my bill proposes to give "any person" the right of free, or unrestricted, trade in leaf tobacco; that is, trade in leaf tobacco without license or tax. As the law now is, as I shall show, the grower of tobacco can dispose of his tobacco in the leaf of his own growth, and none other, without tax or license; but the purchaser of such tobacco must pay a tax as a dealer or manufacturer.

This places the grower of tobacco at the mercy of his customer, who usually is a manufacturer, notably the tobacco trust, or his representative, or the exporter who is also in the tobacco trust, directly or indirectly.

The man to whom he sells the leaf tobacco, let that man be whom he may, whether an exporter or manufacturer of snuff, or tobacco, or cigarettes, or any other thing that we make out of tobacco, must pay a tax of 6 cents per pound or more.

The second section of this bill provides that the tobacco grower shall have a right without tax to stem or twist his tobacco. As the law now is the tobacco grower has not the right to stem or twist his tobacco, except for his own personal use, without paying 6 cents per pound. He can not even stem and twist it and give it away to his neighbors or to anybody else unless he pays this tax. He can only grow his tobacco and stem or twist it for his own private use without being taxed. If he does stem or twist or change the "natural condition" of the tobacco, except merely to cure it, he

becomes a manufacturer and is at once subjected to all its onerous conditions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order that the committee may hear literally the measure which I have introduced to cure these evils I ask the Clerk to read the bill I introduced November 19, 1903.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4482) for the relief of tobacco growers.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be lawful for any person to buy and sell tobacco unstemmed and in the leaf without license or the payment of any tax of any kind.

SEC. 2. That it shall be lawful for any grower of tobacco to sell his own product, or to deliver to another person any tobacco grown by himself to be by such person carried to market and sold for the benefit of the grower, any tobacco grown by such planter, in the hand or in the leaf, or stemmed, or stemmed and hand twisted, or stemmed and hand pressed, or hand twisted, or hand pressed, without license and without the payment of any tax of any kind: *Provided*, That such planter shall furnish to the person by whom he sends it to market or offers it for sale a written authorization for that particular transaction, specifying the number of pounds.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The purpose of the proviso at the end of this bill is simply to protect the producer of tobacco against its being stolen and sold. It is a police regulation to protect the farmer and, being self-operative, I think will greatly aid him in this way.

Mr. Chairman, there was considerable doubt amongst some Members of the last Congress with whom I discussed this bill as to what the law is as to this tax. Some who should have known better contended that this oppressive law had been repealed, which I denied not only in the House, in private conversation, but in my canvass for renomination for Congress. In view of this and the enormity of the evil in question, I concluded to address a letter on the subject to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Yerkes, asking him, categorically, certain questions, which that distinguished official promptly answered, clearly showing that my contention of the law was correct.

Omitting his argument, for the sake of brevity, I will read that portion of his letter containing my questions substantially and his answers thereto, as follows:

MR. YERKES'S LETTER.

WASHINGTON, March 12, 1903.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES,

Member of Congress, House of Representatives.

SIR: I have received your letters, dated 7th and 9th instant, respectively, presenting the following questions:

1. You ask, Did the Fifty-sixth or Fifty-seventh Congress relieve tobacco growers of taxes on tobacco raised by them; and if so, under what statute and section thereof?
2. Does the law tax—and if so, how much—tobacco growers when they stem or twist their tobacco for their own use or to sell the same?
3. Can tobacco growers stem or twist their tobacco for their own personal use without paying a tax?
4. Can tobacco growers stem or twist their tobacco for the purpose of giving it away without paying a tax?
5. You ask for the departmental or judicial definition of the term "dealer in tobacco."
6. You ask for the definition of the term "manufacturer of tobacco."
7. You ask whether a tobacco grower who stems or twists his tobacco grown on his own farm or purchased from a neighbor is a manufacturer, or, in other words, whether stemming or twisting tobacco is manufacturing.

Mr. Yerkes replies to these questions as follows:

From the foregoing premises, I [Mr. Yerkes] am constrained to answer your questions categorically, as follows:

1. That Congress has never imposed a tax on natural-leaf tobacco in the hands of farmers, but only upon leaf tobacco which they may have sold directly to consumers.
2. Under the present law a tax of 6 cents per pound is imposed upon all tobacco stemmed or twisted by a farmer not intended for his own personal use.
3. A farmer may stem and twist tobacco for his own use without incurring liability to tax on such tobacco.
4. Stemming or twisting tobacco is regarded as manufacturing, and a grower or planter can not lawfully stem or twist his tobacco for sale or for the purpose of giving it away without payment of tax. If he should engage in that business he would be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco and be required to qualify as such by registering with the collector of the district, filing statement and bond, and to pack, label, and stamp his product, as provided by regulations No. 8, pages 5 and 6.
5. "Every person whose business it is to sell or offer for sale manufactured tobacco, snuff, or cigars shall be regarded as a dealer in tobacco."
6. My answer to question 4 is an answer to question 7.
7. The term "manufacturer of tobacco" is defined in the first and second paragraphs of section 69, act of August 28, 1894, amending Revised Statutes, 324, which section 69 provides that—
"Every person whose business it is to manufacture tobacco or snuff for himself, or who employs others to manufacture tobacco or snuff, whether such manufacture be by cutting, pressing, grinding, crushing, or rubbing of any raw or leaf tobacco, or otherwise preparing raw or leaf tobacco, or manufactured or partially manufactured tobacco or snuff, or the putting up for use or consumption of scraps, waste, clippings, stems, or deposits of tobacco resulting from any process of handling tobacco, or by the working or preparation of leaf tobacco, tobacco stems, scraps, clippings, or waste, by sifting, twisting, screening, or any other process, shall be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco."

The second paragraph of that section provides that—

"Every person shall also be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco whose business it is to sell leaf tobacco in quantities less than a hoghead, case, or bale, or who sells directly to consumers, or to persons other than duly registered dealers in leaf tobacco or duly registered manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars, or to persons who purchase in packages for export; and all tobacco so sold by such persons shall be regarded as manufactured tobacco, and such manufactured tobacco shall be put up and prepared by such manufacturer in such packages only as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe: *Provided*, That farmers and growers of tobacco who sell leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising shall not be regarded as manufacturers of tobacco; and

so much of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and acts amendatory thereof, as are in conflict with this act are hereby repealed."

Commenting on these sections the Commissioner says:

In the first paragraph every person is regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco who in any manner prepares his leaf tobacco for consumption by crushing, twisting, stemming, grinding, or otherwise changing the tobacco from its natural condition.

In the second paragraph every person is regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco who sells and delivers his leaf tobacco in its natural condition to consumers, or to persons other than registered dealers in leaf tobacco, manufacturers of tobacco or cigars, or persons who buy leaf tobacco in packages for export; and all leaf tobacco so sold by such person is regarded as a manufactured tobacco subject to tax; but there is this exception, that farmers and growers are not to be regarded as manufacturers for selling leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising.

By even "changing the tobacco from its natural condition" (except by "curing" it in the usual way) the producer becomes a "manufacturer" and liable for a tax as a manufacturer.

Mr. Chairman, the first tax on cigars, chewing and smoking tobacco was levied in July, 1862, on cigarettes in 1864, and on dealers, manufacturers, and producers in 1868. You will all remember, particularly some of you gentlemen who are a little more gray-haired than I, that this internal-revenue tax on tobacco is a war tax.

Possibly the distinguished gentleman [Mr. HILL of Connecticut] now occupying the chair is perfectly familiar with these enactments. It will be remembered that Congress passed or undertook to pass in 1861 or 1862 a tax on both cotton and tobacco for the purpose of providing means for crushing the Confederate States. Out of that spirit of legislation, out of the desire, as it were, to crush the Confederacy and the civil war of forty years ago, this tax was first levied on tobacco, and that tax, gentlemen, has remained upon the statute books in different forms down to the present hour of this year of our Lord 1903.

We allow any person to shell his corn and sack it and take it to town and sell it, as I have done. We allow a man to gin his cotton and separate the seed from the cotton, take the cotton to town and sell it—seed and all. But we do not tax the man who shells or sacks his corn. We do not tax the cotton grower who gins and sells his cotton.

Why, in the name of heaven, is the tobacco man, the tobacco grower, required to pay the burdensome tax of 6 cents for stemming and twisting his tobacco to sell or give away, when to-day that same tobacco is selling in the leaf at 4 and 5 cents a pound?

Hence it is that the farmers in Tennessee and Kentucky and Virginia, North Carolina, Missouri, and, I dare say, the farmers of Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and New York, indeed throughout the United States, are crying out against such an unnecessary and oppressive law—a war tax in time of peace, if you please.

It is not simply a tax or a burden, but it has gotten to the point where the farmer must raise something else, if he can, in his tobacco fields, because he can not raise 4-cent tobacco and sell it in the leaf or twist it and pay 6 cents tax on it and make a living. There is this much about the tobacco soil, and my handsome, able, and eloquent friend from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], who does me the honor to listen to me and who knows more about the tobacco soil than I, can correct me if I am in error in this: That is, the farmer can not raise anything else profitably on tobacco soil except tobacco. Is not that so? [Mr. STANLEY assented.]

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] is doubtless versed in tobacco and tobacco soil, and is thoroughly familiar with all the pains the tobacco farmer undergoes in taking care of his crop, in killing the worms and doing various other things, looking after it daily as he would a sick infant; yet that farmer has to pay a tax of 6 cents a pound if he undertakes to twist that tobacco for anybody except himself, when his tobacco is selling and was selling the other day in Louisville and in Clarksville, a tobacco market in my own district, at 4 and 5 cents a pound.

Mr. Chairman, here in a time of peace, when we have to take our tax money out of the overflowing Treasury and place it in the banks of the country in order that it may be put in circulation and prevent panics, we have an oppressive civil-war tax—not simply a tax levied for revenue—but a war tax vigorously enforced forty years after the law was first enacted and the civil war ended!

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his able report, makes a most remarkable statement, which I do not undertake for a moment to dispute. He says that notwithstanding the fact that we repealed in 1902 what is known as the "Spanish-war tax," for the purpose of reducing the internal taxation, nevertheless, last year, 1903, the internal revenue amounted to sixty millions more than it did in 1898, before we enacted the Spanish-war tax. Here is his language:

The total receipts for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1898, were \$170,866,819.36; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, \$230,740,925.22.

I will read all Secretary Shaw says on the subject, at page 29 of his last report:

INTERNAL REVENUE.

The collections in the Internal Revenue Bureau have been variable during the past five years because of the passage of Spanish war revenue taxing laws, which for three years increased the collections by \$100,000,000 per year.

Congress, by act approved March 2, 1901, reduced materially the receipts of the Bureau by a partial repeal of these laws, and by act approved April 12, 1902, the Spanish war taxes were totally repealed.

During the past fiscal year, therefore, the objects and rates of internal-revenue taxation have been practically the same as those existing prior to the 1st of July, 1898. By reason, however, of general business conditions, the income of the Government from internal-revenue receipts is much larger than prior to the Spanish war. The total receipts for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1898, were \$170,866,819.36. The receipts for the past fiscal year were \$200,000,000 greater. The following summarized statements show the operations of the Bureau during the year:

Receipts from internal revenues, as shown by collectors' reports, in 1902 and 1903.

Objects of taxation.	Fiscal year ended June 30—		Increase.	Decrease.
	1902.	1903.		
Distilled spirits	\$121,138,013.18	\$131,963,472.39	\$10,815,459.26	
Manufactured tobacco	51,937,925.19	43,514,810.24		\$8,423,114.95
Fermented liquors	71,988,902.39	47,547,856.08		24,441,046.31
Oleomargarine	2,944,462.46	736,783.31		2,207,709.15
Filled cheese	24.00	6,445.26	6,421.26	
Mixed flour	2,212.85	1,705.50		417.35
Adulterated butter and process or renovated butter	500.00	151,558.97	151,058.97	
Banks and bankers	227.50	809.50	672.00	
Miscellaneous	623,855,692.73	6,827,303.97		17,023,388.76
Total	271,867,960.25	230,740,925.22		41,127,035.03

^a Advance collections under act of May 9, 1902.

^b Includes special taxes, legacies, Schedules A and B, excise tax, etc., repealed July 1, 1902.

^c Includes \$5,366,774.90 from legacies on which the tax had accrued prior to the repeal of the act.

With "practically the same objects and rates of internal taxation" in 1903 that we had in 1898, yet to-day we have in the Treasury of the United States, with the Spanish war tax totally repealed, sixty millions more coming in from internal taxation than we had when we put the Spanish war tax upon our statute books in 1898. Now, carrying out the spirit and purpose of Congress to reduce taxation in law and fact, why not reduce it more—why not carry out that spirit in fact and law until you do reduce the taxation down to where it was on a peace basis, and thus confer a substantial benefit upon the tobacco farmer?

Did not the Republicans say the Dingley tariff of 1897 would supply all the revenue we need? Then repeal the law imposing this tax on the tobacco producer until at least your internal receipts shall fall to \$170,000,000, as in 1898.

I will grant you, Mr. Chairman, that "manufacture" means something done with the hand—from manus, the hand, and facere, to make—I believe. But is stemming and twisting tobacco a process of manufacture under a fair and honest definition? Is that not stretching the word mightily? I will leave that question very largely to my genial friend from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL], who is now a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, and I ask him if it is not very farfetched to say that when I go out and shell my corn from the cob that I am manufacturing? Is that not simply shelling corn? But when I turn around, stop shelling corn and go to stemming tobacco, then I am manufacturing tobacco. I am a manufacturer under this abominable law.

Mr. BOUTELL. I would say to my genial friend from Tennessee that I think it is just about as much manufacture as the present oleomargarine law is a revenue law; and while we are on this matter of reducing taxation, I should like to ask my genial friend from Tennessee if we had not better repeal this so-called revenue tax on oleomargarine, which discriminates against an honorable and upright industry?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. No; I disagree with my friend on that. It is not an honorable and upright industry to engage in making and branding "oleo" as butter, or whether thus branded or not, to sell "oleo" as butter. Making and branding, or, whether branded or not, the making and selling of "oleo" as "oleo" is honorable and upright, so far as I can see.

Mr. BOUTELL. I should like to ask my genial friend from Tennessee—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Let me tell the gentleman why I voted for a 10-cent liability or tax on "oleo." Because this tax was to be levied and the liability attached only upon the fraudulent disposition of "oleo." If it is sold as "oleo" no tax attaches or liability is incurred. When I go to a store and ask for butter I mean cow butter, and the grocer knows I do, and if he sells me "oleo" he not only misleads his neighbor and friend, but he practically lies to him and perpetrates a fraud as well. [Applause.]

Hence, as I contend, this 10-cent tax or liability is a tax on vice, not virtue. It is not a tax on a natural right. It was the best we could do to protect the honest farmer in the honest manufacture and sale of cow butter. This fraud could have been prohibited otherwise, and I would have freely and without any

reluctance whatever supported that law. As it was I voted for a makeshift. If the "oleo" manufacturer or vender perpetrates this fraud, he ought to pay the penalty for that sin against his neighbor whom he is in duty bound to love as himself.

Mr. BOUTELL. And yet—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I have always tried to oppose fraud and wrongs in Congress and elsewhere, and I hope my friend will give me the credit to believe that I acted conscientiously in thus acting in behalf of the honest farmer as against the fraudulent manufacturer or vender.

Mr. BOUTELL. And yet my friend from Tennessee—whose opinion about the oleomargarine industry is entirely contrary to my opinion of it—had to go outside and away beyond any precedent ever established by the Democratic party in the matter of Federal taxation in order to enforce a police power within the limits of a sovereign State, and I think the sooner that law, and the principle which that law presents, is wiped off our statute books the sooner we will return to the grand old principles of Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Andrew Jackson, of everywhere, if you will permit me.

Mr. BOUTELL. Just one moment, as my friend has brought me into this discussion.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I yield with pleasure. I am always glad to have something good in my speech, and I get it from the gentleman, my friend.

Mr. BOUTELL. Why not also favor the repeal of the present high tax on distilled spirits and give some free alcohol in the arts?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. But would it aid the arts to tax corn? My friend from Illinois has reminded me of a strong point, just as I expected he would do, in favor of my bill, which is this: When I went to the Department the other day to find out about how much this bill, if law, would reduce the revenues to the Government, this argument was used: "Why don't you take the tax off of whisky? Why don't you take it off this, that, and the other?" "Well," I said, "I will tell you why. That is not exactly a parallel case. You take corn that is incapable of doing any harm to anybody on earth, unless you give a horse too much of it or unless you eat too much corn bread—and I ate that until I came to Congress and I am very sorry that I do not get a chance to eat it now three times a day—but the corn is changed from corn into whisky—entirely different from corn. That is manufacturing, pure and simple. But when the farmer stems or twists his tobacco it is still tobacco, and not manufactured tobacco. It is still used for and as tobacco. Here is the difference between the two propositions."

Now, Mr. Chairman, Congress has gone along and said stemming and twisting is manufacturing. Congress says other things are true that are not. Congress legislates on Sunday, and we are so ashamed of it that, although we have a constitutional right to do so, yet we change the RECORD or JOURNAL, or both, and make it the legislative day—Saturday. I think one day last Congress we undertook to correct something we had in fact and law done on Sunday, and made it appear that it was not done in fact or law on Sunday, when we all knew the House had. So we go along and do a great many things by legislation. We try sometimes to call a lie the truth and the truth a lie in other words, to make a long story short.

Now, gentlemen, I appeal to your candor and your fair-mindedness and ask you if a farmer is engaged in manufacture when he stems and twists his tobacco with his own hands on a rainy day in the barn when neither he nor his hands can work outdoors? He either goes into the barn and shells corn and sends somebody to mill or he goes in there and stems tobacco and throws the stems away or fertilizes his ground with them. Is this manufacturing?

Now, let me go back, so far back that they almost use the long s's in printing the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, reported in 5 Cranch, page 284, in a case decided by Chief Justice Marshall, of the United States *v. Potts and others*, in 1809. The counsel in the case said:

The real question is whether these raised bottoms can be considered as manufactured copper, or as much a raw material as plain copper plates.

It was undertaken to exact a duty on the copper plate with "raised edges" as manufactured copper. In this state it was more easily used. But Chief Justice Marshall repudiated this contention. He said:

The opinion of this court is that copper plates that stand up at the edge are exempt from duty, although imported under the denomination of raised copper. It appears to have been the policy of the United States to distinguish between raw and manufactured copper. From the facts stated the copper in question can not be deemed manufactured copper within the intention of the legislature.

Tobacco stemmed or twisted is still raw material. It is still tobacco. It can be used with and without stemming or twisting. In either condition it is still raw tobacco.

The process of manufacture is supposed to produce some article by the application of skill and labor to the raw material. (145 N. Y., 377, *People v. Roberts*.)

Stemming or twisting does not "produce." We "produce" when we make a cigar, snuff, or plug tobacco. There is no "skill," but there is labor employed in stemming or twisting tobacco; but it is still tobacco—raw tobacco.

In the case just cited the court said:

Webster defines manufacture to be "anything made from raw materials by the hand, by machinery, or by art, as cloths, iron utensils, shoes, machinery, saddlery, etc." (145 N. Y., 377.)

Each of these articles is a new product, not raw material. "Shoes" are not hides. "Cloths" are not cotton or wool. "Saddlery" is made of raw hides and raw iron by skill and labor. The court in this case held that "mixing teas, roasting, mixing, and grinding coffee is not manufacturing." The tea was bought in "its original state and the coffee in the raw bean."

The court said:

No new article is produced, as it is still coffee and tea that is placed upon the market.

The court cited and followed the leading cases: *Frazer v. Maffit*, 20 Blatch., Cir. Ct. Rep., 267; *Hartranft v. Wiegman*, 121 U. S., 609; *People v. Knickerbocker Ice Company*, 99 N. Y., 181.

In the *Hartranft* case the court cites and approves the 5 Cranch case, the *Frazer* case, and other cases.

In the *Hartranft* case the court held as "unmanufactured" shells that had been cleaned by acid and are intended to be sold as shells. They are still shells. The court held—

We are of opinion that the shells in question here were not manufactured, and were not manufactures of shells, within the sense of the statute imposing a duty of 35 per cent upon such manufactures, but were shells unmanufactured.

They were still shells. They have not been manufactured into a new and different article, having a distinctive name, character, or use from that of a shell.

The application of labor to an article, either by hand or by mechanism, does not make the article necessarily a manufactured article, within the meaning of that term as used in the tariff laws.

Washing and scouring wool does not necessarily make that resulting wool a manufacture of wool; cleaning and ginning cotton does not make the resulting cotton a manufacture. (121 U. S., 614.)

Pressed or baled hay is not manufactured (20 Blatch., supra); a publisher of a newspaper is not a manufacturer. (In re Capital Publishing Co., 3 McArthur, 412; in re Kenyon, 1 Utah, 47.)

Marble cut into blocks for convenient transportation is not manufactured. (121 U. S., supra.)

But Congress can pronounce any person a manufacturer, regardless of what that person does, if Congress so chooses, nowadays.

The supreme court of the State of Massachusetts has declared that mining coal is not manufacturing, and that ice harvesting is not manufacturing. The coal is still coal, and the ice is still ice. (106 Mass., 131; 135 Mass., 162; *Hibbing v. Westford*.)

It used to be, as I remember when I was a boy at my native home, 12 miles from Nashville, that I could go down to my old neighbor, whose spirit long since took its everlasting flight, and there in his barn I could see long strings of twisted tobacco; all this he would sell. Then I have seen him crush it for smoking purposes, which he would put in boxes and give away to his neighbors as a Christmas gift, and so on.

Now, the farmer of to-day is not allowed to do that. Everything of that kind is done away with. That business is under the control of the tobacco trust by the law. The tobacco trust to-day has the control of everything that the farmer makes in the nature of tobacco save that he consumes himself. Take the year of 1899, there were about 4,340,816 pounds of tobacco left in the hands of the farmers and their neighbors, according to the census report, out of 868,163,275 pounds of tobacco raised that year. Think of it. The balance was made into "cigars, cigarettes, snuff, and tobacco" and exported. This is shown by the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, December 12, 1903.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your verbal inquiry regarding the share of the tobacco crop of the country not sold for manufacture or exportation, and therefore, presumably, consumed by the producers, I have the honor to say that the United States census of 1900 reports the total tobacco crop of 1899 at 868,163,275 pounds in the cured state. It further reports the amount consumed in factories and exported in 1900 at 662,818,341 pounds, but says that the tobacco loses from 15 per cent to 20 per cent in the sweating process after leaving the farm but before its manufacture or exportation. Allowing 20 per cent for the loss from the sweating process between the farm and the factory or export dock, the 662,818,341 pounds manufactured or exported would represent 828,522,293 pounds when sold by the farmers.

The census report also states that the loss by the stemming of tobacco exported has been estimated to amount to as much as 3½ per cent of the entire crop of the country, which would be 30,385,715 pounds. It also estimates the loss by fire at one-half of 1 per cent, or 4,340,816 pounds. To obtain the amount retained in the hands of producers it would therefore be necessary to subtract from the total production:

	Pounds.
The amount manufactured and exported	662,818,341
The loss by sweating between the farm and the factory or export dock	a 165,704,585
The loss by stemming	b 30,385,715
The loss by fire	c 4,340,816

a Loss of 20 per cent. b Loss of 3½ per cent. c Loss of one-half of 1 per cent.
Combining these four totals, the amount manufactured and exported, the weight lost by sweating, the loss by stemming, and the loss by fire, produces a total of 863,249,457, which, subtracted from the total product, 868,163,275

pounds, would leave a total of 4,913,818 pounds unaccounted for, and presumably retained by the farmers. It is proper to add that this total is in substantial agreement with the census report, which estimates the "home consumption by farmers and the sale of tobacco to their neighbors" at about one-half of 1 per cent of the total crop, which would be 4,340,816 pounds.

Very truly, yours,

O. P. AUSTIN, Chief of Bureau.

Hon. J. W. GAINES, Member of Congress,
1325 G street NW., Washington, D. C.

Now, my idea is to give the farmer free trade in his tobacco. Let him sell it to Smith, and let Smith sell it to Jones, and let Jones trade it off for coffee, for cows or horses, or buy himself more land, or trade it again throughout the country, and in that way do the best he can with it, instead of forcing the farmer to take his tobacco to the cities and be compelled to sell it to the tobacco trust and take their trust-set price. Leave them the same control over it they had in former days, and maintain that industry in the country. In this way you will maintain the tobacco industry and prevent the people from leaving their homes in the country and seeking employment in our cities, thus doing away with those conditions that cause the population of the cities to grow so unduly, leading more and more to the decadence of our municipal governments.

You will thus add to the good citizenship of the people in our rural districts, maintaining the local inhabitants, and giving each and every man the right to take his own hands and his own fingers and stem and twist his tobacco—trade in the fruits of his own labor—made on the sunny hillsides of the South, the nutmeg valleys of Connecticut, or the prairie farms of the West.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal, I guess, will be said about the revenue that will be taken from the Government by making this bill the law.

Free trade in leaf tobacco will not lessen the manufacture of cigars, cigarettes, and snuff, and very little, if any, reduce the making of "chewing and smoking tobacco."

During the calendar year 1902, Mr. Yerkes says, we manufactured tobacco, etc., as follows:

Quantity of tobacco and snuff manufactured.

	Pounds.
Quantity of plug and twist tobacco produced	185,736,781
Quantity of fine-cut chewing tobacco produced	12,065,617
Quantity of smoking tobacco produced	131,130,733
Quantity of snuff produced	18,682,341
Total quantity of tobacco and snuff produced	347,615,472

Cigars and cigarettes manufactured.

Number of cigars weighing more than 3 pounds per 1,000 produced	6,231,714,558
Number of cigars weighing not more than 3 pounds per 1,000 produced	676,115,995
Number of cigarettes weighing not more than 3 pounds per 1,000 produced	2,961,229,132
Number of cigarettes weighing more than 3 pounds per 1,000 produced	10,131,315

Leaf tobacco.

	Pounds.
Unstemmed used in the production of large cigars	114,955,138
Unstemmed used in the production of small cigars	2,434,029
Unstemmed used in the production of cigarettes	11,816,159
Unstemmed and scrap used in the production of chewing and smoking tobacco and snuff	298,348,638
Total leaf tobacco used	427,553,954

Average quantity of leaf tobacco used per 1,000 large cigars	18.44
Average quantity of leaf tobacco used per 1,000 small cigars	3.57
Average quantity of leaf tobacco used per 1,000 large cigarettes	8.08
Average quantity of leaf tobacco used per 1,000 small cigarettes	3.96

The total collections of revenue from each source during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1903, were as follows:

From manufactured tobacco	\$18,640,059.20
From snuff	1,130,455.00
From cigars, taxed at \$3 per thousand	20,359,171.60
From cigars, taxed at 54 cents per thousand	343,889.93
From cigarettes, taxed at \$1.08 per thousand	2,743,584.89
From cigarettes, taxed at 54 cents per thousand	265,425.17
From cigarettes, taxed at \$3 per thousand	29,041.06
Total collections	43,513,616.85

Such a law will not stop the exportation of the leaf tobacco, because that will go on as it has always gone on. But what will it do? It will give the farmers, it will give the manufacturers, the broker, the dealers, and people who desire to deal on a small or a large scale in leaf tobacco, under the first section of this bill, the right to buy it, to make it into manufactured products without paying the tax of 6 cents, and then afterwards to make cigars and other productions out of it. That will do what? It will lessen the price of cigars in all probability unless the trust keeps up the price. It will not lessen the making of cigars, cigarettes, snuff, plugs, etc., not in the least.

Suppose the farmer stems and twists his tobacco, it will only be on a small scale; he will do it with his own hand. He will not buy machinery, for he has not the money to thus invest. Then he dare not do so. If he did have the money and invested it in machinery, he would come in competition with the tobacco trust and their machinery for twisting and stemming, and he would be

practically driven out of the business in a short while. Still, it would be a great blessing for the farmer, in his little way, to have the chance to twist and stem his tobacco like any other man; to have the same right as he does to manipulate his corn and other farm products. It will bring trade into his neighborhood; it will be practically legal tender, as it used to be in Virginia, when 12 pounds of "bright Virginia" bought a wife, and some of us now couldn't get her with a thousand pounds [laughter]—belles have gone up so and tobacco down.

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

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. With pleasure.

Mr. MACON. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if the farmer now stems and twists any tobacco at all?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Only for his own personal use.

Mr. MACON. He does not do it for sale?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. He does not stem or twist any for sale unless he pays the tax, and I do not believe he does either.

Mr. MACON. If the gentleman's bill is enacted into law the revenue will not be cut down a single cent, because the farmer now pays nothing into the revenue by reason of the tax for stemming and twisting tobacco.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. He does not pay any tax unless he stems and twists it for sale.

Mr. MACON. Then it will not cut down the internal revenue if the gentleman's bill is enacted into law, because the farmer now stems and twists none for sale.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman may be right. I contend that it will not materially cut down the revenue if this bill is passed. If it does cut it down it ought to be cut down, because the tax is unjust. We are paralyzing the farmer, robbing him of his right to labor that God Almighty has given him, and we ought to repeal this unjust tax. I am for the farmer first and the superstrata of society next. If you destroy the farmer, you destroy the manufacturers, cities, and our institutions. My heart goes out to the farmer. All my interest in this measure is to take care of the farmer, his wife and children first.

Mr. MACON. If the gentleman will allow me, my reason for asking the question was simply this: I thought it would be in favor of the gentleman's proposition, that if his measure was enacted the revenue would not be cut down.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I appreciate the suggestion. It is a good one. Section 1 would only cut down the revenue in this way, that the farmer's little amount of twisted and stemmed tobacco would come in contact with the trust's stemmed and twisted tobacco, and lessen that amount which the tobacco trust, as well as the manufacturers, now pay in revenue to the Government. In other words, it would create a competitor to the trust, but only in a very small way. And what would be the result? The tobacco grower would be made more independent, and you would protect him from the tobacco trust. To-day his unstemmed common leaf sells, some of it, at 4 and 5 cents, but a year ago it sold for 6 and 7.

Why, we hear a great shout in and out of Congress, and I hope it is absolutely true, that all the people are in a prosperous condition, that there is more money in the country than ever before. Listening to the speech of my friend from Iowa the other day, why, my goodness alive! you would have supposed that money was growing on the trees, and that prosperity was washing away the country. [Laughter.] And yet you find the farmer's leaf tobacco to-day cheaper in the markets than last year, and possibly for years.

Clarksville, Tenn., is a great tobacco exporter. The Daily Leaf-Chronicle, Clarksville, of December 12, says:

CLARKSVILLE TOBACCO MARKET.

[From our regular correspondent.]

Our receipts this week were two hogsheds, private sales forty-six hogsheds—no changes to report. There were some small sales on the loose tobacco floors, but the cold weather checks operations in both branches of the business. We will have lively times later on. We quote:

Low lugs at	\$3.00 to \$3.50
Common lugs at	3.50 to 4.00
Medium lugs at	4.00 to 4.50
Good lugs at	4.50 to 5.25
Low leaf at	4.50 to 5.25
Common leaf at	5.25 to 5.75
Medium leaf at	6.00 to 6.75
Good leaf at	7.00 to 8.00

The Leaf Tobacco Exchange of Louisville, in the press December 11, 1903, compared the prices of tobacco for 1902 and 1903, as shown by the following:

LEAF TOBACCO.

[Louisville Courier-Journal, Friday evening, December 11 (1903).]

The market to-day was without special feature. No good or fancy tobacco was offered, the offerings consisting entirely of medium and common grades, for which fair prices were realized in view of market conditions. Burley continues strong, but dark tobacco rules low.

The offerings to-day consisted of 86 hogsheds, 13 burley and 73 dark; 43 were original inspections and 43 reviews. Rejections yesterday amounted to 26 hogsheds.

The first sale Tuesday will be held at the Planters' warehouse. The range in prices for both the 1902 and 1903 crops of tobacco is practically unchanged this week. Total sales amounted to 1,079 hogsheads, as compared with 4,145 the corresponding week a year ago, 2,034 in 1901, and 4,269 in 1900. Out of the total for the week 818 hogsheads were sold at auction and 261 sold privately. The sales for the year to date amount to 102,562 hogsheads, as compared with 157,819 in 1902, 151,278 in 1901, and 139,308 in 1900. Sales of Burley for the week total 468 hogsheads, 151 of new crop and 317 of the 1902 crop; sales of dark were 611 hogsheads, 63 of new crop, and 548 of 1902. The average percentage of rejections for the week was 17. Burley rejections were light, averaging only 14 per cent of the offerings. Receipts for the week were 339 hogsheads, and from January 1 to date they amount to 79,159 hogsheads, as compared with 118,465 the corresponding period in 1902 and 117,987 in 1901. The cold, dry weather has made it impossible to move tobacco to market, owing to the fact that it is not in condition for shipping, and for the first time in years it looks like December will go by without a heavy movement of the season's crop being recorded for the month. The movement will become heavy shortly after the first general rain.

WEEKLY REPORT.

The following are the revised quotations as prepared by the quotations committee of the Leaf Tobacco Exchange:
1902 crop.

	Burley.		Dark.	
	Red.	Colory.	Rehandlimg.	Export.
Trash (green or mixed).....	\$4.00 to \$4.50	\$5 00 to \$5.50	-----	\$3.25 to \$3.50
Trash (sound).....	4.50 to 5.50	6.50 to 8.50	-----	3.50 to 3.75
Common lugs.....	5.50 to 6.00	8.50 to 9.50	-----	3.75 to 4.25
Medium lugs.....	6.00 to 6.50	9.50 to 10.50	-----	4.25 to 4.50
Good lugs.....	6.50 to 8.50	10.50 to 12.50	\$4.00 to \$4.50	4.50 to 5.00
Common leaf (short).....	6.50 to 7.50	7.00 to 8.50	4.00 to 4.50	4.75 to 5.25
Common leaf.....	8.00 to 9.50	8.50 to 10.50	4.50 to 5.25	5.25 to 6.00
Medium leaf.....	9.50 to 11.50	10.50 to 12.50	5.25 to 6.50	6.00 to 7.00
Good leaf.....	11.50 to 13.75	12.50 to 15.00	6.50 to 7.50	7.00 to 8.50
Fine and selections.....	15.00 to 18.75	15.00 to 30.50	-----	-----

1903 crop.

	Burley.		Dark.	
	Red.	Colory.	Rehandlimg.	Export.
Trash (green or mixed).....	\$3.50 to \$4.00	\$4.50 to \$5.00	-----	\$2.00 to \$2.25
Trash (sound).....	4.25 to 4.50	5.00 to 6.00	-----	2.25 to 2.75
Common lugs.....	4.50 to 5.00	6.00 to 7.00	-----	2.75 to 3.00
Medium lugs.....	5.00 to 6.00	7.00 to 8.00	-----	3.00 to 3.50
Good lugs.....	6.00 to 6.50	8.00 to 9.50	\$3.50 to \$3.75	3.50 to 3.75
Common leaf (short).....	6.00 to 7.00	6.50 to 7.50	3.00 to 3.50	3.00 to 3.50
Common leaf.....	7.00 to 8.00	7.50 to 8.50	3.50 to 4.00	3.50 to 4.00
Medium leaf.....	8.00 to 9.50	8.50 to 10.00	4.00 to 5.00	4.00 to 5.00
Good leaf.....	10.00 to 11.50	10.00 to 12.50	5.00 to 6.00	5.00 to 6.00
Fine and selections.....	11.50 to 13.50	12.50 to 14.25	6.00 to 7.50	6.00 to 7.50

N. B.—Unsound or defective in condition, length, or color, or mixed packages from 1 cent to 3 cents lower.

Clarksville market.

M. H. Clark & Bro. write as follows concerning the Clarksville tobacco market, under date of December 10, 1903:

"Our receipts this week were 2 hogsheads. There were no public offerings. Private sales 46 hogsheads of the lower grades of leaf at the late ruling prices. Sales would be larger but for the cold weather, which makes warehousemen averse to sampling.

There has been quite a movement in the loose tobacco market in purchases of the fine and fancy crops at from \$10 for leaf and \$2 for lugs down to \$7 for leaf and \$2 for lugs, and purchases would be larger but for the unfavorable weather for examining crops in the barns. For old crop we quote:

Low lugs, \$3.50 to \$4; common lugs, \$4 to \$4.50; medium lugs, \$4.50 to \$5; good lugs, \$5.25 to \$5.75; low leaf, \$4.75 to \$5.25; common leaf, \$5.50 to \$6.25; medium leaf, \$6.50 to \$7.50; good leaf, \$7.50 to \$8.50; fine and selections, none appeared.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the farmer has not the right to manipulate his tobacco, to prepare it for market?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What do you call "manipulating" it?

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. To sort it, to strip it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. No, sir; he can not stem or twist it without paying a tax of 6 cents per pound unless for personal use.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. We do it in Connecticut with our seedling tobacco, our wrapper tobacco. Our farmers do that without paying a license.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, I tell you right now they are acting contrary to law.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. We are a law-abiding people.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I know that; but this just shows that the good people of Connecticut, though they rarely make a mistake in the matter of sending good men to Congress, may be ignorant of some things in regard to the law. Commissioner Yerkes, in his letter to me March 12, 1903, thus expounds the law on that point:

2. Under the present law a tax of 6 cents per pound is imposed upon all tobacco stemmed or twisted by a farmer not intended for his own personal use.

3. A farmer may stem and twist tobacco for his own use without incurring liability to tax on such tobacco.

4. Stemming or twisting tobacco is regarded as manufacturing, and a grower or planter can not lawfully stem or twist his tobacco for sale, or for the purpose of giving it away, without payment of tax. If he should engage in that business he would be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco, and be required to qualify as such by registering with the collector of the district, filing statement and bond, and to pack, label, and stamp his product, as provided by regulations No. 8, pages 5 and 6.

This is the law of April 12, 1902, which the gentleman helped to make.

It will thus be seen that the farmer is required to put the tobacco up in "packages" of a certain shape and size and weight, which he can not do because he has not the means of doing so. So that he is not allowed to stem or twist his tobacco, but he has not the machinery with which to put it into packages. Thus it is clearly shown that the tobacco trusts have this law in their favor on the statute book, and they are trying to perpetuate it here, with Congress, I believe, ignorant of what is being done or what it has done. I know that my friend from Connecticut is, as I am, a friend of the farmer. He has shown that often.

When the farmer, although he has a legal right to sell his tobacco without tax while in the leaf only, tries to sell it, the would-be purchaser says: "I can not pay you so much for your tobacco because of this tax; you must cut down the price below what you asked last year." That is the result.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go a little further and read some testimony that I have here, showing how much this measure will affect the revenues. That question has been asked me before today. I have shown already that in 1898, before we had any Spanish war tax, we collected \$170,000,000 of internal revenue, and now, after we have taken off the Spanish war taxes, we are collecting \$60,000,000 more in 1903 than we did in 1898.

Mr. M. H. Clark, one of the ablest and best writers on the subject of tobacco, an experienced tobacconist of Clarksville, Tenn., as well as a good citizen, has written several articles on this subject, some of which have fallen into my hands. Here is what he says about this revenue question:

If these repeals of laws are made, then a new line of customers will be made for leaf tobacco and a new competition brought into the market, bearing especially against the Italian tobacco monopoly, which is considered so detrimental to the interests of our tobacco planters and general tobacco trade. The competition would be the greatest against the purchasing interest, as it is just those Italian types which would find the readiest sale in the Southern States.

It would virtually be a new demand, which might take little or none from the revenue the Government receives from the sale of manufactured tobacco, as the southern negroes would be large consumers of the raw leaf tobacco, while they are but small consumers of plug tobacco. The action of the tobacco trust in working this law through Congress was a blunder, and a serious one, as it has antagonized against it the planters and others interested in this great staple and lost it good profits.

Now, I want to say that the negroes and laborers in the South, and possibly elsewhere, rarely ever buy cigars. They rarely ever buy manufactured tobacco. If they do it is "plug," for chewing. They prefer what they call "old long green" or "old Lincoln twist," as a distinguished Republican called it the other day, when talking about the twisted tobacco which he saw down South during the civil war.

In another article Mr. Clark goes further, and says:

GIVE JUSTICE TO THE TOBACCO PLANTER.

[M. H. Clark, Montgomery County, Tenn., 1903.]

All agricultural products raised by the farmer—hay, wheat, corn, cotton, hemp, and the rest—under the spirit of American Constitution and laws, in their raw state are free of taxation under the internal-revenue laws, and any person can buy and sell same to consumers without vexatious regulations or tax per pound on same. Even sugar raised by planting can be sold by anyone to consumers; but when it comes to selling leaf tobacco to consumers a tax is levied of the same amount per pound as if it was manufactured, and required to be packed in boxes of specified weights, and vexatious regulations made intended to, and does, prevent the sale of raw leaf tobacco to consumers for chewing or pipe tobaccos.

It was not always so. Raw leaf tobacco, like all other agricultural products, was permitted to be sold to consumers by anyone until a bill was lobbied through Congress in 1894 by the tobacco trust and manufacturers of plug and pipe tobaccos which acted as a positive prohibition to the sale of raw leaf tobacco to the consumer.

The bill was cunningly devised by the trust, and argument was made that the manufacturer paid a large revenue to the Government and demanded protection from the sale of raw leaf. But as Congress will not knowingly legislate against the agricultural interests, it was cunningly amended, permitting planters to sell their own raw leaf tobacco personally to consumers, but not through agents except by licenses, payment of same tax as manufactured tobacco, and vexatious regulations. This vicious legislation succeeded, and the trust has the whole field, and the consumer, however he may wish it, can buy no raw leaf tobacco, and the planter loses this small competition against the tobacco trust.

WANT RAW LEAF FREE FROM TAX.

The facts are that in the States south of North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri there are many poor people—whites and negroes—who much desire to buy the raw leaf and hang it up in their cabins and chew or smoke it as they may prefer, instead of buying the heavily sweetened plug, for which the trust compels them to pay from 30 to 60 cents per pound or go without. The so-called tobacco trust has bought out or crushed out so many of their legitimate competitors for business that there is only a comparative handful of independent manufacturers left. This is notably so in the snuff branch, there being only one independent factory left. This independent concern has been so oppressed by illegal methods used to destroy its business and crush out its honest competition that it has been compelled to appeal to

the protection of the Supreme Court of the United States and sue for \$150,000 damages, which does not half cover what it has suffered.

Every tobacco section south of the Potomac, Ohio, and Missouri rivers is in a state of unrest and distress under the throttling of this so-called "octopus," with its many arms. Growers fear further suffocation of the great industry of tobacco planting. This crop has been the money crop of these sections.

Since the American Tobacco Company and Imperial Tobacco Company of Great Britain have combined and formed the British-American Tobacco Company the planters of South and North Carolina and Virginia have been rushing their crops to market to sell them before the full effect of this last combination is felt.

Of all the numerous strip stemmeries in the West only two have opened their doors, one an Irish house, which stems for its own factory at Belfast, and the other a member of the Imperial Tobacco Company. Thousands of hands are idle, and planters have virtually no competition for their crops in the stemming districts.

PRICES TO GROWERS SHOULD BE HIGHER.

With the conditions in the burley districts of Kentucky, Ohio, and Missouri, the stocks of old leaf now reduced to a few thousand hogsheads, a crop smaller than the last, observers say that under the old conditions burleys would be 3 to 5 cents higher than at present, but with one buyer taking, perhaps, 80 per cent of the crop, the independent manufacturers, with the present selling methods seeking to drive them out of the trade, can give but feeble competition, and the trust fixes the price at what it thinks the planter will still make enough tobacco for it.

There are no more intelligent men in the United States than the tobacco planters. They feel the present evils and fear the darker future, hence their conventions at Lexington, Mayfield, and in the stemming districts of Kentucky and at Clarksville, Tenn. While conventions of farmers and planters are productive of much good, they rarely achieve practical results, and naturally. The agriculturists have their laborious duties to attend to and can not combine effectively against a small body of capitalists, who can turn loose on Wall street \$150,000,000 of bonds as fast as the presses can print them, making the public furnish their "sinews of war," and apply methods to crush out fair competition, and to buy the raw material at the lowest and sell the product at the highest, and bring in Congress to aid them in these plans.

Wall street sees the game, says the bonds at present are safe, and buys them. What chance has the honest planter to contend? He can sell his crop at 6 cents, but when a buyer wants to pay 8 cents to sell in the leaf in the Southern States to people who prefer the natural leaf, the trust says, "no; Congress passed my bill, taxing you 6 cents a pound if you do so;" and that little competition dies, for the planter can not leave home to peddle his crop out in boxes of stipulated weights of 10, 20, 40, and 60 pounds. A cute little trick and dodge to work into the law of 1894.

For every evil there is a remedy. The evils referred to are so great that they can not be remedied all at once, but a start can be made, and it is suggested that the following plan be adopted as a start in the right direction:

PETITIONS TO CONGRESS SUGGESTED.

Let there be appointed in each large district—the burley, stemming district, Clarksville, and the rest—a full executive committee, with power to appoint subcommittees in each county, who are to appoint a committee in each county district to obtain the signature of every planter to petition to Congress. Let the petitions have an appropriate heading, asking that all laws prohibiting the free sale of raw leaf tobacco to consumers by anyone be at once repealed, and have these masses of petitions forwarded to the Representatives and Senators of their districts and States.

Congress can not fail to heed such petitions crying so loud for just relief, as the whole prosperity of the country rests upon agriculture. The sale of raw leaf tobacco will reduce but little the consumption of plug tobacco, for many will not use it on the plantations, and as they can not get natural leaf go without, but will increase the demand for leaf tobacco and give that much competition against the "trust." The negroes have not received from the United States Government the once expected "40 acres and a mule," but it might at least give them the chance to buy what they want—natural leaf tobacco—to use as they wish.

There are more voters in the country than in the towns, and if representatives at Washington refuse justice to the country people they will return home to stay there.

God save the people!
The people, Lord, the people!
Not trusts and combines,
But men. God save the people!

The tobacco farmers in Tennessee and Kentucky met at Clarksville, Tenn., last spring a year ago and passed a resolution in the form of a petition, which is as follows:

To the honorable Senators and Representatives of Congress:

The tobacco planters of Tennessee and Kentucky feel a great oppression from the law passed in 1894 restricting the sale of raw leaf tobacco, and respectfully represent that leaf tobacco is the only agricultural product upon which a tax is laid upon its sale to anyone. All of the cereals, hay, hemp, cotton, sugar, and other agricultural products are free of sale to anyone by anyone without tax, but raw leaf tobacco can not be sold to consumers without paying a tax of 6 cents per pound (nearly 100 per cent of its value), the same as if it was manufactured, with one exception, viz, the planter can in person sell to consumers his own crop without said tax, but the real consumers and customers for raw leaf tobacco are the negroes and poor white people in the cotton and sugar States, too far away from the tobacco-growing States to be reached by the tobacco planters.

This demand is from people who use very little manufactured tobacco and prefer the raw leaf, and failing to get that go without, therefore the repeal of the tax on raw leaf tobacco would cause but little loss of revenue to the Government. The sale of raw tobacco used to be free, as are the cereals and all other products of the soil, but a law was passed by Congress in 1894, largely through the efforts and influence of the "tobacco trust," placing, as aforesaid, the tax of 6 cents per pound on the sale of leaf tobacco.

Therefore, appealing for justice, the tobacco planters respectfully petition Congress to put raw tobacco on the same footing as other vegetable products and repeal all laws and parts of laws which prohibit the sale of leaf tobacco to consumers by anyone, which will give an entirely new demand for leaf tobacco and lift a burden from the tobacco planters, and we will ever pray, etc.

JANUARY, 1903.

This is a matter which appeals peculiarly to me. I am constantly appealed to by letters and petitions, every one asking that some relief be given. When I presented the bill a few days ago to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the very moment that he scanned the bill he said that it was important, a very important matter, not only to the farmers of the

country, but immediately asked me how much it would reduce the revenues of the Government.

I have shown, I think, as you can all see, that it will not materially reduce the revenues of the Government, but if it does that the relief asked for should be given. It is a tax upon the farmers' hands. He can not use the hand that God Almighty tells him he must use to make a living. He becomes a pauper, a vagrant, if he does not do so. Under the law of the land he is arrested and put out on the vagrant force to make the highways of our country or clean our streets. So that we have a law that not only ties the hands of the farmer, but, as you must see, it so restricts his natural abilities and the usefulness of his tobacco lands that it is practically pauperizing our tobacco growers. They must quit raising tobacco or become bankrupts if this relief is not granted.

Again, is it better, Mr. Chairman, to destroy the tobacco growers of this country than to reduce the revenues of this great Government? Is it not better to put back upon the statute books the stamp on checks, from which we gathered millions of war tax into our coffers during the recent war, than to grind and grind and destroy and oppress the tobacco interests of the country and bankrupt the tobacco growers of the country? If we can not reduce the revenues, cut down expenditures before you cut down the farmers. It is an outrage to permit the tobacco trust to control the tobacco growers, rather than to have the Congress control them and make and execute laws in the interest of the farmers and laborers.

I say give the God-made man a chance to go on with his tobacco raising, as it was intended he should do by the great God who made him, and as the preservation of society and his own fireside and family require him to do. Hence it is, not only at the instance of the people I represent, but of Members of the House to whom I have addressed myself in private, that I have to-day thus at great length and in a running way undertaken to bring especially to the attention of this great lawmaking power the unhappy conditions of the tobacco farmer, hoping that I may persuade this Congress to give this relief to the farmer, which he says he must have, and which we know from the facts that I have stated he must have, to remain a tobacco grower of this country.

Mr. Chairman, in order that I may have the opportunity of rounding out my speech, I ask unanimous consent to insert some papers to which I have alluded and from which I have quoted in part, but not entirely read, and I reserve the balance of my time and yield it to my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

APPENDIX.

TOBACCO GROWERS—ORGANIZING FOR PROTECTION AGAINST THE TRUST ENCROACHMENTS—HOW THE PRESENT CONDITIONS AFFECT THE FARMER AND WHAT THEY PROMISE.

[Springfield (Tenn.) Herald, January 24, 1903.]

Tobacco growers in many counties are holding meetings and organizing for the purpose of forming some cooperative plan whereby they may protect themselves against the encroachments of the tobacco trust in destroying competition and fixing the price of both the leaf tobacco as it leaves the producer and the manufactured article as it leaves the factory.

So far these organizations have accomplished nothing. While it is hoped that they may accomplish much good, there can be little doubt as to the final result. Further than that, they may serve to stimulate a wholesome education along certain lines.

Trusts have come to stay until they are destroyed by national legislation, and the people might as well make up their minds to that effect. The purchase of the Weissinger tobacco factories, of Louisville, a few days ago by the Continental Tobacco Company gives the trust a complete monopoly of the whole business, except a few small concerns in different places, and the tobacco growers are at its mercy with scarcely the semblance of what may be called a tobacco market at home or on the breaks.

The farmer has nothing better left than to sell his crop to the local agent of the trust, or sell it on the breaks to the agent of the same party, both of which agents receive and execute instructions from the same head. There may be, and doubtless always will be, some variation between the price offered by the local agent and that for which the tobacco will sell on the breaks, but the difference will never be greater than the average upon the whole of the cost of prizing, shipping, and selling the tobacco.

This, if it can be called a market, will be practically the only future one. Just what the ruling price for leaf tobacco will be will depend somewhat on circumstances. A short or bad crop will vary the general average some. The trust must have the tobacco and it will hold out some sort of inducement both for a full crop and a short one, but the rule by which the price will be gauged is fixed, and not on competition at that, but it will be the least average price for which landowners will permit the tenants to raise the crop, and whatever that may be.

There will, of course, scattered here and there, be a few fancy crops and sold at fancy prices. This must, for policy, obtain as incentive to growers who usually believe they grow the fancy crop and obtain the fancy price, while it amounts to nothing with the trust, because it so little affects the average price for the whole crop.

This is not, we admit, a very rosy view of the tobacco-growing business, but we can see no hope for improvement in the market until the life is crushed out of the trust system by national legislation and conditions freed from monopoly and made such that individuals can safely engage in business on their own hook without the fear of being crushed by trust combination.

LET THE TOBACCO PLANTER HAVE JUSTICE.

The following letter explains itself:

CLARKSVILLE, TENN., January 21, 1903.

EDITOR AMERICAN AGRICULTURIST:

In a former letter attention was called to the great injustice done to the tobacco planter by the law made in 1894, by the passage by Congress of the so-called Wilson bill, which prohibited the sale of raw leaf tobacco to consumers, except by the payment of the same tax as is laid upon the manufactured tobacco.

As every agricultural product except raw leaf tobacco has free sale to any and every one, by any persons, amendment was made permitting planters in person to sell tobacco of their own growth to consumers. But as the consumers who wish to buy and use the raw leaf live in other States, the amendment was worthless to the planter, as it was intended it should be.

The Tobacco Growers' Association of this district, under the able leadership of its energetic president, Charles H. Fort, and secretary, C. N. Meriwether, have taken the matter up and are getting up petitions to Congress to abolish all laws and parts of laws which prohibit the free sale of leaf tobacco by anyone to anyone.

If these repeals of laws are made, then a new line of customers will be made for leaf tobacco and a new competition brought into the market, bearing especially against the Italian tobacco monopoly, which is considered so detrimental to the interests of our tobacco planters and general tobacco trade. The competition would be the greatest against the purchasing interest, as it is just those Italian types which would find the readiest sale in the Southern States.

It would virtually be a new demand, which might take little or none from the revenue the Government receives from the sale of manufactured tobacco, as the Southern negroes would be large consumers of the raw leaf tobacco, while they are but small consumers of plug tobacco. The action of the tobacco trust in working this law through Congress was a blunder, and a serious one, as it has antagonized against it the planters and others interested in this great staple and lost it good profits.

Its truest and most intelligent policy would have been to let matters stand as they were and to follow the lead of those enterprising jobbers and compete with them for this trade.

Its immense command of capital, most of which has only cost blank paper and printer's ink, its thorough methodic organization, and trained experts, would have given it advantages realizing \$2 profits where ordinary jobbers or shippers got \$1, and won the gratitude of the planter as a competitor against the Italian monopoly.

This great trust in its methods has been progressive and aggressive, and whenever any branch of tobacco manufacture was seen to be making profits it has at once entered into competition with it and occupied most of the field.

If the great "Duke of North Carolina" has gotten the fog of "the London particular" out of his brain, and the matter be brought before him, he must clearly see that the former action of his trust was a serious blunder, and its true interest is now to join heartily with the planters in their efforts to secure the repeal of the obnoxious law of 1894 referred to, and be able to add a new and profitable branch to its present aggregation of business.

Respectfully, yours,

M. H. CLARK.

MR. YERKES'S LETTER.

WASHINGTON, March 12, 1903.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES,

Member of Congress, House of Representatives.

SIR: I have received your letters, dated 7th and 9th instant, respectively, presenting the following questions:

1. You ask, Did the Fifty-sixth or Fifty-seventh Congress relieve tobacco growers of taxes on tobacco raised by them; and if so, under what statute and section thereof?
2. Does the law tax—and if so, how much—tobacco growers when they stem or twist their tobacco for their own use or to sell the same?
3. Can tobacco growers stem or twist their tobacco for their own personal use without paying a tax?
4. Can tobacco growers stem or twist their tobacco for the purpose of giving it away without paying a tax?
5. You ask for the departmental or judicial definition of the term "dealer in tobacco."
6. You ask for the definition of the term "manufacturer of tobacco."
7. You ask whether a tobacco grower who stems or twists his tobacco grown on his own farm or purchased from a neighbor is a manufacturer, or, in other words, whether stemming or twisting tobacco is manufacturing.

In conclusion, you ask if there is in existence any law which requires a farmer who raises tobacco to pay any tax for raising tobacco, or for stemming his own tobacco, or that which he purchases from another farmer who grows the tobacco.

If there is such law you ask to be referred to it, and to the section thereof, and you ask whether a farmer who grows tobacco can take that tobacco and sell it without paying any tax.

Without attempting to give you an immediate categorical answer to each question as presented, I have the honor to inform you that at the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress, by act approved April 12, 1902, section 3, the following law was passed relating to tobacco:

"Sec. 3. That upon tobacco and snuff manufactured and sold, or removed for consumption or use, there shall be levied and collected, in lieu of the tax now imposed by law, the following taxes:

"On snuff, manufactured of tobacco or any substitute for tobacco, ground, dry, damp, pickled, scented, or otherwise, of all descriptions, when prepared for use, a tax of 6 cents per pound. And snuff flour, when sold or removed for use or consumption, shall be taxed as snuff, and shall be put up in packages and stamped in the same manner as snuff.

"On all chewing and smoking tobacco, fine cut, cavendish, plug, or twist, cut or granulated, of every description; on tobacco twisted by hand or reduced into a condition to be consumed, or in any manner other than the ordinary mode of drying and curing, prepared for sale or consumption, even if prepared without the use of any machine or instrument, and without being pressed or sweetened; and on all fine-cut shorts and refuse scraps, clippings, cuttings, and sweepings of tobacco, a tax of 6 cents per pound."

You will not find in this section any exemption in favor of the farmer, who is not privileged to twist, stem, or otherwise change his tobacco and prepare it for consumption.

This section is only a reenactment of section 3368 of the Revised Statutes of 1873, act of July 20, 1868, section 61, and which last act first imposed a stamp tax on tobacco.

This provision of law has been in force continuously, without change except as to the rate of tax, since 1868.

Section 3362 of the Revised Statutes, and amendatory acts, require that all manufactured tobacco and snuff shall be prepared and put up by the manufacturer thereof in certain specified packages and in no other manner before removal for sale or consumption, and provides that all cavendish, plug, and twist tobacco shall be put up in certain packages, and smoking tobacco and

all cut and granulated tobacco in certain other packages; and this section makes no exemption in favor of the farmer or grower of tobacco.

The definition of a "manufacturer of tobacco" will be found in subsection 9 of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 60, act of August 28, 1894.

Said section 60 provides that—

"Every person whose business it is to manufacture tobacco or snuff for himself, or who employs others to manufacture tobacco or snuff, whether such manufacture be by cutting, pressing, grinding, crushing, or rubbing of any raw or leaf tobacco, or otherwise preparing raw or leaf tobacco, or manufactured or partially manufactured tobacco or snuff, or the putting up for use or consumption of scraps, waste, clippings, stems, or deposits of tobacco resulting from any process of handling tobacco, or by the working or preparation of leaf tobacco, tobacco stems, scraps, clippings, or waste, by sifting, twisting, screening, or any other process, shall be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco."

The second paragraph of that section provides that—

"Every person shall also be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco whose business it is to sell leaf tobacco in quantities less than a hoghead, case, or bale, or who sells directly to consumers, or to persons other than duly registered dealers in leaf tobacco or duly registered manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars, or to persons who purchase in packages for export; and all tobacco so sold by such persons shall be regarded as manufactured tobacco, and such manufactured tobacco shall be put up and prepared by such manufacturer in such packages only as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe: *Provided*, That farmers and growers of tobacco who sell leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising shall not be regarded as manufacturers of tobacco; and so much of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and acts amendatory thereof, as are in conflict with this act are hereby repealed."

In the first paragraph every person is regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco who in any manner prepares his leaf tobacco for consumption by crushing, twisting, stemming, grinding, or otherwise changing the tobacco from its natural condition.

In the second paragraph every person is regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco who sells and delivers leaf tobacco in its natural condition to consumers, or to persons other than registered dealers in leaf tobacco, manufacturers of tobacco or cigars, or persons who buy leaf tobacco in packages for export; and all leaf tobacco so sold by such person is regarded as a manufactured tobacco subject to tax; but there is this exception that farmers and growers are not to be regarded as manufacturers for selling leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising.

You ask for a departmental or judicial definition of the term a "dealer in tobacco."

In reply, you are advised that—

"Every person whose business it is to sell or offer for sale manufactured tobacco, snuff, or cigars shall be regarded as a dealer in tobacco."

The difficulty in the way of a lucid interpretation of the statutes relating to the sale of leaf tobacco by farmers has been that such restrictions have been coupled with special tax provisions and not contained in any separate statutes.

The tenth subdivision of section 3244, Revised Statutes, imposing special tax, exempted a farmer from paying the tax as a dealer in leaf tobacco, but he was required to confine his sales to tobacco of his own production and that received by him from tenants as rent and who produced the same on his land.

This statute also provided that nothing therein should be construed to exempt the farmer or planter from the special tax who, by peddling or otherwise, sold his leaf tobacco at retail directly to consumers.

This provision was also reiterated in section 14, act of March 1, 1879.

The statute imposed upon retail dealers in leaf tobacco a special tax of \$500 per annum and 50 cents for every dollar of sales in excess of \$1,000.

All persons were regarded as retail dealers who sold leaf tobacco directly to consumers, or to persons other than those who had paid special tax as leaf dealers, or manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars, or to persons who purchased leaf tobacco for export.

This, in effect, was a prohibitory tax against the sale of leaf tobacco at retail directly to consumers.

This act was amended by act of March 3, 1883, only so far as it imposed a special tax and provided that retail dealers should pay annually a special tax of \$250 and 30 cents for each dollar on amount of their monthly sales in excess of \$500 per annum.

It was provided, however, that farmers and producers of tobacco could sell, at place of production, tobacco of their own growth or raising at retail directly to consumers to an amount not exceeding \$100 annually.

This was also, in effect, a prohibitory tax against the sale of leaf tobacco to consumers.

The special tax provision was repealed by section 26, act of October 1, 1890. This act, section 27, made it the duty of the farmer to furnish a statement of his sales of leaf tobacco, with the name and residence of the person to whom sold, and the previous limitations on sales were continued, although the special tax had been repealed.

The act of August 28, 1894, repealed the former act requiring farmers to make a sworn statement of their sales, and since that time farmers and growers of tobacco have been privileged to sell leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising, and that received from tenants as rent for their land, without restriction as to the quantity sold, place of sale, or the business of the persons who purchase the tobacco.

From the foregoing premises I am constrained to answer your questions categorically, as follows:

1. That Congress has never imposed a tax on natural-leaf tobacco in the hands of farmers, but only upon leaf tobacco which they may have sold directly to consumers.
2. Under the present law a tax of 6 cents per pound is imposed upon all tobacco stemmed or twisted by a farmer not intended for his own personal use.
3. A farmer may stem and twist tobacco for his own use without incurring liability to tax on such tobacco.
4. Stemming or twisting tobacco is regarded as manufacturing, and a grower or planter can not lawfully stem or twist his tobacco for sale, or for the purpose of giving it away, without payment of tax. If he should engage in that business he would be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco, and be required to qualify as such by registering with the collector of the district, filing statement and bond, and to pack, label, and stamp his product, as provided by regulations No. 8, page 5 and 6.
5. I have already given you the legislative definition of term "dealer in tobacco."
6. My answer to question 4 is an answer to question 7.
7. The term "manufacturer of tobacco" is defined in the first and second paragraphs of section 60, quoted on page 3 of my letter.

Respectfully,

J. W. YERKES, Commissioner.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] is recognized for six minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, in this morning's Washington Post appears the following editorial:

GOVERNMENT ESTIMATES ON COTTON.

No end of dissatisfaction is being expressed in cotton-growing and cotton-raising circles over the estimate made by the Department of Agriculture of the season's cotton production. The speculators on Wall street secured a tip on the figures, or at least acted upon an alleged tip, which was emphatically confirmed by the figures given out by the Government, and succeeded in creating something like a panic on the cotton exchange.

There is no way of telling how much of the present and recent excitement in the speculative cotton market is due to the Government's part in furnishing estimates of the year's cotton supply, but the fact remains that a most disturbed condition of affairs exists, and many of those most deeply concerned in the business blame the Government for having had a part in it. Protests are being made by the cotton manufacturers against the further furnishing of estimates by the Government.

The purpose of the Agricultural Department in furnishing these estimates is to give the cotton-mill managers a hint of the season's output, and thus enable them to better gauge their purchases. The immense importance of the cotton crop and the interest felt in it by home and foreign manufacturers are considered sufficient excuse for the Government's part in securing estimates of the crop and making them public. The cotton manufacturers, however, have become convinced that the publication of these estimates do more harm than good. The information, which would be of immense advantage to the mill owners and exporters, is seized by the speculators and used by them in manipulating the cotton market, upsetting values, and, as has been the case this fall, causing the closing of cotton mills until normal conditions are restored.

These mill men argue, and with apparent force, that it is the duty of the Government to furnish facts, but that it is not the duty of the Department of Agriculture to go to the expense of furnishing "estimates" for the benefit of the speculators. It is argued that if the speculators desire to secure this advance information, they should be compelled to go to the expense of collecting it, and, further, that when the Government indulges in guesswork it causes confusion and trouble, doing much more harm than good.

It would seem that the mill men have offered pretty sound arguments in support of their contention. The Government estimates are made before the cotton is picked and before it could be of use either to the cotton grower or to the cotton manufacturer. The only result, apparently, is to supply the cotton brokers with information upon which they are able to juggle with the market futures, forcing prices for the entire crop up or down before a bale of it is picked. When the last Government bulletin of estimates was announced the speculators ran the price up several cents.

The cotton growers were naturally jubilant, but they have not been able as yet to realize anything upon their joy. The mill operators have called for a conference, looking to the curtailment of production until the demand for manufactured products warrants an increase of price and warrants them in paying an advanced price for raw materials. So that nothing has been gained by the growers or the mill owners from the publication of the Government's estimates. The only beneficiaries of this gratuitous work of Government, up to date, appear to have been the speculators.

This editorial is an attack upon the correctness of the report made by the Department of Agriculture on the present year's cotton crop. It attacks it almost viciously, and if the high source and high standing of this paper did not preclude the idea one would think that it was inspired, from the fact that it does not state the facts, but misstates almost every fact attempted to be stated.

The Washington Post is quoted by more newspapers than perhaps any other newspaper in the United States, and the character and standing of this paper are such as to warrant belief in any statement it makes without investigation. So much the greater the harm done by misstatements of fact from such a source.

This is my excuse, Mr. Chairman, for giving this matter attention in this manner and at this time.

This editorial says, among other things:

The purpose of the Agricultural Department in furnishing these estimates is to give the cotton-mill managers a hint of the season's output, and thus enable them to better gauge their purchases. The immense importance of the cotton crop and the interest felt in it by home and foreign manufacturers are considered sufficient excuse for the Government's part in securing estimates of the crop and making them public. The cotton manufacturers, however, have become convinced that the publication of these estimates does more harm than good. The information, which would be of immense advantage to the mill owners and exporters, is seized by the speculators and used by them in manipulating the cotton market, upsetting values, and, as has been the case this fall, causing the closing of cotton mills until normal conditions are restored.

The editorial charges that the Agricultural Department is doing this work, so far as the cotton crop is concerned, for the benefit of manufacturers and exporters, leaving the grower out of sight entirely. It criticises the accuracy of these reports as to cotton, but does not say one word about wheat, corn, and oats crops, that are treated in exactly the same way. It further says:

It would seem that the mill men have offered pretty sound arguments in support of their contention. The Government estimates are made before the cotton is picked, and before it could be of use either to the cotton grower or to the cotton manufacturer.

That statement is absolutely inaccurate. The report was made on the 3d day of December this year, and information was received from all sources up to the 26th of November. And now to say that this report is made up before a bale of cotton is picked is an absolute inaccuracy, and is not true in substance or in detail. Then further the editorial says:

The only result, apparently, is to supply the cotton brokers with information upon which they are able to juggle with the futures, forcing prices for the entire crop up or down before a bale of it is picked.

Before a bale is picked! The report here referred to is the report made by the Agricultural Department on December 3. Peo-

ple who live in the cotton-growing country know this statement is absolutely untrue, but there is an attempt being made to manufacture a sentiment in Congress to deprive the Agricultural Department of this function. The farmers and producers are interested in knowing the facts about the crop, as much so as the purchaser of the product of their toil, and they have a right to demand this information from an absolutely reliable and unbiased source.

The cotton farmers can not send agents out all over the country at great expense to bring them these facts, but the Government is doing it for the benefit of no particular class, but for the benefit of everybody in general who is concerned in this industry—the exporters, the manufacturers, the growers, the dealers, consumers, everybody.

This article further says:

When the last Government bulletin of estimates was announced the speculators ran the price up several cents. The cotton growers were naturally jubilant, but they have not been able as yet to realize anything upon their joy. The mill owners have called for a conference looking to the curtailment of production until the demand for manufactured products warrants an increase of price and warrants them in paying an advanced price for raw materials. The only beneficiaries of this gratuitous work of Government up to date appears to have been the speculators.

This statement is on a par with the others referred to. Cotton did not advance several cents, not even 1 cent. It went up about 75 points, which means three-quarters of a cent. There is not a spot-cotton market in the United States that has not been three-quarters of a cent higher since that report was published than it was before, and that increase is here with us and is going to remain. The Agricultural Department has made an effort to be absolutely fair and absolutely correct and truthful, and conditions warrant the conclusion at which they have arrived, notwithstanding such misleading statements as the editorial referred to.

Mr. Chairman, I have not by me the detailed information as fully as I would like to have to reply to this editorial, but will use such as I have. The great spot-cotton markets of the United States are New Orleans, Galveston, and Savannah.

The price of spot cotton middling in quality quoted November 5 at New Orleans was 10½ cents per pound. On December 1—just two days before the Government report was published—the price in New Orleans was 11½ cents per pound, showing an advance of 11½ points, or 1½ cents, per pound. During this period of twenty-five days no Government report of estimated yield had been made, but cotton advanced more than 100 points. On December 1—just before the Government report was published—spot cotton was selling in the largest spot market in the United States at 11½ cents per pound. At noon on December 3 the Government report of estimated yield was made public and spot cotton jumped in the same market to 12½ cents per pound, or 75 points.

On last Saturday, the last day for which we have quotations, spot cotton middling in quality sold in New Orleans at 12½ cents per pound, or in one-eighth of a cent of as much as it sold for on the day the report was published, showing a net gain of 62½ points, or \$3.25 per bale. Mr. Chairman, think of the many millions of dollars this means to the cotton farmers whose cotton had not been marketed when this report was published, and the Washington Post is clamorous to have these reports discontinued. Has not the farmer as much right to know facts beneficial to him at Government expense as any other class of citizens?

Mr. Chairman, it is altogether whose ox is gored as to the source of these complaints against the Agricultural Department. I remember quite well that when the report of the Department as to the August condition of cotton was published about the 1st of September last, showing a condition of over 80 per cent, and about 8 per cent above the ten-year average, that there was a great clamor went up from the bull speculators in New York and elsewhere to the effect that the estimate of condition was much too high, and was made in the interest of the mills, and was intended to put the price of the new crop down when it came into the market. Now, after the crop has been practically gathered, and with much better and more accurate and reliable sources of information, the Department makes an estimate of the size of the present crop, and the accusation is now made that the estimate is much too small and made in the interest of the speculators.

Mr. Chairman, the object of the Government report is to place the growers on an equal footing with the dealers in cotton. The Department speaks to everybody, and its benefits are general and confined to no class, while the reports and estimates coming from private sources are made to subserve private interests and are never made public unless it is in the interest of private gain.

The Department seeks information from every available source, including growers, ginners, manufacturers, merchants, bankers, carriers, State agents, traveling agents, the records of statistical bureaus showing which source gave best information in the past. This year additional agents from the Department reported from Texas. The greatest possible effort has been made to give reliable

information as to the probable yield of cotton and the report is entitled to the highest consideration.

The argument made in the Post as to cotton is equally applicable to reports made by the same Department on wheat, corn, and oats, but there appears no demand to abolish them. The whole fight is made against the cotton grower. It has been charged that the report of the Government as to cotton leaked. This is positively denied by the Department, and is entirely disproved by the course of the market on December 3, the day the report was made public. The Cotton Exchange in New York opens at 10 o'clock a. m. and closes at 3 o'clock p. m. The Government report was made public and read in the exchange at 12 o'clock noon. On December 3, 1903, the December option opened at 11.65 per pound and sold down to 11.59 just before noon. The report was read at noon, and the December option closed that day at 12.32, showing a gain of seventy-three points from noon, after the report was read, until 3 o'clock, when the exchange closed. Now, if any speculator or broker had had a tip as to what the report would be, does it stand to reason that futures would have declined just in advance of the publication of the report? No, indeed. If advance information had been given of the character of the report cotton would have advanced instead of declining, as it did.

The methods of the Statistical Office of the Department of Agriculture make leaking impossible.

The more important reports are not opened until the morning of the day when the report goes to the public, and not until after the door of the office of the Statistician and his assistants who do the final tabulating is locked, no one being permitted to go in or come out until the report is made up and brought to the Secretary for his signature. It is then given to the public, to the whole world, at one and the same moment.

Mr. Chairman, these repeated attempts to discredit the good faith and honesty of one of our great Departments of Government are to be deplored and frowned upon.

The late report of the Government has saved to the farmers, who toil in the cold and in the heat, many millions of dollars. Most usually the price of cotton is kept down during the gathering and ginning season, and until the European and American spinners have purchased their supplies, after which speculators have taken hold of the small remnant of cotton and run the prices up and made fortunes for themselves. But, thanks to the Agricultural Department, the farmers of the South this year are getting the benefit of information as to the actual size of the crop that they were of themselves unable to procure.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, there is no one here at the present time who desires to speak on this side, so I give way to the gentleman on the other side.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I now yield thirty-five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND].

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time that I shall occupy I shall not attempt any general discussion of the tariff. I shall discuss only certain phases of the question. One reason is that I do not think that a general discussion of that question at this time is called for—certainly not so far as the general merits of the policy of free trade or protection is concerned.

It seems to me that since the decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in the income-tax cases the possibility of free trade in this country, were it desirable, no longer exists. By that decision this country is irrevocably committed to a tariff policy for purposes of revenue at least, and a tariff for any purpose is necessarily protective to a greater or less extent under present industrial conditions.

By modern processes, not only in this country but the world over, the cost of manufacture has been cheapened to such an extent that any tariff on a commodity produced at home is necessarily protective. I can imagine that twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty years ago a 20 or 30 per cent tariff might not have been highly protective, but with the modern and cheaper processes of production it is now necessarily so in many industries.

We hear a great deal said on both sides of the Chamber in regard to a protective tariff and a revenue tariff, as though the two terms represented distinct and opposed policies. They may have in the past, but there is little ground for distinction any longer. What is imposed to-day as a revenue tariff is also a protective tariff, and from this time on, when our industrial activity covers almost the entire field of human endeavor, any tariff levied upon the commodities that we produce within our own domain—and we produce everything—is necessarily a protective tariff to its extent. In the future it will be more accurate to speak of the tariff as "high" or "low" than to speak of a revenue tariff or a protective tariff.

Aside from this there is another reason why any academic discussion of the question has ceased to be of importance, and it is this: We are to-day absolutely the greatest industrial nation in

the world, not only in our capacity to produce, but in the amount and character of our industrial production. My Republican friends will undoubtedly suggest that the protective policy has made us such.

Granting this to be true, and I do not care to discuss the question, for no one advocates a free-trade policy, let me suggest to you that the other great industrial nation of the world, England, relatively greater than we are—not in fact, because her domestic trade is much smaller and her population is less—has attained her industrial greatness under a different fiscal policy, the policy of free trade. So that here we have an historical and absolutely incontestable fact, that the two leading nations of the world have attained industrial greatness, one under an almost constant policy of protection and the other under a continuous policy of free trade.

With these facts before us it seems to me that it is economic folly to predicate absolute right or wrong of either protection or free trade. Like other economic policies, either may be right or wrong, according to the circumstances or situation of the country for which it is proposed. In a country such as England was when it adopted the policy of free trade, with its favorable situation and facilities for commerce, with its large amount of capital, and with the industrial progress that it had already made, free trade was undoubtedly the best adapted and most beneficent fiscal policy to develop and advance its industrial greatness.

So in the United States, a young country, rich in natural resources, richer than any other in the world in raw materials, not rich in capital, with a sparse population, and that population not skilled in manufactures, there is every reason to believe that the protective policy has had a beneficent effect in stimulating its industries.

If these suggestions are true, and they seem to me incontestable in the light of history, then the question that presents itself to us to-day is not protection or free trade, but the practical question, What shall we do under existing conditions to further our industrial and commercial interests in the greatest degree? I am delighted to see perhaps the leading advocate of the protective policy before me [Mr. HEPBURN], the gentleman who certainly has made the most eloquent appeal to the House that has been made for the preservation of conditions as they are. I will submit to him this proposition, because it is the basis upon which I shall present the questions that I propose to discuss.

The proposition is this: A fiscal policy is useful to any country in connection with its industrial development to the extent to which it tends to develop and extend the demand for domestic products without unduly burdening the consumer. A fiscal policy is injurious in the same respect to the extent that it tends to destroy, reduce, or embarrass the demand for home products or home manufactures.

Now, to the extent that the protective policy has furthered our industrial and general growth—because I will concede that under the conditions that have prevailed it has had a stimulating effect, although I do not concede that it does not produce other effects that possibly counterbalance its good effects, but which are largely ethical rather than economic—to the extent that the protective policy has benefited American industry, it has been by restricting and burdening the importation of foreign manufactures by the tariff, thereby increasing the demand for the domestic product.

By increasing the demand, by broadening the field for the domestic product, it has tended to increase the price of that product, because, in increasing the demand for a commodity, necessarily, other factors being equal, it increases the price. By reason of increasing the price it has invited additional capital and additional labor into industrial production, and, by that means, it certainly has extended the scope of labor, and possibly increased wages.

The effect of the free-trade policy in England has been identically the same. By reason of her greater industrial advance and progress than any other nation in the world at the time, by reason of her commercial situation, by reason of the fact that she was ready to supply the civilized world with the results of modern invention and industry to a greater degree and earlier than any other people, she wisely adopted a policy of free trade and invited the commerce of the world to come without let or hindrance, and thereby created the greatest possible demand for her domestic products.

Now, our situation was different from that. What worked well in England and created the greatest possible demand for domestic products—I mean that fiscal system—might not have worked well here.

Now, then, starting from this premise, the virtue in the policy of protection rests on the proposition that it affords the greatest possible demand for domestic products.

Whenever any legislation, whenever any tariff schedules,

whether denominated protective or otherwise, cease to have that effect, and, on the contrary, have a deterrent effect on production and commerce, curtailing consumption at home, harassing and restricting trade, reducing the demand for our products abroad, and only burdens the domestic consumer, it ceases to be justifiable, gentlemen of the majority, even on your own ground, on the grounds of protection; and that is the great difficulty with our tariff to-day.

It has ceased to be an economic policy that tends to develop, foster, and bring forth the greatest industrial activity within our domain, and to make the largest, broadest domestic and foreign market for our products. It is this that we complain of; it is for this reason that we appeal to you to forget partisan interests for the moment and meet the present necessities of our situation.

Why, I read in a Republican Philadelphia paper that came to my desk the other day—the Inquirer, November 18—that a steel plant in Philadelphia has negotiated a large sale of steel rails in Asia, of which fact I am very glad, for we are all proud of any conquest made by American capital and American industry.

I read this statement:

The price of \$22.88 per ton, which the company gets for rails sold to the Mecca Railway Company, is \$5.12 per ton below the pool price to domestic buyers, but still the company will make a profit of \$9 per ton, it is said.

Now, I am proud of the fact that American industry should reach a point where a ton of steel rails can be produced at such figures, but I would be prouder of the fact if our legislation were such that the American people could have part of the benefit of it. [Applause.]

I was out on the Pacific coast for a couple of weeks just before I came down here, and I learned of an occurrence that impressed the situation with reference to our iron and steel schedule on my mind in a greater degree than anything that has yet come to my notice.

As you all know, there is an immense packing industry on the Pacific coast. A great deal of tin plate is used in that industry. There is also a large demand for sheet steel and sheet iron for Alaska. On the trip referred to I learned what I am now about to state. I am not going to give names, but what I shall say is capable of verification by anyone who is curious. The Northern Pacific Railroad Company, to which I shall refer, will give you the data and the facts.

A firm in Portland, Oreg., dealing in hardware and handling large quantities of tin plate and sheet steel found that they needed some six or seven carloads of such material. This was about a year ago last summer. They wrote to Pittsburg, the only place where those commodities could be bought, to one of the subsidiary companies of the steel trust, and received quotations. These people at Portland found that the price made by the Pittsburg company was exorbitant, that it left no profit to them on the basis of the contracts that they had entered into, so they sent up to Vancouver, a thriving town just over the Canadian line, I think within 15 miles of the United States boundary, and they procured a firm of Canadian brokers to write to the same concern a letter similar to that which they had sent, to ascertain at what prices they could buy these seven carloads of tin plate and sheet steel.

The Canadians were given quotations ranging from eight to eleven dollars per ton less than the quotations to the American applicants. At the instance of the Portland firm the Canadian brokers immediately ordered the tin plate and the sheet steel. In due course of time the orders were filled and the bills of lading, with drafts annexed, were sent to the bank at Vancouver. Those of you who are at all familiar with dealings in that kind of commodities know that the manufacturer usually advances the freight, directs the route of shipment, and sends draft with bill of lading. These cars had been routed from Pittsburg to Chicago, from Chicago to St. Paul via the Burlington road, and from St. Paul to the Pacific via the Northern Pacific Railroad.

In due time, as I say, the bills of lading, with drafts attached, arrived in Vancouver, and the Vancouver brokers promptly paid the drafts, indorsed the bills of lading, and sent them to their Portland customers.

They immediately put themselves in communication with the Northern Pacific Railroad and found that the cars were in transit somewhere in North Dakota. They demanded that the cars should be diverted, so as to be sent—three to Portland, two to Seattle, one to Tacoma, and one to another point, I think, instead of being carried through to Vancouver. They had the title papers—the bills of lading—indorsed; the drafts duly receipted. The railroad company could do nothing else than comply with the demand, and the cars were diverted, and this clever Portland firm saved about \$3,000 by the transaction.

Now, gentlemen, speaking to you as American citizens, what do you think of a condition of affairs that compels our own citizens to resort to lying and subterfuge to get that decent treat-

ment that they ought to be entitled to as a matter of right under our own laws? And still you say, "We stand pat." Party policy, the exigencies of a prospective campaign, will not justify you, you say, in remedying these evils at this time; nor do you promise to do it at any future time.

If my time permitted, I should like to call your attention to some of the schedules in the present law, and comment on the burdens that they impose upon our people, but I can not go into details, and will insert them in my remarks.

Ad valorem duties collected on the following commodities in 1902.

	Per cent.
Earthen, stone, and china ware.....	53
Leather manufactures.....	50
Glass and glassware, total.....	53
Window glass and plate glass, up to.....	125
Lead and manufactures of.....	72
Sugar and molasses.....	86
Bay rum.....	241
Borax and borates.....	122
Woolens and worsteds.....	105
Cotton hose.....	60
Carpets of flax, hemp, or jute.....	65
Flannels for underwear.....	105
Dress goods, woolen, for women and children.....	102
Hats of wool.....	93
Knit fabrics.....	91
Calico, value not over 7 cents per yard.....	78
Shawls.....	73
Bleached cotton, valued at not more than 7 cents per yard.....	85

In the iron and steel schedule, notwithstanding that we produce more iron and steel than any other nation and more cheaply, our exports in 1902 amounting to over \$98,000,000, we impose rates of ad valorem duty on the items named, as shown by Treasury returns for the year 1902:

	Per cent.
Hoop iron or steel.....	40
Band steel for making band saws.....	57 to 64
Boiler or other iron or steel plate, cold rolled.....	50
Common sheet iron or steel, valued at less than 3 cents per pound.....	57
Wire.....	40
Wire coated with zinc or tin (galvanized).....	51
Wire rope smaller than No. 16.....	81
Wire rope larger than No. 16 and all sizes.....	54
Chains.....	45 to 75
Pocket knives.....	80
Cutlery, average.....	66
Scissors and shears, average.....	51
Bar iron (charcoal).....	29
Flat iron (not less than 1 inch wide).....	27
Square iron.....	28
Steel rails (railway).....	32
Pig iron.....	29

Schedules like these, in view of the present state of the industry, do not stand for protection—you can not justify them as such. They only afford opportunity for "graft." They retard railroad development and other construction at home, and handicap our manufactures abroad.

There is hardly a village in the North having a population in excess of 5,000 where there is not a factory of some kind manufacturing implements, manufacturing engines, tools, carriages, and what not. My city of Minneapolis sends hundreds and thousands of machines and engines abroad every year—thrashing machines, harvesters, plows, cultivators, bicycles, gasoline engines, steam engines, wagons, carriages, and a variety of manufactured articles requiring iron and steel—and there are many smaller cities in our State developing manufacturing in numerous similar lines.

But they have been hampered and restricted for years in their work. Why? Steel and iron are their raw materials, and unless they can get their raw material, their steel and their iron, substantially on the same basis of prices which prevails in the markets of the world they are handicapped. By these exorbitant schedules you enable the trust to hold up these hundreds of smaller manufacturers and prevent them from getting the raw material that they need to engage in the world's competition, which they are otherwise better equipped for in many lines than any manufacturers in the world.

In these and many other schedules your tariff has ceased to be a protective tariff, because instead of furthering and increasing the demand for domestic production it has decreased it. Instead of encouraging industry it retards industry. Mr. Chairman, I arose really not to speak on these questions so much as to call attention to another situation connected with our tariff, which to my mind is more important to the American people than is any other pending question.

The fact that I have grown up in the North Star State, that I have lived a neighbor to Canada all my life, perhaps enables me to speak, not only with stronger personal convictions, but with greater familiarity than most of you. I remember when I was in this House, a young fellow, fifteen or sixteen years ago, I had occasion to discuss our Canadian relations. I remember one occasion when the House passed a bill pellmell, at the suggestion of President Cleveland, to retaliate against Canada for some imaginary wrong.

The whole performance was absurd; but there were only two men in the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and myself, who recorded our votes in the negative. The bill died in the Senate. If you will look at the map of North America which is usually displayed in the lobby, you will find that on our northern border, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a distance of over 4,000 miles, is a country much larger in area than ours. It is peopled by the same people—that is, it has drawn its population from the same source. They speak the same language. They read the same literature as we do and have on the whole the same system of government, at least so far as self-government is concerned. They are actuated by the same ideals.

They are Americans just as intensely as are we. Those of you who justify the protective policy on the ground that it protects our own people against the competition of a lower population, a lower standard of living, a lower standard of wages, can not truly say, if you know the Canadians as I know them, that we are justified in maintaining a tariff wall against them on that ground.

The standard of living in Canada, excepting possibly in the Province of Quebec, is just as high, just as promising for the future as the average standard in the States, and I think possibly a little better. What about this country to the north? Some of you say it is a cold, barren, worthless region. There was a time, gentlemen, when our country was less known and less regarded, when the population of this country was much less than Canada's six millions.

When this country became one of the nations of the world in its own right it had less than 3,000,000 people. The place occupied by the magnificent city of Minneapolis, which I now have the honor to represent, was not a village fifty years ago. The great State of Iowa, so ably represented by the gentleman before me [Mr. HEPBURN], was a frontier settlement fifty, or, at the utmost, sixty years ago.

But look at that map again, as I suggested, and you will observe that the great interior basin of North America extends without interruption from the Gulf of Mexico clear up to the Arctic Ocean. This basin in the aggregate comprises the largest, richest, most valuable agricultural area in the world. In physical conformation it is a unit. It ought to be commercially. It will be. It is destined to be a unit commercially and economically, whether it will be politically or not. I do not care for political unity.

You are familiar with the portion of this area south of the boundary line. The tillable area north of our boundary line is almost as large. I speak from personal knowledge. A year ago last summer I started from Minneapolis and went 1,700 miles north and west into Canada. I traversed the larger portion of the northwestern Provinces, whose area and population are as follows:

	Area.	Popula- tion, 1901.
	<i>Sq. miles.</i>	
Manitoba.....	73,956	255,211
Alberta.....	100,000	65,876
Assinibolia.....	90,340	67,385
British Columbia.....	383,300	178,657
Saskatchewan.....	114,000	25,679

This immense domain is more than twice the size of Texas; three times the size of the original thirteen States; larger than Minnesota, the two Dakotas, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Illinois, with Michigan, Ohio, and New York thrown in. And what about this vast territory? Let me tell you that for a distance of over 1,200 miles in that journey I saw wheat fields dotting the prairie—grain fields as good as I ever saw in our State or in Dakota. I was up in that region some twelve years ago, when I was a Member of this House before. Then it was a wilderness west of Manitoba, but now it is dotted with settlements all the way up the Saskatchewan River and into the Peace River country. Within the last three years grain production in that region has more than doubled. The wheat crop has increased from 25,000,000 bushels per annum to upward of 50,000,000, and I presume it will reach 60,000,000 or 65,000,000 this season. I do not assume to speak with absolute accuracy in these figures, but the statistics are readily accessible.

This immense region is destined to raise more grain, more cereals other than corn, than any equal area in the United States. But notwithstanding these conditions and this development at our own borders, taking place before our eyes, with a wanton shortsightedness, influenced by the petty notions that prevail in New England and have dictated the policy of this great and growing nation for the last quarter of a century, we have shut our-

selves by a tariff barrier from participating in the development and in the trade of that magnificent territory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRUNDIDGE. Does the gentleman desire any further time?

Mr. LIND. I should be glad to have fifteen or twenty minutes more.

Mr. BRUNDIDGE. I yield to the gentleman twenty minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. LIND. This region not only will raise immense quantities of grain, but is capable of developing and maintaining as high a degree of prosperity and civilization as we have in Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the two Dakotas. It is bound to come, and in a short time. The young men from Iowa, the young men from Dakota, the young men from our State, the young men from Illinois, are going there, went there last year and the year before, not by thousands but by tens of thousands, to participate in the development of that magnificent domain.

Do you blame them for going? Did you not do the same when you came out to the prairies in Illinois; when you ventured to Oregon? Did not my father do the same when he came to Minnesota? Some of you before me ventured to go to the frontier prairies of the Dakotas. It is in destiny—although I almost despise the word after the way it has been prostituted of late—but if there is any permissible use for it in connection with politics I say it is in the destiny of this continent that that section shall be part and parcel of ourselves, economically at least. [Applause.]

Why stand in the way? Why will you not permit those of our own blood, of our own language, of our own ideals, and our own manners—in fact, I heard it said that my colleague from the Red River district strayed into Canada to electioneer last fall, and did not discover that he had strayed until he was told. [Laughter.] I say, why will you not permit those people to trade with us, to be part of us economically?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LIND. I will, if my time can be extended. What is the question?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota whether he thinks the people of the Province of Quebec are of the same standard of living and of the same standard of blood as the people of the United States?

Mr. LIND. If I understand the statistics correctly of the State from which the gentleman hails, the standard of living, or at least the antecedents, of a considerable portion of the population of Massachusetts is very similar to the standard of living and the antecedents of the people of the Province of Quebec. [Applause.] And I was very careful in my preliminary statement to except—

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts again rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIND. I will yield for a question.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Are you not aware of the fact that the standard of living is very much higher among the people of Massachusetts, although perhaps some few of them are of similar descent? Are you not also aware of the fact that the French population in Quebec is increasing in far greater ratio than any other birth rate in the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. LIND. I am not familiar with the rate of increase of the population in French Canada. I have never had an opportunity to investigate. My acquaintance with Canadians has been wholly in the West, and that is the future of Canada, as it is of the United States. [Applause.] Now, I said the suggestion has been made that those people might sell a few dozen eggs, that they might sell an occasional mutton, that possibly they might ship a little cream and an occasional cheese to the New York market. Supposing they do! If they shipped their entire product—every pound of it—it would be less than 2 per cent of the American product.

Now, gentlemen, do you think seriously that that would embarrass our markets? If you will consult the statistics you will find that we have sold to Canada this year as much agricultural produce—yes, over 100 per cent more—than Canada has sold to us. Our farmers and produce merchants have found a market in Canada during the first ten months of 1903 for \$16,000,000 worth of meat and dairy products, breadstuffs, cotton, fruit, and livestock.

The reason for that is, in part, that the whole Klondike or Yukon region, the gold region in Canada, is largely tributary in trade to the west coast of the United States.

I am glad to see a gentleman from the west coast before me. I say to him that if we had freer trade relations with Canada, if we

had free trade with Canada in natural products, his State and his neighboring State of Washington would supply every pound of food that goes into the Klondike. Is not that true?

Mr. HERMANN. We are practically doing it now.

Mr. LIND. You are doing it now in face of the restrictions that are now imposed. You sent them over \$3,000,000 worth last year, and that amount could readily be doubled.

It is said also that the Canadians would sell us some lumber. It is unfortunately true they do send a few clapboards to the New England coast, and that is where our weakness lies. If Canada had kept her clapboards off the New England coast we would have no tariff wall. They have sold us this year about \$3,000,000 worth of lumber, and we sold them \$5,000,000 worth. Is that a great difference? Some of the gentlemen before me, who were members of the Committee on Ways and Means in the last Congress, and are again, if I read the report aright, argued that it would not do to suspend the coal tariff; that such action would injure the American coal industry. Congress did temporarily put it on the free list. Will you continue it there, or will you contend again that the American coal industry is threatened? Let us look at the facts.

We bought from Canada during ten months of this year, ending with October 31 last, some \$3,000,000 worth of coal, and sold the Canadians some \$16,000,000 worth in round numbers. Should we object to such exchange? Is it not ridiculous for a great, powerful nation like ours to use such a petty argument? Why, I dislike in a discussion to devote so much time to figures, but there is a class of figures here that I wish to interest you in. I selected some of our exports to Canada and imports during the ten months ending on the 31st of October, 1903, in just a few, but they indicate the character of the trade.

Exports to Canada.	
Agricultural implements	\$3,461,714
Cattle	1,719,642
Breadstuffs	6,000,000
Horses	1,985,124
Books and printed matter	1,401,620
Paper and manufactures of	1,235,833
Leather, furs, and manufactures	2,603,465
Cotton, and manufactures of	6,766,126
Coal, anthracite	8,645,094
Coal, bituminous	9,985,809
Oils	2,130,839
Lumber and furniture	4,822,734
Meat products	3,009,857
Tools, electric apparatus, sewing machines, locomotives, cycles, typewriters, vehicles	5,644,533
Imports from Canada.	
Horses	\$359,134
Coal	3,531,203
Copper and ore	2,818,902
Paper pulp	1,618,192
Furs and hides	2,584,826
Wool and flax	331,068
Lead	309,347
Liquors	353,138
Sugar	221,023
Lumber	8,020,856
Tea	446,211
Tobacco	359,585

We sold the Canadians in the last fiscal year, ending June 30, approximately \$125,000,000 worth, while they sold to us a little over \$55,000,000. I may not be correct in these figures, but they are approximately right. Now, these figures do not tell half the tale. They sold us raw material, products of the forest, the mines, and the soil. We sold them industrial products—sewing machines, typewriters, electrical instruments, electrical machinery, engines, and machinery of all kinds. If there is any one rule well settled in economics it is that profitable export is in articles that have been carried to the highest point of industrial finish.

Here are the figures of United States trade with Canada for three years, 1901-1903:

Year ending June 30—	Exports to Canada.	Imports from Canada.
1901	\$107,746,519	\$42,932,478
1902	111,708,275	48,787,573
1903	125,981,831	55,523,648
Total 3 years	345,436,625	147,243,699

There is ten times the profit to America in exporting an Elgin or a Rockford watch at \$50 than there is in sending out \$50 worth of grain. Now, our exports to Canada were largely of that profitable class—industrial goods—and our imports were chiefly of the raw-material kind. That is not all. If we had trade relations which permitted our commerce to follow the natural channels of trade, not only the present but the future trade of the great interior region from the Minnesota State line to the Arctic Ocean, which I have referred to, would be ours. Its natural outlet would be down the Mississippi Valley, to Lake Superior, and to Lake Michigan.

Geographically and physically that great interior country is cut off from the rest of Canada. There is a physical barrier of nearly a thousand miles of rock and morasses to be traversed without profit, without local freight, between Winnipeg and Ontario. While, as I say, if you would give the natural factors in commerce the opportunity to operate, that entire traffic would come through our State.

I speak to my colleagues from the Northwest with full assurance that they will not deny the statement that the one factor that has contributed the most to make Minneapolis great is the development of her milling industry—through the development of that magnificent industry, the greatest in the world, and through the energy and foresight of our earlier business men, Charles Pillsbury and others, living and dead.

Minneapolis has become the greatest primary wheat market in the world. It makes every bushel of wheat raised in Minnesota and the Dakotas worth 2 to 6 cents a bushel more than it would be if our section were dependent on Chicago or any other eastern point. Some of us know what has made Milwaukee famous. [Laughter.] All of us know what has made Minneapolis famous—"Pillsbury's Best." To maintain the standard of that magnificent bread and of all of our flour, our mills must have a certain proportion of hard wheat; and let me tell you confidentially that wheat raised in Iowa and southern Minnesota and South Dakota is deteriorating somewhat from year to year, both in quantity and in quality.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LIND. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Is it not true, as a matter of fact, that the mills of Minneapolis grind a considerable portion of the grain that is raised within, say, 100 or 150 miles tributary thereto, the Dakotas and Minnesota?

Mr. LIND. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Is it not also true that the cash price of wheat raised in that vicinity at various times in the year is from 1 to 4 and 5 cents higher than in any portion of the northwest market or the market in Chicago?

Mr. LIND. Possibly.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If that is true, is the speech of the gentleman in the interest of the farmers of the Northwest or is it in the interest of the milling industry in Minneapolis? If it is in the interest of the milling interest at Minneapolis, will not the breaking down of the barriers and allowing this great quantity of wheat to come in across the border and pass to these mills have a tendency to reduce the cash price of the wheat grown by the farmers in the Dakotas and in Minnesota?

Mr. LIND. The gentleman is making a speech. Let me proceed to answer his question. I want to say to my friend, who represents a portion of the old district I had the honor to once represent—

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Adjoining the gentleman's district at the present time.

Mr. LIND. Let me say that I am not here to represent any one interest of Minnesota. I own one of the good farms in the gentleman's own county.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman is a constituent of mine. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIND. What little property I own in this world is invested in farms. I speak on this question as a farmer. I am thoroughly familiar with wheat farming in our State. The gentleman only supplemented my statement by his question. His question implies that by reason of the mills in Minneapolis and the resulting large demand for wheat, wheat frequently commands at Minneapolis 4 to 5 cents per bushel more than the general market price. That is true. I started to say, and the gentleman will not deny the fact, that the wheat in his section, in Iowa, and in the southern portion of Dakota is somewhat deteriorating in quality.

What has made Minneapolis flour great? What has given it a world-wide market? Is it not its superior quality and the faithful maintenance of that quality? But, to maintain that standard, we must have the stronger wheat, that wheat rich in gluten which comes now only from the prairies of the Dakotas and from the northern part of our State and, in decreasing amount, but which we must obtain from Manitoba and from the other Canadian Provinces in the future.

If for possible present temporary gain you think that our millers should be prohibited from maintaining the quality of their goods and maintaining their world-wide market, where will your farmer neighbors and mine land when "Pillsbury Best" has ceased to stand for what it now stands? You know, as I know, that our local wheat commands the price that it does only because our mills can as yet obtain enough of the stronger northern wheat to mix with it.

But I trust, my friend, that you and my other colleagues from our State, who are men given to economic thought and study, will

take a broader view of this whole question, one commensurate with its importance to the future of our State. Do you think that a tariff of 20 cents a bushel helps the price of grain in Minnesota? Do you think that the tariff on hog products helps the price of hogs? Last year hogs were 5, 6, and 7 cents a pound; this year they are 3 cents a pound; steers, last year, 7 and 8 cents a pound; this year, under 3 cents. If the tariff helps those prices, for God's sake give us more tariff on hogs and more tariff on steers.

But you know as well as I do that it is absurd to contend that the tariff can help the price of a commodity of which we produce millions upon millions of pounds or bushels, as the case may be, for export. In some corner in Minnesota or Michigan, away from railroads, the tariff on these commodities might have a local effect, but it can not influence the market price of our staple exports. But this is the weakness of extreme protection; that is, the ethical weakness of the policy which makes men come here as exponents, agents, advocates for this little special interest or that, instead of standing by the great general economic interests of the nation that need attention. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TAWNEY. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. TAWNEY. I ask that his time be extended two minutes that I may ask him one question.

Mr. LIND. Would not the gentleman make the extension a little longer?

Mr. TAWNEY. I am willing to make it five minutes.

Mr. BRUNDIDGE. I yield the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] fifteen minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman is extended for fifteen minutes. Does he yield to his colleague?

Mr. LIND. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. I wish to ask my colleague whether he thinks a tariff of 20 cents a bushel on wheat affects the price of that article in Minnesota or the Northwest generally? I will answer the question in the language of a gentleman from his own town or city who came here during the last Congress—

Mr. LIND. My colleague is not asking me a question.

Mr. TAWNEY. And urged upon me the idea of removing that tariff, but when he was asked what effect that would have upon the price of wheat in Minnesota and vicinity, he said it would reduce the price of wheat to the farmers by perhaps 4 to 5 cents a bushel. That was the answer of that advocate for the removal of the duty on wheat.

Mr. LIND. Now, Brother TAWNEY, I do not claim a monopoly of the folly in Minneapolis. [Laughter.] There are men there wiser than myself and also those who are not wiser. [Laughter.] Before the gentleman asked his question I was suggesting that we take, if you please, a larger view of this wheat question than that suggested by him and my other friend.

We all know that next to cotton our chief export consists of wheat and wheat products. It will so continue for many years. Our principal American competitor is Argentine in the south, and Canada on the north is rapidly becoming a factor not to be despised in the markets of the world. Now, let me ask the gentleman from Winona, my colleague, if this is not a true statement of an economic principle, that the price of any commodity is regulated by the number of competing factors, either as sellers or buyers?

The more competitors offering a commodity for sale, the less price it will bring; the more competing buyers, the higher price it will bring. If you permitted natural causes to operate in trade; if you permitted the great future wheat crop of that region to be handled along nature's route and by the men and means the best equipped in the world to handle a great grain crop, viz, the people of Minneapolis and of the Northwest, every bushel of that wheat would pass to the markets of the world through our country and through our commercial channels, or at least under conditions which we in part controlled.

Instead of reaching Europe as a competing factor at unseasonable times, to be dumped on the market when not wanted, at a low price, it would go there as part and parcel of the one great American wheat crop. The American wheat crop would then be offered to the foreign consumer as required, instead of being subjected to a dual competition in its sale, and that in the aggregate would mean infinitely more than any possible temporary gain of a cent or two in a locality, but I do not concede that the repeal of the tariff would affect the price except for the better.

But wheat is only one out of a score of commodities that might be mentioned. Why, Canada has mines, forests, water power, coal, oil—all of the natural resources that have made the United States great, all in the infancy of their development. Will you continue to deprive our young men of the opportunity to assist in their development? Will you forever compel them to renounce intercourse with their kinsmen if they go there?

In another aspect the upbuilding and development of Canadian trade merits consideration. When established it will be a per-

manent trade. It will not be of the temporary character of the trade which results from mere differences of industrial development. It will be as permanent as the differences in climate and latitude. What have the farmers of Minnesota and Pennsylvania to exchange? Absolutely nothing. If the industrial development of Minnesota were the same as the industrial development of the State of Pennsylvania, there would be little commerce between the two States.

Trade along lines of parallels continues only so long as there is a marked difference in industrial development. All permanent trade—Jefferson saw this and Blaine saw it—between nations, the trade that is not dependent on differences in industrial development, extends along lines of longitude instead of lines of latitude. I said the Pennsylvania farmers and the Minnesota farmers can not trade. Tennessee farmers and Minnesota farmers can trade and do trade. We send them the old-fashioned cheerful Minnesota "Murphy;" they send us the sweet potato. They send us tobacco, and we send them flour. The South sends us fruits and early vegetables, and we return the products peculiar to our section.

One of the large items of imports to Canada, over a million dollars, was fruit. I left Minneapolis in July—strawberries selling three boxes for a quarter. When I reached Winnipeg the next morning they were selling at 25 cents a box. At that very time we had bushels—hundreds of bushels—in my own county to be shipped, the same as we shipped every day into the Red River Valley during the season and into the Dakotas, but on account of the tariff barrier we could not send them to Canada. Now, that is wicked. I believe it to be wicked in the sight of God to thus prevent the good people of Canada from enjoying the luscious fruits that we produce to the southward. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Nor do we profit by it. You, my Republican friends, are prone to talk about Democratic inefficiency and Democratic shortsightedness. If at any period in the history of our country it has been worse than yours is now, all I can say is, may the Lord have mercy on the memory of Democracy. On this question the only rational, efficient legislation the country has had it received at the hands of the Democratic party. In 1854, foreseeing the possibilities and the future of our great neighbor to the north, the Democratic Administration then in power negotiated a treaty providing for free trade in natural products between Canada and the United States.

In the year before the negotiation of that treaty we exported eight millions to Canada. In the year following the negotiation of that treaty our exports increased to \$15,000,000 and our imports grew almost apace, not quite; and so our trade increased from year to year until the treaty, without any human being having given a tangible reason for the act, was abrogated by us in 1866.

Ever since that time, by a persistent course of irritation, littleness, unbecoming a nation as great as ours, we have done everything to annoy and estrange our Canadian friends.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will my colleague permit an interruption there? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIND. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. That treaty of 1855 was a treaty merely for the exchange of natural products, was it not?

Mr. LIND. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. And the balance of trade the year before that treaty took effect was how much in favor of the United States, can the gentleman state?

Mr. LIND. Well, it was very trifling.

Mr. TAWNEY. From thirty-two to thirty-four millions the year before.

Mr. LIND. Oh, the whole trade, my friend, between the two countries was less than \$15,000,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. Well, the report of the Bureau of Statistics shows that it was between thirty-two and thirty-three million dollars. Now, the year before the treaty was abrogated the balance of trade had changed so that it was almost \$30,000,000 in favor of Canada. Is not that a fact?

Mr. LIND. No.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is the fact as shown by the figures furnished by the Bureau of Statistics. Now, I will ask the gentleman just one question more.

Mr. LIND. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it not also a fact that since the abrogation of that treaty our trade with Canada has been constantly increasing, and has increased every year?

Mr. LIND. It has been increasing.

Mr. TAWNEY. And the balance of trade in favor of the United States has been increasing every year?

Mr. LIND. Yes. Now, there is the point. So long as American statesmanship is based upon such arguments as that, that because we have the advantage of a sister nation—for we have it—and so long as that advantage tends to our profit, no matter how it irritates, no matter what desperation it drives the other

nation to, no matter what retaliation or foreign alliances it may drive that nation into, we must persist in it, forsooth, because it pays.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understand my colleague is pleading for charity in trade.

Mr. LIND. I am not pleading for charity. If there has been any plea for charity in my remarks up to this moment I would like to have some gentleman call my attention to it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Canadians need not our charity. They have a dominion as magnificent as ours, and they are beginning to have just as much pluck and self-sufficiency as we have; but you and your party, by persisting in the exclusive policy that has prevailed for the last five years, have driven English statesmen into the advocacy of a counter policy which, if it prevails, will cause you to plead for charity before your former constituents. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to say to my friend from the First district of Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], who undoubtedly thinks that he is representing his former constituents well—I know he means to, and I only regret that he can not take a broader view of his duties and of their necessities [applause on the Democratic side]—you raise a good deal of pork in your district. I raise some on my farm. Heretofore we have been selling hams and pickled pork as well as flour in Germany. In the ten months which expired on October 31 last we sold to the United Kingdom, Germany, and France of these commodities, as follows:

United States exports of wheat flour during ten months ending October 31, 1903.

Country.	Quantity.	Value.
United Kingdom.....	7,989,492	\$30,962,842
Germany.....	668,633	2,619,849
France.....	2,921	12,524

United States exports of hams and pork.

Country.	Hams.	Value.	Pork.	Value.
United Kingdom.....	148,270,363	\$17,795,311	58,811,999	\$6,111,712
Germany.....	880,043	90,158	2,653,163	248,272
France.....	96,365	10,418	133,437	12,815

This shows how tariff war affects our exports to the Continent.

By reason of the retaliatory tariffs which the "graft" schedules in our tariff law have raised against us, and upon which you "stand pat," our farmers have virtually been cut out of the markets of continental Europe. And if Chamberlain's proposed policy should be adopted and Canada become part of the proposed imperial commercial union, our farmers will be cut out of the English market as well, and it will be a sorry day for us if they are.

I believe that even in national affairs instead of pursuing a narrow, selfish, and shortsighted policy it is better to act on the principle of "Live and let live." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Canadian tariff is reasonable as compared to ours. It averages less than 25 per cent ad valorem, and ours is nearly 50 per cent.

That the Canadians should complain of this treatment is natural, especially as they are our largest customer next to England. The Canadians desire free trade in natural products. I believe that we can well afford this concession. Our trade relations were mutually profitable under that arrangement during the time that the treaty was in force. I call attention to the following table:

Table showing our trade with Canada during the reciprocity treaty of 1854, including five years prior to its adoption and the last full year under its operation.

[Treaty period, March 16, 1855, to March 17, 1866.]

Year ending June 30—	Imports into United States.	Exports from United States.
1850.....	\$1,830,399	\$3,585,170
1851.....	5,279,718	11,787,092
1852.....	5,409,445	10,229,608
1853.....	6,527,550	12,423,121
1854.....	8,784,412	24,157,612
1855.....	15,118,289	27,741,808
1856.....	21,276,614	29,025,349
1857.....	22,108,916	24,138,482
1858.....	15,784,836	23,604,526
1859.....	19,287,565	28,109,494
1860.....	23,572,796	22,685,928
1861.....	22,724,489	22,676,518
1862.....	18,511,025	20,573,070
1863.....	17,484,786	27,619,614
1864.....	23,608,736	26,574,624
1865.....	33,153,672	27,529,939

Canada allows England a preferential of 33½ per cent on manufactures. If we accorded her natural products the same treatment as England does, we would, of course, demand and be entitled to the same reduction upon our manufactures.

Much more might be said on this subject, but my time does not permit. I will print some extracts from an article which appeared in the November number of the Gateway, a magazine published at Detroit:

In overlooking Canada we have passed by the richest country, and in many ways one of the most desirable countries with which to enter into reciprocal trade relations. For one thing, facility of communication is abundant as that between the different States of the Republic.

Canada, or British North America, lies next to us, and, like our country, is growing stupendously. We formerly had a reciprocity treaty with Canada. In those days the trade of Detroit was not shut out from its neighbors. We found customers there with the same facility that we found them in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and every other State where our manufacturers and merchants did business.

How is it to-day? A wall, hard to pass through and as restrictive of intercourse as the Chinese Wall we hear about, fences us in. In this situation our trade with the 5,000,000 of Canada about equals our trade with one of the minor cities of our land.

Every State that borders on the Dominion of Canada realizes the handicap on commerce made by the custom-houses of the two nations. We have been stupid in erecting these tariff barriers against Canada. It does not require the knowledge of a student of political economy to see the result. It is especially plain to those of us who live nearest the national boundary, reaching across the continent, from the mountains of Maine to the bays of Oregon.

Our tariffs have brought retaliatory tariffs from Canada. For every stroke we have given her she has given us a counterstroke. Both stroke and counterstroke have been the occasion of much loss. It is all very foolish. The time has come to get back to sensible ways in dealing with our neighbors. To the extent of language, institutions, and sympathy they are people like ourselves.

EXPORTS OF 1903, BY COUNTRIES.

In the fiscal year just closed our exports totaled \$1,420,138,014. By world grand divisions the distribution was:

Europe.....	\$1,029,587,728
North America.....	215,640,051
Asia.....	57,954,467
South America.....	41,114,601
Africa.....	38,433,131
Oceania.....	37,408,036
Total.....	1,420,138,014

The practical question now is whether the United States will be wise—as some appear to think—or will be unmistakably foolish—as we believe—in permitting a tariff war with our best American customer to develop through failure to recognize the importance of the existing situation.

A comparison of our trade with Canada in 1902 in identical classes of goods shows a total of about \$40,000,000 of imports from the Dominion and about \$97,000,000 of exports, a heavy balance in our favor. From the list we select a few leading articles showing the most important interchanges:

Trade of the Dominion of Canada.

Articles.	Exports to United States.	Imports from United States.
Animals.....	\$2,535,493	\$1,832,777
Breadstuffs.....	651,529	10,817,450
Coal.....	4,564,433	13,956,942
Cordage.....	158,565	1,795,105
Drugs.....	747,415	3,041,991
Fruits.....	212,174	2,753,179
Fish and fish products.....	4,145,803	486,298
Furs, and manufactures of.....	683,241	1,179,218
Hay.....	504,247	121,624
Hides, etc.....	1,701,442	2,174,318
Iron and steel, and manufactures of.....	2,460,528	25,167,427
Leather, and manufactures of.....	64,734	1,466,382
Provisions.....	182,313	2,496,281
Seeds.....	370,306	2,173,034
Stone, and manufactures of.....	593,695	250,572
Potatoes.....	328,625	87,970
Other vegetables.....	265,910	254,498
Wood, and manufactures of.....	16,723,329	5,656,270

If these "specific" figures signify anything, they show such an operation of the laws of supply and demand as practically nullifies the high tariff argument in this connection. With hampering duties removed, trade would increase in both directions, and for every dollar the Canadian made he would send 60 cents or more back to this country for the purchase of more goods.

Reciprocity in noncompetitive products only is not a sensible proposition in its relation to Canada. The point to bear in mind is that it would be beyond the power of Canada to send goods enough here, under the most unrestricted reciprocity, to cause serious competition in the American market. What she could send would be of enormous benefit to her, for she is small in numbers, but it would be only a trifle in comparison with the production of this country.

In other words, we can afford to be generous with the Dominion, as we can afford to deal generously and humanely with the Philippines, to say nothing of the fact that our merchants and manufacturers want more of her goods for the purpose of making money with them.

Can we afford to do otherwise than meet the Dominion halfway with a trade proposition and evince a disposition to treat her fairly? The menace which overhangs the State of Maine contributes to the answer to this question. One of the most powerful mainsprings which is operating to favor the construction of the new Canadian transcontinental railway is the fear that the United States will withdraw the bonding privileges which the Dominion now enjoys. Canada fears American jingoism, and New England jingoism particularly. Her railroads are being constructed east and west, when they should run north and south. We have taught her to fear instead of rely upon us, and Portland bids fair to become a conspicuous victim of the result of this policy.

Can we afford to ignore the importance of negotiating a reciprocity treaty with Canada? As one of the leading Canadian journals says, she is exerting "the pressure of her determination to become an industrial nation." This

suggests, in effect, that one of her first steps will be to bar the importation of foreign manufacturers.

We had better wake up and press the subject upon Congress, and especially upon our own Congressmen, with the energy that the subject demands.

[The time of Mr. LIND having expired, Mr. BRUNDIDGE yielded to him two minutes more.]

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, since I was last a Member of this body great events have transpired. We have disposed of a foreign war. It brought trouble, it brought problems that I think will embarrass us in the future, but it also brought blessings, and the greatest of those blessings—that the American people have awakened to a consciousness of their greatness. [Applause.] We know to-day what it is to be an American. It means more than it ever did before. With that national consciousness, with this greatness before the world, let us approach these great fiscal and economic questions in the same spirit, in a spirit as broad and comprehensive as that of the elder statesmen and befitting the future and the potentialities of this nation. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BISHOP 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 bill and resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

An act (S. 833) for the relief of Joseph M. Simms, captain, United States Revenue-Cutter Service (retired).

Senate concurrent resolution No. 23.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed in paper covers, at the Government Printing Office, 5,500 additional copies of the annual report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration for the year ended June 30, 1903, with illustrations, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 2,500 copies shall be delivered to the Bureau of Immigration for distribution.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BRUNDIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the greatness and the power of the Republican party. I know that in the twinkling of an eye, almost, it has changed the geography of the world. I know that over the night it can make one republic by despoiling another. It has done so. But there is one thing the Republican party can not do, and that is to put the Democratic party in the attitude of opposing the great isthmian canal.

The Democratic party was the pioneer, was the pathfinder, in this great enterprise of connecting the two great oceans by a canal through which might pass the argosies of the world's commerce. Democrats in season and out of season, in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, in party platforms, upon the stump, and through the press, wherever their voices could be heard, have dinned into the ears of the American people the demand for the construction of this canal.

Long before some of the saints of this new dispensation came upon the scene, even while the present "strenuous" one was in his swaddling clothes, Democratic Presidents were clamoring for the construction of this canal that would bind together the Orient and the Occident by ties of commercial interests and commercial friendship. Before a single Republican now in public life had identified himself with the movement, and when, indeed, the Republican party stood in either apathetic indifference or, in serving the great transcontinental railways and other antagonistic interests, in positive opposition to the idea, a great Democrat, now and for a long while past a distinguished member of the Senate from the South, was devoting the best energies of his life to crystallizing sentiment in favor of the isthmian canal.

Nor will the party now permit differences of opinion as to the route of this canal to affect its loyalty to the canal idea. Democrats have had their preference as to the route. For a generation past, while the great crusade in its favor was going on it was waged upon the theory that it would be constructed upon the Nicaraguan route. The canal and the route became identified, so that the project became known as the Nicaraguan Canal. With scarcely an exception, engineers have declared it to be the most practicable route; commissions appointed by the Government reported in its favor; only two years ago the House of Representatives declared, with scarcely a dissenting voice, that the canal should be built and built as a Nicaraguan canal. In the Senate an amendment was adopted giving the Panama route the preference, but providing that, if satisfactory terms for the construction could not be agreed upon with the United States of Colombia, then the President should negotiate for its construction by the Nicaraguan route.

The treaty with Colombia failed; the law was mandatory in its provisions; it gave the President no discretion. Democrats believe that the law is supreme; that it applies with equal force to the President of the United States and to the humblest citizen. We

believe the President should have obeyed the law, but he did not. He has negotiated a treaty with the freshly hatched Republic of Panama for the construction of the canal by that route, and this treaty is before the Senate for ratification.

It is not because a canal is to be built that Democrats are dissatisfied; it is not because the Panama route may be the route by which the canal will be built that Democrats criticize the recent conduct of the President; it is not because they hope to restore to Colombia the sovereignty over Panama that Democrats attack the President, but it is to protest against a wrong, to appeal to the conscience of the American people to disavow an act which if established as a precedent will endanger our peace in the future and which will lessen the confidence of the world in our moral integrity as a nation.

For fifty years past the Government has been seeking to cement the ties of friendship between the United States and the South American governments; to overcome the feeling of fear and distrust with which they were inclined to regard us; to demonstrate to them that we did not covet their territory and had no designs upon their sovereignty. Especially has this been the case with those governments having sovereignty over the territory across which a canal could be dug. In 1846 we entered into a solemn treaty with New Granada. New Granada was afterwards merged into the United States of Colombia and the latter succeeded to all the rights and benefits of that treaty.

I desire to quote a part of Article XXXV of that treaty, expressing in part the obligations assumed by each Government, as follows:

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 guarantees 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 one to the other sea may not be interrupted or embarrassed at any future time while this treaty exists; and in consequence the United States also guarantees in the same manner the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over said territory.

It will be observed that this article recites that certain special advantages have been given to the United States in the preceding articles of the treaty. Under this treaty the United States Government secured the right of transit across the Isthmus of Panama, and as part consideration therefor the United States guaranteed two things, viz: First, the complete and perfect neutrality of the Isthmus of Panama; and, second, "the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over said territory."

This treaty was made just after a war of secession which had been in progress for the preceding twelve years within the limits of New Granada, and it was designed to prevent its possible recurrence. Under the provisions of the treaty the United States interfered in more than one instance to protect the sovereignty of New Granada and its successor—the United States of Colombia—over the territory of Panama. Article XXXV, before quoted, could not have been designed to protect Colombia against the aggression of European nations, for the Monroe doctrine of our Government, independent of any treaty stipulation, would effect this object. It did not have in view the protecting of Colombia against the attacks of other South American governments, because none was threatened and none contemplated. Its covenant surely was to protect Colombia against dismemberment by internal disturbances, and for more than fifty years this Government observed its obligations.

You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that on November 3, 1903, the Government of the United States was bound by its traditional policy of amity and friendship to Colombia to do no act subversive of her sovereignty, and, in addition, was bound by the most solemn treaty obligation to protect this sovereignty. If, as a fact, this Government had become weary of fulfilling its treaty obligations to Colombia, it had the right, in the way recognized by international law and by honorable means, to abrogate this treaty of 1846, but in doing so good conscience would have required us to relinquish the rights we had secured under it. We could not honorably and consistently refuse to perform our part of the contract and yet require the other contracting nation to perform its part.

On March 21, 1902, the United States negotiated another treaty with Colombia, known as the Hay-Concha treaty, and on January 22, 1903, the Hay-Herran treaty was signed by the representatives of the two Governments. This last treaty was ratified by the Senate on March 17, 1903. Colombia apparently was still suspicious of the designs of the United States upon her sovereignty and evidently required an additional pledge from the United States, and in both these proposed treaties the following provisions were inserted:

The rights and privileges granted to the United States by the terms of this convention shall not affect the sovereignty of the Republic of Colombia over the territory over whose boundaries such rights and privileges are to be exercised.

The United States freely acknowledges and recognizes this sovereignty and disavows any intention to impair it in any way whatever, or to increase its territory at the expense of Colombia or of any of her sister republics of South or Central America; but, on the contrary, it desires to strengthen the powers of the republics on this continent, and to promote, develop, and maintain their prosperity and independence.

It was provided by the Hay-Herran treaty, ratified by the Senate on March 17, 1903, that to become operative it must be ratified by the United States of Colombia on or before September 22, 1903. This was not done. Two special complaints are waged against Colombia—one that she refused to ratify a treaty from which we expected to derive a manifest advantage, and the other that this refusal was brought about by corrupt means, and proceeded also from a desire to drive a better bargain with the United States in order to secure \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000 instead of \$10,000,000 provided for in the treaty, and that the failure of Colombia to ratify the treaty would delay the United States in its purpose to construct the canal.

In so far as the first complaint is concerned, it can be dismissed with but little consideration. It is a right inherent in every nation to decide for itself whether or not a treaty negotiated by its representative shall be ratified where ratification is required.

The President and Secretary of State of the United States negotiated the Hay-Concha treaty, but it was not ratified by the Senate. Colombia had no just cause of complaint because of this. In 1884 we negotiated a treaty with Nicaragua for the construction of the canal, but the Senate refused to ratify it. Nicaragua did not make war upon us because of this failure. Within recent years we negotiated a treaty with Great Britain which our Senate rejected, and yet Great Britain did not feel aggrieved.

Nor can justification be found for our conduct because Colombia attempted to "drive a sharp bargain." We drove a "sharp bargain" with the New Panama Company ourselves, compelling them, under threat of building the canal by the Nicaraguan route, to agree to accept our valuation upon their concessions and property.

Nor can we defend our conduct because corrupt influences may have conspired to delay the construction of the canal by the rejection of the treaty. It took half a century in the United States to educate the people with respect to the canal project; to overcome the tremendous influences opposing it absolutely and seeking to defeat it by delay. Against it were arrayed powerful influences in the North and East, because the South and West, by reason of their geographical position, might reap the prime advantage, and the great transcontinental railroads have made their influence felt because the canal threatened to destroy the monopoly of transportation which they have so long enjoyed and upon which they for so long feasted and fattened.

At the very time the Spooner amendment to the Hepburn bill was passed, by which the canal route was changed from Nicaragua to Panama, the very contingency that has happened—the rejection of the treaty by Colombia—was provided for when it directed the President to construct the canal by the Nicaraguan route should Colombia fail, after a "reasonable time," to ratify the treaty with the United States. That law has never been repealed. It should have been obeyed. The President in his recent message used the following language:

No man is above the law and no man is below it, nor do we ask any man's permission when we require him to obey it. Obedience to the law is demanded as a right, not asked as a favor.

How hollow and insincere these words seem in the light of the flagrant violation of the law by the President himself.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us briefly examine into the part played by the United States in the recent revolution in Panama and see how it comports with fair and honorable dealing with a sister republic and with the established precedents of our Government. This revolution was not indigenous to the soil of Panama. It was of foreign birth and foreign parentage. The eggs from which it was hatched were laid in the United States and in Paris. Mr. Roosevelt and his Administration were not ignorant of the events that were transpiring, nor were they disinterested spectators of what was occurring. It was known to the conspirators against Colombia that if the United States lived up to its treaty obligations the revolution would fail. It was not expected that it would do so. It must have been known that our Government would not do so. Indeed, it has been current in the press that a prominent promoter of the revolution had the audacity to visit the Secretary of State before the revolution occurred to discuss with him coming events. It was an open secret for weeks and months that a revolution was coming as soon as the plotters in the United States and France were ready for it, and it was openly proclaimed that it would have the moral support of the Administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. BEALL of Texas. With pleasure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In June, or July or August, the Baltimore Sun accurately foretold the whole business, and

said it was being concocted in Paris and here. I will give the articles to the gentleman to insert in the RECORD if he wishes them.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. I will be very much obliged to the gentleman. It was also an open secret that such a revolution was being fomented, and if the Administration didn't know about it the Administration was practically all there was in this country in ignorance of what was occurring. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

I will insert in the RECORD these extracts from the Baltimore Sun of different dates, long prior to the revolution, which show that something was expected to happen.

BOLD STEPS FOR CANAL—STATES OF PANAMA AND CACUA MAY SECEDE FROM COLOMBIA—ROUTE GOES THROUGH THEM—DRASTIC MEASURES ARE THREATENED UNLESS COLOMBIAN GOVERNMENT MAKES HASTE TO RATIFY TREATY.

WASHINGTON, June 11.

In case the Congress of Colombia declines to ratify the Panama Canal treaty at its meeting beginning June 20, it is thought exceedingly probable that the two Colombian States of Panama and Cagua, occupying all the Isthmus of Panama, will revolt and set up an independent republic favorable to the interests of the canal.

Information has recently been received by the State Department from agents of the United States in Colombia which shows most conclusively that the people of Panama and Cagua are in favor of the canal treaty, and that they are working strenuously for the ratification.

The possibility which is said to exist that Panama and Cagua will secede in case the treaty is defeated will preclude the possibility of the State Department entering into any negotiations with Nicaragua looking to the ratification of the treaty for the construction of a canal over the Nicaragua route. It may be stated upon the best authority that the United States intends to build its canal over the Panama route, and that confidence is felt at the State Department that either the treaty will be ratified by the Colombian Congress or else some sort of an agreement will be reached between the States of Panama and Cagua whereby the United States will obtain the privilege of construction.

In the event of a coalition between Panama and Cagua it is more than probable that the United States would have to promise its protection to the new republic against Colombia. The two States together would form a republic larger than Costa Rica, and with the canal passing through it would be in an excellent position to be self-supporting.

It is sincerely hoped by the State Department that the treaty will be ratified by Colombia and that it will be unnecessary to resort to drastic measures in order to procure the right of way across the Isthmus. Confidential reports are being received from time to time by the Department regarding the possibilities of ratification. One day these are of optimistic character, only to be followed shortly by a report from another section of the country in which it is said positively that the treaty has not the slight chance of being ratified.

This appeared three months before the limit given to Colombia to ratify the treaty had expired and indicated that at that time a revolution would follow the defeat of the treaty, and that the President would wait such revolution rather than obey the mandate of Congress as expressed in the Spooner amendment, and that "drastic measures" would be resorted to by this Government in order to procure the right of way across the Isthmus. In the light of subsequent events this article has the appearance of being inspired. The treaty did fail, the President did wait for the revolution to occur, the Administration did resort to "drastic measures."

Permit me to direct the attention of the House to another special from Washington to the Baltimore Sun of July 28, 1903, more than three months before the revolution occurred:

"MORAL" AID TO UPRISING—UNITED STATES MAY SUPPORT THE MOVEMENT IN PANAMA—SITUATION REGARDED GRAVE.

WASHINGTON, July 27.

Not for several months has the feeling of the State Department officials, in their anxiety to see the consummation of the Isthmus canal project, reached such a high degree of encouragement as it did to-day upon the receipt of news from Colombia that a revolution is imminent in that Republic.

The last few months advocates of the canal, who have been greatly discouraged by certain opposition in Colombia, have been hoping for a revolution in that Republic. It is believed now that the time for such an outbreak has arrived, though the belief is entertained in some quarters that ratification of the canal treaty will follow the first sign of revolution and possibly settle this disturbance.

There is every reason to believe that the United States will give encouragement to the revolutionists should the break come. It is said that agents of the Panama Canal Company are prepared to finance a revolution, feeling assured that the United States will give it moral support. The scheme is to have the States of Panama and Cagua secede from the union in Colombia and establish another government. It is held that with the moral support that the United States could offer it would be impossible for the present Government of Colombia to withstand the revolution.

There is no doubt that had the United States not interfered in the last revolution in Colombia by seizing and operating the Isthmus railroad the revolution would have succeeded. Therefore, without such interference by this country a second time, it is thought the Government would collapse and the insurgents be installed as rulers. The interests of the United States in the case are entirely different now. At the time of the last revolution the canal project was not in its present shape. At the present the United States would give moral aid to the insurgents, even though it acted within the bounds of "benevolent neutrality."

This special emphasizes several facts:

First. The "State officials" felt "encouraged" because a revolution was threatened.

Second. That certain "canal advocates" have been hoping for a revolution.

Third. That the revolutionists would be encouraged by the United States with "moral" support.

Fourth. That the French Panama Company (the company selling their possessions to the United States for \$40,000,000) would "finance" the revolutionists.

Fifth. That the "interests" of the United States favored the insurgents. Yet at this time the United States was at peace with Colombia, and bound by solemn covenants to protect her against dismemberment.

I direct your attention now to what appeared in the Baltimore Sun of August 20, 1903.

SECRET PLOT IN PANAMA—FOREIGN RESIDENTS INVOLVED IN THE CANAL AGITATION—ALREADY PREPARING A BLOW—IT IS EVEN DECLARED THAT THE NEW GOVERNMENT TO TAKE CHARGE HAS ALREADY BEEN SELECTED.

SAVANNAH, GA., August 19.

An English owner of valuable properties in Panama, who came to buy machinery, said to-day:

"You may look for a governmental revolution in Panama at any time. General Cobos's recent attempt was premature, but he and I and every foreign resident of the Isthmus know that a de facto government has been selected; that it has the support of the only troops available for service, and that the word of American property owners is all that is needed to see Governor Muti supplanted—this time in earnest."

The hitch in the canal treaty is not surprising to those of us who have most at stake, the foreign residents, but has been a foregone conclusion for months. Failure on the part of the United States to complete the Panama Canal means ruin to many, serious loss to all. Revolution that shall terrorize the powers in Bogota is easy to arrange. The army has not been paid for months, and a promise by the foreigners to pay each enlisted man \$50 in gold and officers sums proportionately larger has gained an enthusiastic, though secret, allegiance.

But if it be said that these extracts represent only the opinions of the newspaper correspondents and do the President and his Administration an injustice, let me call your attention to a remarkable interview given out by Senator McCOMAS, of Maryland, on August 26, 1903, and appearing in the Baltimore Sun of August 27, 1903. Let it be remembered that Mr. McCOMAS is a Republican Senator, a close personal and political friend of the President, called by the President into council in his efforts to win Maryland for the Republicans, and in every way situated so as to reflect the sentiment of the President.

McCOMAS'S VIEWS—WHAT HE THINKS ABOUT NATIONAL AND STATE AFFAIRS, FINANCES, PANAMA, AND CUBA—THE ADMINISTRATION MAY SUPPORT SECESSION.

HAGERSTOWN, MD., August 26.

* * * Senator McCOMAS also believes that the extra session of Congress will not begin before November 9. * * *

He is also satisfied that nothing can stop the nomination and election of Mr. Roosevelt next year, and he believes that the Isthmus canal will be dug at Panama. If the Colombian Government holds out against the treaty, then, in the Senator's opinion, the State of Panama, and possibly one or two other States will secede and set up a government which will treat with the United States, and that in seceding they will receive the moral support of the Administration at Washington.

Discussing national affairs, Senator McCOMAS said to the the Sun correspondent:

"* * * The Panama Canal will be built. There will be a revival of the agitation for Nicaragua, induced by the apparent refusal of Colombia to ratify the treaty ratified by us last March. I believe Marroquin will succeed and we will get the treaty. If we do not I believe Panama, with or without other Colombian States, will declare her independence, if necessary, to achieve this waterway, to make her a great state.

"The United States is pacific and just to all South American countries. In the interests of civilization and of America we must favor within the international law this enlightened country, which wants what the world wants—the isthmian canal. Our moral influence would strongly support Panama. However, the Colombian Government may yet prevail, and this treaty is backed by the Marroquin Colombian Administration, which is potent with the Colombian Congress."

Among the great metropolitan papers of this country none has been more loyal to the Republican party nor more earnest in the support of its policies than the New York Times. On November 6, 1903, this paper contained a remarkable editorial under the caption "A national disgrace," in which the policy of the Administration was criticised in the severest way. In the course of this editorial the following statement of facts was made:

Pending the consideration of the treaty at Bogota the prediction was confidently made in this country that if ratification should be refused the State of Panama would secede, set up a government of its own, and make a treaty with us to permit the building of the canal. In proof of the fact that this was not empty speculation we have now before us the disclosure that three months ago 4,000 Winchester rifles, 1,500,000 rounds of ammunition, and other materials of war to the value of \$90,000 were shipped from Morgan City, La., under clearance papers purporting to cover a cargo of lumber. The attempt to land these munitions of war on the Colombian coast 25 miles north of Colon failed because the Government troops had got wind of the matter. The steamship having the arms aboard then sailed away for Porto Rico, a Territorial possession of the United States, where the rifles and ammunition were successfully delivered over to the revolutionists.

However that may be, it is a fact that the plans of the insurgents were known in New York more than two months ago. It was to this country that the authors of the plot naturally turned for help.

The revolt occurred on the 3d of this month, and a new government on paper was created. It is a fact that will not escape observation that seven war vessels of the Navy were, by orders from Washington, dispatched almost on the instant from nearby stations for Colon and Panama. We were in a position to make an immediate display of an armed force on both coasts of the revolted State.

The revolution that was scheduled to occur, and which it was said repeatedly months before would have the support of the President, did occur on the afternoon of November 3, 1903. It was rather a significant fact that it occurred just at the time the

polls were closing on election day in the United States, just too late for the people to voice any protest by their ballot.

The following correspondence, by cable, between the State Department and the representative of the United States at Panama, shows how keen this Government was to catch the first intelligence of the uprising to which its "moral" support was to be given. According to press reports, the gunboat *Nashville* appeared on the scene during the preceding twenty-four hours. The mine is laid. The fuse is ready. Let the fireworks begin.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 3, 1903.
(Sent 3.40 p. m.)

Uprising on Isthmus reported. Keep Department promptly and fully informed.

LOOMIS, Acting.

Mr. Ehrman to Mr. Hay.

PANAMA, November 3, 1903.
(Received 8.15 p. m.)

No uprising yet. Reported will be in the night. Situation is critical.

EHRMAN.

Mr. Ehrman to Mr. Hay.

[Telegram.]

PANAMA, November 3, 1903.
(Received 9.50 p. m.)

Uprising occurred to-night, 6; no bloodshed. Army and navy officials taken prisoners. Government will be organized to-night, consisting three consuls; also cabinet.

Soldiers changed. Supposed same movement will be effected in Colon Order prevails so far. Situation serious. Four hundred soldiers landed Colon to-day Barranquilla.

EHRMAN.

Mr. Loomis to Mr. Ehrman.

[Telegram.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 3, 1903.
(Sent 11.18 p. m.)

Message sent to *Nashville* to Colon may not have been delivered. Accordingly see that following message is sent to *Nashville* immediately:

"NASHVILLE, Colon:

"In the interests of peace make every effort to prevent Government troops at Colon from proceeding to Panama. The transit of the Isthmus must be kept open and order maintained. Acknowledge. (Signed) DARLING, Acting."

Secure special train, if necessary. Act promptly.

LOOMIS, Acting.

Mr. Loomis to Mr. Ehrman.

[Telegram.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 4, 1903.
(Sent 12.02 p. m.)

Communicate with commander of gunboat *Bogota* and state plainly that this Government, being responsible for maintaining peace and keeping transit open across Isthmus, desires him to refrain from wantonly shelling the city. We shall have a naval force at Panama in two days, and are now ordering men from the *Nashville* to Panama in the interests of peace.

LOOMIS, Acting.

Mr. Ehrman to Mr. Hay.

[Telegram.]

PANAMA, November 4, 1903.
(Received 7.10 p. m.)

Mass meeting held. Independence publicly declared. Three consuls approved organize government, composed Federico Boyd, José Agustín Arango, Tomás Arias. *Bogota* in sight.

EHRMAN.

Mr. Ehrman to Mr. Hay.

[Telegram.]

PANAMA, November 4, 1903.
(Received 9.50 a. m.)

Cables *Nashville* received. *Nashville* notified. Troops will not be moved. Last night gunboat *Bogota* fired several shells on city; one Chinaman killed. *Bogota* threatens bombard city to-day.

EHRMAN.

Mr. Ehrman to Mr. Hay.

[Telegram.]

PANAMA, November 5, 1903.
(Received 12.50 p. m.)

Received an official circular letter from the committee of the provisional government saying that on 4th political move occurred, and the Department of Panama withdraws from the Republic of the United States of Colombia and formed the Republic of Panama.

Requested to acknowledge the receipt of circular letter.

EHRMAN.

Mr. Loomis to Mr. Ehrman.

[Telegram.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 5, 1903.
(Sent 3.15 p. m.)

Acknowledge the receipt of circular letter and await instructions before taking any further action in this line.

LOOMIS, Acting.

Mr. Loomis to Mr. Ehrman.

[Telegram.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 5, 1903.
(Sent 5.09 p. m.)

Keep Department informed as to situation.

LOOMIS, Acting.

Mr. Ehrman to Mr. Hay.

[Telegram.]

PANAMA, November 5, 1903.
(Received 9.42 p. m.)

Colombian troops reembarked per Royal Mail for Cartagena. Bogota supposed at Buenaventura. Quiet prevails.

EHRMAN.

Mr. Ehrman to Mr. Hay.

[Telegram.]

PANAMA, November 6, 1903.
(Received 11.55 a. m.)

The situation is peaceful. Isthmian movement has obtained so far success. Colon and interior provinces have enthusiastically joined independence. Not any Colombian soldiers known on isthmian soil at present. Padilla equipped to pursue Bogota. Bunau-Varilla has been appointed officially confidential agent of the Republic of Panama at Washington.

EHRMAN.

Mr. Hay to Mr. Ehrman.

[Telegram.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 6, 1903.
(Sent 12.51 p. m.)

The people of Panama have, by an apparently unanimous movement, dissolved their political connection with the Republic of Colombia and resumed their independence.

When you are satisfied that a de facto government, republican in form, and without substantial opposition from its people has been established in the State of Panama, you will enter into relations with it as the responsible government of the territory and look to it for all due action to protect the persons and property of the citizens of the United States and to keep open the isthmian transit in accordance with the obligations of existing treaties governing the relations of the United States to that territory.

Communicate above to Mahmros, who will be governed by these instructions in entering into relations with the local authorities.

HAY.

But that is not all. On November 2, 1903, the day before the "revolution" occurred, the Administration was preparing for it and was carrying out its determination to despoil Colombia, to prevent the Government force from landing, not on the canal strip alone—the only strip in which this Government had an interest—but at any place within 50 miles of Panama; and our war vessels are now patrolling the coast of Colombia to prevent the landing of any Colombian troops upon Colombian soil, and our marines are stationed along the border line of Colombia to prevent her army from marching overland into Panama to put down the revolution which our own Government helped to incite.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] this morning in an attempt to defend the Administration related the occurrence of the abdication by old Dom Pedro of the Brazilian throne. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was the representative of the United States in the capital of Brazil at the time. He says he saw the old Emperor in his carriage ride through the streets one afternoon; that a revolution occurred that night, the Empire tottered and fell, and the Emperor sailed away. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made an admission that should have caused his removal. He admits that he knew nothing of this revolution being in contemplation until it occurred. We have certainly advanced since then, Mr. Chairman. We have an Ehrman on guard at Panama now, and Loomis and Darling are "acting" at Washington. Ehrman was not groping in darkness, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania was in times past, because Ehrman knew before the revolution ever occurred that it was going to occur. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] By some sort of mental telepathy Loomis here in Washington knew in advance that it was going to occur, and it may be that for fear that it might not occur on time he sends Ehrman a gentle reminder, suggesting to him that something "ought to be doing."

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Why, certainly.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. The same allegation was made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE]. A rumor that a revolution had broken out in Panama was brought to the State Department by a person representing the Associated Press. Thereupon, with that prudence which should be exercised by the State Department, a telegram was sent to our representative there, asking if the rumor was true—not informing him that a revolution was expected to take place. This is evidenced by the note at the head of the correspondence sent to the House of Representatives at their request by the President, showing how that dispatch was sent.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. I yielded for the purpose of a question only, but if what the gentleman states was sufficient authority

for the State Department to act, then it ought to have acted weeks and months before, because the press of this country teemed with suggestions that a plot against the integrity of the United States of Colombia was being formed, and the details of that plot were known under the very shadow of this Capitol.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. That telegram was sent to find out whether the rumor was true.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. In order, if it was true, I presume, that recognition might instantaneously be accorded the bantam Republic. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] That illustrates the grounds of my complaint against the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He is entirely too slow. He couldn't report the details of the Brazilian revolution until it had occurred. The gentleman from Pennsylvania should sit at the feet of Ehrman and Loomis. They don't do things that way. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. If we were as slow as the Democratic party the canal would never be built. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BEALL of Texas. I did not understand the remark of the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman had listened to my remarks this morning he would have heard me say that the Administration is to be commended for seizing the opportunity to construct a canal under more favorable conditions than has ever happened before.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Of course the gentleman would commend the Administration for "seizing" anything; that is what we are objecting to of late years. There is a disposition manifested by the Republican party to "seize" anything that is lying around loose. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] There is too much "seizing" and too much "Caesarism" being displayed in this country.

The State Department evidently wanted a revolution; it expected a revolution. It inquired whether one had reported for duty. The representative at Panama answered, "No uprising yet." But he afforded Loomis consolation in what followed, for it notified him that the revolution would come off in the night, and it did come off at 6 p. m. [Laughter.] Two hours and twenty minutes after the secession special was due by Loomis's time card in Washington it hove in sight in Panama. Loomis was the acting chief dispatcher for the Roosevelt Revolution Road, and Ehrman ran an information bureau. One hour and thirty-five minutes after the Department of State was advised by Ehrman that a revolution was expected it was notified by the same party that the revolution had already occurred and that a government would be organized during the night "consisting of three consuls and also a cabinet."

But the gentleman said this morning that it was dangerous to reflect upon this Republican Administration. That sounds like Russia. I concede that it is dangerous for a Republican to reflect upon it, because this Administration is on horseback and has teeth, and if a gentleman on the other side doesn't prostrate himself he is likely to suffer mutilation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania dare not reflect upon this Administration. He has post-offices and patronage at stake; his portion of the "official pie" would look smaller than 30 cents if he did. "Pie" is the favorite Republican provender. In a contest between principle and "pie" principle had better take to the woods so far as the Republican party is concerned. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BEALL of Texas. If the gentleman will not make a speech.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I want to say to the gentleman that there is only one post-office in my district, and the Senators from my State take care of that.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Well, I don't know much about Pennsylvania. I accept his statement that there is but one post-office in his district, but there must be other "plum trees" for him to shake. The gentleman from Pennsylvania flaunted the Stars and Stripes this morning and said he stood for the sentiment "Our country, right or wrong." We echo the sentiment. Adopting the expression of a distinguished orator of the North we are for our country, "If it is right, to keep it right; if it is wrong, to get it right." It is because we love our country that we protest against this course of dishonor—this departure from the traditions of the past.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] a few days ago denounced the conduct of this Government in its dealing with Colombia and Panama as unprecedented in our history and

unwarranted by international law. Complaint has been made that the opinions quoted were not modern enough to suit the case. Until now I have cherished the belief that it was far wiser and better for one seeking to fortify his position by authorities to go back to fundamental principles and to the founders of the Government—to seek counsel from those who guided our country in days past and gone. It is not a matter of surprise that the President refuses to heed the example of many of his predecessors, for his estimate of their character is wholly at variance with the popular conception. We have been taught to look with deference and respect back to the fathers and founders, to heed their admonitions, and to follow their examples. But the President has disillusionized us. Instead of giants in those days, there were pigmies; instead of statesmen, there were mountebanks and impostors; the vaunted statecraft of the fathers was a myth, and the glories achieved upon the field pale before the incomparable splendors of this peerless soldier of San Juan.

The President once wrote a history of Thomas H. Benton, and in this book he consigns to oblivion many hitherto historic characters; and for the information of the House and as a warning against the folly of ever looking to their words or examples in times of national stress I desire to read what he has to say in regard to these "little Americans."

JEFFERSON.—Scholarly, timid, and shifty doctrinaire, who supplanted the elder Adams.

MONROE.—He was a courteous, high-bred gentleman, of no special ability, but well fitted to act as a Presidential figurehead during the politically quiet years of that era of good feeling which lasted from 1816 to 1824.

JACKSON.—Ignorant, headstrong, and straightforward soldier; of strong, narrow mind and bitter prejudice, with few statesmanlike qualities.

VAN BUREN.—Faithfully served the mammon of unrighteousness, both in his own State and later on at Washington.

HARRISON.—General Harrison had already shown himself to be a good soldier and a loyal and honest public servant, although by no means standing in the first rank either as regards warcraft or statecraft; but the mass of his supporters apparently considered the facts, or supposed facts, that he lived in a log cabin, the walls of which were decorated with coon skins, and that he drank hard cider from a gourd as being more important than his capacity as a statesman or his past services to the nation.

TYLER.—He has been called a mediocre man, but this is unwarranted flattery. He was a politician of monumental littleness. * * * His chief mental and moral attributes were peevishness, fretful obstinacy, inconsistency, incapacity to make up his own mind, and the ability to quibble indefinitely over the most microscopic and hair-splitting plays upon words, together with an inordinate vanity that so blinded him to all outside feelings as to make him really think that he stood a chance to be renominated for the Presidency.

POLK.—Who was, excepting Tyler, the very smallest of the small line of Presidents who came in between Jackson and Lincoln.

TAYLOR.—He was neither a great statesman nor yet a great commander. **PIERCE.**—A small politician, of low capacity and mean surroundings, proud to act as the servile fool of men worse than himself, but also abler. He was ever ready to do any work the slavery leaders set him, and to act as their attorney in arguing in its favor—to quote Benton's phrase, with "undaunted mendacity, moral callosity, [and] mental obliquity."

The Panama "revolution" occurred at 6 p. m. November 3. Its independence was recognized at 2.45 p. m. on November 6 by the United States. What justification was there for this action? What was there to recognize? No stable government had been formed. A self-constituted junta had assumed power under the protection of the United States war vessels. Press reports were responsible for the statement that the flag of the insurgents was raised by a naval officer of the United States. It had no army; no navy. It had not enough citizens of Panama in its support to fill its offices, and it had to conscript Frenchmen interested in the old canal company.

If the support of the United States had been withdrawn, this Government of Panama would have vanished in an hour. Yet it was recognized. By what right was this done? That "timid doctrinaire" (Jefferson) said that to be entitled to recognition it "must be made by the will of the nation substantially declared." The Government of Panama did not represent the "will of the nation," nor was it substantially declared.

John Quincy Adams, when Secretary of State, said recognition would follow when—

the independence is established as a matter of fact, so as to leave the chance of the opposite party to recover their dominion utterly desperate.

In 1823, in discussing the attitude of this Government toward certain revolted colonies in South America, he used the following language:

When a sovereign has reasonable hope of maintaining authority over insurgents, the acknowledgment of the independence of such insurgents would be an international wrong. It is otherwise when such sovereign is manifestly disabled from maintaining the contest.

That "Presidential figurehead" (James Monroe) refused to recognize the independence of certain South American States until—

it is manifest that all those provinces are not only in full enjoyment of their independence, but, considering the state of war and other circumstances, that there is not the most remote prospect of their being deprived of it.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman has expired. **Mr. BRUNDIDGE.** Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Republican party has reversed itself upon the two great principles that gave it birth

and life. It was born as a protest against slavery. Within recent years it has recognized and permitted slavery in the Philippine Islands. Its first success precipitated secession, and its first President made war upon it and destroyed it by the sword. This last Republican Administration sets its seal of approval upon secession, not only by encouraging it in Panama, but in using the Navy—and if need be, the Army—of the United States to prevent its suppression.

In 1836 Texas declared her independence of Mexico. Her people had been largely drawn from the United States and were one in language, one in tradition, one in sentiment, and one in aspiration with the people of the Union. By their valor in the field they had enriched the history of the world. They had made that era the heroic age of the Southwest. They had given the Alamo to the world as a shrine dedicated to imperishable heroism; at Goliad they had furnished the world the inspiring spectacle of heroes dying for liberty; at San Jacinto they had vindicated their right to be free; they had dispersed and driven from their soil the invading army; they had captured its leader; they applied to the United States for recognition. Mr. Clay of Kentucky, in a report made in the Senate on June 18, 1836, used the following language:

About three months only have elapsed since the establishment of an independent government in Texas, and it is not unreasonable to wait a short time to see what its operations will be, and especially whether it will afford those guaranties which foreign countries have a right to expect before they institute relations with it.

At that time the "ignorant, headstrong" Jackson, of "narrow mind and bitter prejudice, with few statesmanlike qualities," was President. He had been the close personal and political friend of Houston and of Crockett. He had been a soldier; he knew how to appreciate valor. All the impulses of sympathy, of sentiment, and of interest urged upon him the recognition of Texas. In his message to Congress in December, 1836, however, he used the following language:

The acknowledgment of a new State as independent and entitled to a place in the family of nations is at all times an act of great delicacy and responsibility, but more especially so when such State has forcibly separated itself from another of which it has formed an integral part and still claims dominion over it.

And again he says:

It has thus made known to the world that the uniform policy and practice of the United States is to avoid all interference in disputes which merely relate to internal government of other nations, and eventually to recognize the authority of the prevailing party without reference to our particular interests and views or to the merits of the original controversy.

We acknowledged the separate independence of New Granada, of Venezuela, and of Ecuador only after their independent existence was no longer a subject of dispute or was actually acquiesced in by those with whom they had been previously united. It is true that with regard to Texas the civil authorities of Mexico had been expelled, its invading armies defeated, the chief of the Republic himself captured, and all present power to control the newly organized government of Texas annihilated within its confines. But, on the other hand, there is, in appearance at least, an immense disparity of physical force on the side of Texas. The Mexican Republic, under another Executive, is rallying its forces under a new leader and menacing a fresh invasion to recover its lost dominion.

But it is said in this House that we are interested in Panama; that it is to our commercial advantage to recognize Panama in order to hasten the construction of the canal. Compare this spirit of to-day with the spirit of 1836 as viewed by Jackson:

But there are circumstances in the relation of the two countries which require us to act on this occasion with even more than our wonted caution. Texas was once claimed as a part of our property, and there are among our citizens those who, always reluctant to abandon that claim, can not but regard with solicitude the prospects of the reunion of the territory to this country.

A large portion of its civilized inhabitants are emigrants from the United States, speak the same language with ourselves, cherish the same principles, political and religious, and are bound to many of our citizens by ties of friendship and kindred blood; and, more than all, it is known that the people of that country have instituted the same form of government with our own, and have, since the close of your last session, openly resolved, on the acknowledgment by us of their independence, to seek admission into the Union as one of the Federal States. This last circumstance is a matter of peculiar delicacy and forces upon us considerations of the gravest character.

The title of Texas to the territory which she claims is identified by her independence. She asks us to acknowledge that title to the territory, with an avowed design to treat immediately for its transfer to the United States. It becomes us to beware of a too early movement, as it might subject us, however unjustly, to the imputation of seeking to establish the claim of our neighbors to a territory, with a view to its subsequent acquisition by ourselves.

Prudence, therefore, seems to dictate that we should still stand aloof and maintain our present attitude, if not until Mexico itself or one of the great foreign powers shall recognize the independence of the new Government, at least until the lapse of time or course of events shall have proved beyond cavil or dispute the ability of the people of that country to maintain their separate sovereignty and to uphold the Government constituted by them. Neither of the contending parties can justly complain of this course. By pursuing it, we are but carrying out the long-established policy of our Government, a policy which has secured to us respect and influence abroad and inspired confidence at home.

In 1849 the Hungarian patriots were struggling for liberty under the leadership of Louis Kossuth. The splendid heroism they displayed and the fact that they were in revolt against the most intolerable oppression stirred this country most profoundly.

Inspired by the most commendable sympathy, there came a demand from all sections upon the President of the United States to recognize the independence of Hungary. Taylor was President. "He was neither a great statesman nor a great commander," and he refused recognition to Hungary.

In a special message to Congress he gave his reason, as follows:

My purpose, as freely avowed in this correspondence, was to have acknowledged the independence of Hungary had she succeeded in establishing a government de facto on a basis sufficiently permanent in its character to have justified me in doing so, according to the usages and settled principles of this Government, and although she is now fallen and many of her gallant patriots are in exile or in chains, I am free still to declare that had she been successful in the maintenance of such a government as we could have recognized we should have been the first to recognize her in the family of nations.

But if all other precedents were lacking the course pursued by the Government of the United States in the great civil war settled beyond all cavil the policy of the United States. Eleven States seceded from the Union. They established a government of their own. They had a president, a vice-president, a cabinet, a congress. They were performing all the functions of government. In population they had a third, in area a half, of what was then the territory of the States. They had the nucleus for a navy which was driving the commerce of the United States off the seas. They had an army of the best soldiers the world ever saw. The superiority of the southern soldiers stand to-day admitted by Mr. Roosevelt himself. He says that to the decline of the militant spirit of the northeast was—

due, more than anything, the undoubted average inferiority of the northern to the southern troops, at any rate, at the beginning of the war of rebellion. The southerners by their whole mode of living, their habits, and their love for outdoor sports, kept up their warlike spirit; while in the North the so-called upper classes developed along the lines of wealthy and timid bourgeois type, measuring everything by a mercantile standard (a peculiarity debasing one if taken purely by itself), and submitted to be ruled in local affairs by low foreign mobs, and in national matters by their arrogant southern kinsmen. The militant spirit of these last certainly stood them in good stead in the civil war. The world has never seen better soldiers than those who followed Lee.

These soldiers were led by Beauregard, by Joseph E. Johnston, by Albert Sydney Johnston, by Hood, by Jackson, and, above all, by Lee, who, according to Mr. Roosevelt—

will undoubtedly rank as, without any exception, the very greatest of all the great captains that the English-speaking peoples have brought forth, and this although the last and chief of his antagonists may himself claim to stand as the full equal of Marlborough and Wellington.

That army of the South had routed the forces of the Government, had driven back the invading army, and was in sight of the Capitol. The Confederacy applied to foreign governments for recognition. Mr. Seward was Secretary of State. England's "interest" would have been subserved by the recognition of the Confederacy, except that it would have involved her in war with this Government. Mr. Seward, in the course of his very able correspondence on this subject, committed his Government to the policy that—

to recognize the independence of a new state, and so favor, possibly determine, its admission into the family of nations, is the highest possible exercise of sovereign power, because it affects in any case the welfare of two nations and often the peace of the world.

And he further says:

Humanity has, indeed, little to hope for if it shall, in this age of high improvement, be decided without trial that the principle of international law which regards nations as moral persons, bound so to act as to do each other the least injury and the most good, is merely an abstraction too refined to be reduced into practice by the enlightened nations of western Europe. Seen in the light of this principle, the several nations of the earth constitute one great federal republic. When one of them casts its suffrage for the admission of new members into that republic, it ought to act under a profound sense of moral obligation, and be governed by considerations as pure, disinterested, and elevated as the general interests of society and the advancement of human nature.

At that time Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States. Mr. Chairman, I was born in the South, reared in the South; my father, my brother, my kindred, fought in the armies of the South. I love her history, her traditions, her memories. I would not exchange the heritage thus bequeathed to me for all the gold of the barons of trade. But we of the South are forgetting many of the bitter memories of the past. We join to-day with all other sections in doing honor to the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

In this crisis of my country's history, when precedent seems abandoned, when principle seems forsaken, when we are beginning to worship new and strange gods, when our destiny as a nation is "quivering in the wind," I say, Would to God that in such an hour and such a crisis there stood at the helm a man with the gentleness and courage, with the honesty and experience, with the wisdom and statesmanship of Abraham Lincoln to guide the old ship on its wonted way, avoiding the shoals and the narrows and the dangers which it must encounter if it sweeps on in the course it is now going. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, for forty years the Republican party has been hiding behind the tombstones of its great men—first of Lincoln, then of Grant, then of McKinley. It can not in this instance invoke the example of Lincoln, nor of Grant, nor of McKinley. For

almost ten years, beginning with 1868, the Cuban patriots were struggling for their liberty. Grant's sympathies were with them. The interests of our people would have been subserved by the freedom of Cuba. The insurgents there were, under all the rules of international law, a thousand times more entitled to recognition than the Republic of Panama; but with Grant "strenuousness" was not a mania, and this stern and silent soldier chose to abide by the example of the fathers.

Again in 1895 the struggle began anew in Cuba. It was of a character to appeal to our sympathies; it stirred our hearts; the trade of our nation with Cuba was destroyed; the property rights of our citizens were imperiled; the wail of starving thousands in Cuba assailed our ears; the condition was intolerable. Cuba was appealing to McKinley for help, for recognition, for a place amongst the nations of the world. McKinley applied to Cuba the test applied by Jefferson and Monroe, by Jackson and by Taylor, by Lincoln and by Grant, and would not yield to Cuba's importunities; but chose in preference to send the armies and the fleets to Cuba as an act of war, to check and stop the unspeakable horrors being enacted there.

Mr. Chairman, it is better to follow the old landmarks. We are too great to play the bully over the weak. The world hates a bully; it honors a man or a nation that dares always to do right. The weaker the other nation the more careful, the more considerate, we should be. It is better for us to honor the memory of the fathers by walking in their footsteps than to dishonor and discredit them as we are doing at this time. They chose the path of safety; so should we. They chose the way of honor; so should we. They chose the way of right; so should we. The rights of other nations, the honor of our own, and the safety of our people all plead for this Government to stop before it goes too far; before it molds wrong into a precedent; before it enthrones force; before it destroys liberty. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BRUNDIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to take up the time of the House so early in the session. I had thought of exercising that modesty which is becoming in a new Member; but there have been two statements made upon the floor recently, by men conspicuous in leadership on the other side—one economic and the other political—which, it seems to me, demand a reply, even if it be by a new Member.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], in his speech on the 19th of November, said:

There is labor in every part of this country for every man who wants a place to work.

And that sentiment found, as it necessarily and properly would, applause upon the Republican side. There was no reason why there should not be applause upon the Democratic side, if it were true! And then the gentleman from Iowa proceeded:

And there is a compensating wage for every man who will perform a day's labor.

It is because my views are so entirely at variance with what the gentleman evidently regards as a "compensating" wage that I have asked for the privilege here now of making some comments upon what in my estimation is a most extraordinary statement.

What constitutes a compensating wage? In my humble judgment a compensating wage means the entire product which any laborer gives to an article by his toil, and if any part of the value of that labor which he has implanted upon that article is subtracted or taken away by some other power, then to that extent that labor does not obtain a compensating wage.

Is there any man, even upon the Republican side, who will claim to-day that, as we see growing up on the one hand gigantic fortunes almost beyond calculation, and as we see in our great cities especially hundreds of thousands of individuals who scarcely know where their breakfast is coming from in the morning, who will pretend that these men, these hundreds of thousands of individuals, having none of the wealth of the world, have received compensating wages for their past toil?

Mr. Chairman, I want to cite a few authorities to show the lack of proper compensation, the lack of a compensating wage to the laborers of this country. A year ago a hearing took place which attracted the attention not merely of the people of the United States but of the whole civilized world. A great contest had been waged in this country for months, in which on the one hand were arrayed the most powerful band of monopolists that probably ever afflicted any country and on the other hand 140,000 of almost helpless toilers. That struggle had gone to such an extent, had continued so long, the industries of the country had been so seriously affected, that there arose an almost universal demand that the contest should cease, and a commission was appointed—whether properly or not I am not going to discuss—and that commission

gave a hearing. I want to read from the New York American some of the comments on that hearing.

SCRANTON, December 9, 1902.

The members of the strike commission wept to-day when a miner told his simple straightforward story of incredible treatment, of inhumanity that astounded the judges.

Just think of it! In the United States of America, in a country that it is boasted possesses greater freedom than any other country in the world, and where protectionists at least claim labor gets a higher wage, we are told this body wept when they heard of the inhumanities which had been practiced upon some of the men then out on strike. It goes on—

The veil was raised a few inches and the commissioners were astonished as they looked beyond.

I will not burden the House with all the details. Let me call attention only to one or two things, as set forth in the reports appearing in the New York American and Journal. That paper's comment follows:

Coll had had every bone in his body, except his neck, broken in the service of fourteen years ago, testified that since then she and her children have been working to pay off rent and coal.

"I have lived at Jeddo all my life," she said. "My father was a miner and I married a miner. For nine years he worked hard, and when he was carried home dead I had no money saved to bury him. He had been run over by a locomotive in the mines, but there was no redress. I was left with four children, the oldest 14 years of age. We had been living in a four-room house, but after his death I moved to a two-room house.

"I buried my husband with the money contributed by his friends, and got nothing from the company. I had to go to work as soon as my child was born. I took in washing, cleaned offices, did housework, and everything that was possible to keep together my little family.

THE TALE OF KATE BURNS.

"For the two-room house I was charged \$3.65 per month. I found that I got nothing from the company for my work in the offices, as my earnings were credited to the rent bill. For six years I got no credit from the company store.

"When my eldest boy was 14 years of age I sent him to the mines, as I needed the money desperately. He was to get 78 cents a day, but his first pay day he got a due bill of \$3.66 for rent and coal.

"I kept on working as hard as I could to pay that bill. I had received nothing from the company for my husband's death. Two years later I sent my second son to the mines, and he, too, kept working for nothing in cash. We have been working ever since and at last have worked off our debts, but have nothing else to show for all these years."

Where is the "compensating" wage for the Burns boys and their heroic mother? Remember the latter years of this tragedy were enacted during the vaunted period of prosperity, terminating—if the tragedy has really terminated—in May, 1902, the very zenith of this period.

"Compensating wages" we are told exist in the United States for every man who desires to work, and yet the evidence was brought out that under this system of slavery that existed in the anthracite coal regions of Pennsylvania these children worked for fourteen years and never received one solitary penny of cash in wages.

Who were the men that had brought that great industry into this condition? To find the origin of the formation of the coal trust you must go back to the time when Franklin B. Gowen first started to form that combination. Gradually the combination became greater, gradually the power of the monopoly became stronger, until the time came when over 90 per cent of the production of anthracite coal was carried on and controlled by the men who, according to the constitution of the State of Pennsylvania, were acting illegally in everything they did in the mining of that coal.

A former Secretary of State of the United States—a former Attorney-General—characterized these men in this language. Mr. Richard Olney said:

Who are they that are so insistent upon the suppression of lawlessness in the mining regions? Why, the most unblushing and persistent of law-breakers.

For years they have defied the law of Pennsylvania, which forbids common carriers engaging in the business of mining.

For years they have discriminated between customers in the freight charges on their railroads in violation of the interstate-commerce law.

For years they have unlawfully monopolized interstate commerce in violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

Indeed, the very best excuse and explanation of their astonishing attitude at the Washington conference is that, having violated so many laws for so long and so many times, they may rightfully think they are wholly immune from either punishment or reproach.

Does any man in this country believe that these 140,000 anthracite toilers received a "compensating wage?" Does any man here believe they were in receipt of a "compensating wage?" The most remarkable agreement, probably, ever made in this country is that agreement which these monopolists have tricked these miners into: "For each increase of 5 cents in the average price of white ash above \$4.50 at tidewater the miners are to secure an addition of 1 per cent in their pay."

But it is based upon a minimum price of \$4.50 a ton. Four and a half dollars a ton, of which \$3 is absolutely nothing but monopoly.

THE RECURRING ANTHRACITE COAL PROBLEM.

If there were any doubt from any other feature of the Anthracite Commission report that the anthracite monopolists were able to exert an hypnotic influence over that Commission, this "shrewd" provision must dissipate it. It certainly displays great shrewdness from the standpoint of the operators, but it is the "devilish shrewdness" of a highwayman or a buccaner. If Captain Kidd had offered to divide with the captains of the ships he looted on the basis of 5 per cent to them and 95 per cent to himself, provided they agreed to bring other merchantmen within the "sphere of his influence," he would not have displayed as great cunning, nor have effected a more one-sided bargain than that the operators have "dished" the miners with in this clause.

Observe the cool effrontery of the proposition! The miners are to reap no advantage, so far as this proposition is concerned; there is to be no amelioration of the insufferable conditions that were the cause of their striking, until when? Not until their oppressors have secured a price for the product of these very miners which gives the operators at least \$1.50 a ton over and above what would yield large dividends on the actual capital invested. Monopoly is to receive at least four times as much profit as will pay a high rate of dividend on actual capital—\$2.50 per ton would suffice that—before those who risk their lives in digging the coal are to derive any benefit from this clause.

But even this does not disclose the real malignity of the "agreement!" Realizing that while the great American public gave no concrete evidence of their sympathy for the miners in the shape of financial assistance, yet there was a strong feeling among the people generally that they were not receiving an adequate or even fair wage, and that a slight rise in the price of anthracite should be endured, if there was no other way to insure the miners receiving decent wages, the "shrewd" gentlemen who exploit the public through monopolizing the anthracite deposits use this very sympathy of the people for the further undoing of the poor. They say, in effect, "You ought not to complain if anthracite at tidewater does cost more than \$4.50 a ton; you yourselves expressed sympathy for the miners in the wages we were 'enabled' to pay them when coal was low; surely you will not complain of paying a trifle more, now that you know that for every 5 cents increase in price the miners are to receive an increased wage."

A "compensating" wage, I suppose.

So far as the public yields to any such specious pleading it is tantamount to an admission that \$4.50 is a fair price, and operates as an estoppel of complaint against that figure as an outrageously high one. But note the devilish cunning of the proposition from another point of view. None appreciate better than the men who dominate the anthracite "gentlemen's agreement" that the high prices of commodities of the past four or five years have reached their zenith, and that prices are bound to fall very generally—the sloughing off of prices of Mr. Morgan's "undigested securities" is pretty strong evidence that they are tired of holding them until the "lamb" take them off their hands—for some time to come. Therefore, possessing as they do an almost absolute monopoly, and being able to fix the price anywhere they please (short of driving consumers to the use of bituminous), the coal trust will be in a position where they can, in the era of low prices, which will surely soon come for all articles not monopolized, continue to charge even so extortionate a price as \$4.50 without the people doing much "squawking," the same public having in effect admitted that that price was "fair"—or else why use it as the minimum price from which any increase in the wages of the miners must count?

On the other hand, the miners will find their hands tied should they again protest against the prices and conditions under which they are employed. They will be told, "Why you agreed that all demands for an increase of wages shall count from \$4.50; that was an admission that that figure was a low one. You see that we are now operating our mines at a loss, as we are selling coal for less than \$4.50 a ton. How is it possible for us to pay a higher rate, when even the rate we now pay results in our being compelled to sell at a loss?" If the operators feel themselves equal to keeping their countenance while doing so, they will probably gravely suggest that the miners accept a sliding reduction in wages until such time as the price of coal shall again reach \$4.50.

I can think of nothing that so aptly illustrates the value of this concession by the coal barons as the story of the boy who, munching an apple, is asked by a smaller boy standing by, to "save me the core;" to which modest request comes the rejoinder, "There ain't going to be no core."

And this is called a "compensating wage" by gentlemen on the other side.

I want, with the permission of the House, to read another clipping. It is a clipping from a paper that in my judgment is doing more than any other newspaper in the United States to call the attention of the country to the distressing conditions which exist in many industries—the New York American. This is an extract from a sermon delivered by Cardinal Gibbons a few days ago, in which the Cardinal spoke of the conditions obtaining in the clothing industry in the city of Baltimore. It is as follows:

In a careful investigation I have discovered that after laboring for six days at from ten to twelve hours a day, their weekly compensation amounts to \$3 or \$8, and with this pittance they have to pay for house rent, food, and clothing, and other expenses incident to family life. They are living on starving wages. The result is that in a few years they become incapacitated for work.

I would ask gentlemen on the other side when these toilers in the clothing sweatshops of Baltimore become incapacitated for work—the evidence showing that they receive only six to eight dollars a week, and therefore obviously can not lay by anything to maintain them in their old age—from whence are they to receive the "compensating wage" which is to support them when they become incapacitated for work? This is not a unique condition. The conditions in the coal industry and the clothing industry are not unique in the United States. Right in my own city, New York, in the Borough of Brooklyn, where I live, for two years men have climbed my door stoop nearly every day, asking me to use what influence I possessed, which is extremely little, to get them a job in the parks of that city.

And what do these men receive in the park department under the government of that great city? They receive \$3 a day in wages, and if they work every day in the week they earn \$12. These men who do not have to go through a civil-service examination have got to take the chance that climatic conditions will be favorable, so that they can work. A friend of mine who is a foreman in one of the parks tells me that on an average the men do not work more than four days in a week. In other words, these men are begging for an opportunity to get a job where they can not expect to earn more than \$8 a week in the great city of New York, where rents are so high and where prices have been increased in this period of "prosperity," where trusts have been able to squeeze labor down and raise prices up. In that great city these men beg for an opportunity to earn \$8 a week. The cost of living has gone up 37 per cent during this period of so-called prosperous times, and at the best wages have not gone up more than 10 per cent.

A compensating wage! Is it a compensating wage that gives to the toiler a 10 per cent increase in wages and then makes him pay 40 per cent more in the increased cost of his commodities? Bearing upon this subject, I want to read a little article that appeared in the New York World on December 3. It is properly headed "Oil and philanthropy." Oil and philanthropy—that is a combination, it seems to me, that ought to "fetch" the American people. In speaking of what the Standard Oil Company has done, the World said:

Within three years it has increased the wholesale price of kerosene from 8½ cents a gallon to 13½. It has wrong \$125,000,000 out of the host of small consumers of oil, not to make up for greater cost of production, but to increase dividends already enormously swollen by the unfair trade methods which, by crushing competition, have made the trust sole master of the oil market.

By an interesting coincidence in anniversaries, the new oil extortion occurs just before Christmas. It was just before Christmas last year, when coal was high, that the wholesale price was advanced from 10½ cents a gallon to 11½. According to Chicago dispatches President Harper is expecting to get some of these extorted millions for his university this Christmas, as he did last.

But will that gift to a university constitute an act of grace exculpating Mr. Rockefeller for what Dr. Slicer calls his "responsibility for untold suffering among the poor throughout the Eastern States?"

Out of the pockets of scantily paid workers in Baltimore; out of the pockets of 140,000 toilers in the coal-mining region of Pennsylvania; out of the pockets of the poor people of this land; because it is only the poor people that use oil to illuminate their houses. One hundred and twenty-five million dollars is the price that we have got to pay to the Standard Oil Company alone for this glorious period of prosperity. One hundred and twenty-five million dollars—or a large portion of it—goes into the pockets of a half dozen men, who are already in possession of such great wealth that they could not throw it away if they tried.

It would not be possible for John D. Rockefeller to throw away in silver dollars, one every second, if he began on the 1st day of January and devoted every moment of the year—never stopping to eat or sleep—to the close of the 31st of December, it would not be possible for him to throw his income away, let alone his principal. And yet we are told that this is prosperity! Prosperity? Yes, prosperity has come during the past four years to those men who have control of the great monopolies of the country. It has enabled these men with what reputation they formerly had to delude the American people and foist upon them so-called "securities," three-quarters of which is water, and the American people are finding that they can not digest that proportion of water. [Laughter.]

I spent last summer in the highly protected State of Pennsylvania, in a State where practically every man bows down to this idol "protection," and if that theory worked in that State at least you would think that prosperity would be found. And yet at the farmhouse where I stopped, a farm laborer who was asked, to my positive knowledge, to go to work on two other farms received a wage of \$5 a week and a small house to live in. Is that a compensating wage? Fortunately for him he has only a wife and one small child; but if he had nine or ten children his wages would have been no higher. Five dollars a week for eight months in the year is all that that man is sure of receiving.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BAKER. I want to say, this being the first time I have spoken upon this floor, that I shall maintain the invariable rule I have followed outside of this House, to answer every question that may be addressed to me, no matter who the gentleman may be. [Applause.]

Mr. OLMSTED. I want to ask the gentleman where in Pennsylvania this occurred?

Mr. BAKER. In Pike County.

Mr. OLMSTED. That is not very specific.

Mr. BAKER. I will be more specific; it was near Milford.

Mr. OLMSTED. That man must have been a man of feeble mind, because there isn't an able-bodied man in Pennsylvania that can not get \$2 a day. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAKER. Let me say that the farm upon which this man was employed the whole of last summer is situated 2 miles from the city of Port Jervis, in a town called Matamoras, and for the gentleman's own information I will give him the name of the farmer if he wishes. That man to my positive knowledge received a wage of \$5 a week and a small house in which to live.

Mr. OLMSTED. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Port Jervis is not in Pennsylvania. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAKER. I said it was 2 miles from Port Jervis, over in Pennsylvania, at a town called Matamoras, and if the gentleman is familiar with the geography of his own State he will know that Matamoras is in Pennsylvania. [Laughter and applause.] A gentleman on my left calls attention to the singular fact that Port Jervis is in three States, one of them Pennsylvania, so it might have taken place in Port Jervis and still have been in Pennsylvania.

But, as I have already said, this situation is not unique. It is not unique to the mining industry; it is not unique to the clothing industry; it is not unique to the farm laborers. Why, sir, in the great State of Iowa, where we are told every man has his bank account, the farm laborers do not receive in wages during the whole year as much as the mileage (some \$400, I am told) that is paid to the gentlemen from Iowa to come to Congress. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, I want to read something else to this House. A gentleman who I suppose has done more for the great State of Pennsylvania (in the estimation of the people of that State, but not mine) than any other man was, at the time of the great labor struggle at Homestead, very careful to remain secluded at Skibo Castle, was very careful not to respond to cablegrams sent to him asking that he use his influence to see that that titanic struggle be brought to an end—that gentleman would hear nothing of the moanings of the men who were shot down at Homestead, but he has a great deal to say about the "beneficent" system instituted by the United States Steel Corporation which is called a "bonus" plan for their employees. What does Mr. Andrew Carnegie say?

At a meeting of the Iron and Steel Institute, in London, May 7, referring to the stock-bonus plan for employees, Mr. Carnegie said:

In the bonus granted to employees we have proof of regard for them—

Heaven save the mark! "Regard for the employees" is the way in which Mr. Carnegie speaks of this little "arrangement"—

which can not but tell, and the distribution of shares in the concern has an advantage which so far even no partnership has enjoyed.

True! Never before in any large way, on any large scale, has an industrial corporation been able to foist upon its workmen—as a favor—stock at 82½ which is selling to-day in New York at 52½. This is the way they "regard" their workmen. This is the way that great protected industry, the United States Steel Corporation, "takes care" of its employees.

That this infant industry would perish from the land, that the strong arms of its brawny workmen would wither up, that its tall chimneys would topple and fall, that the ore and coal in the ground which this corporation owns would secrete itself nearer to the center of the earth, perhaps finally coming to the surface at the other side of the globe—China, if it were not for the tariff, we have the highest authority to prove.

Its first president, its spectacular president, Charles M. Schwab (a man after the President's own heart), in one of those confidential communications which occasionally pass between captains of industry, but which rarely see the light of day, writing to Mr. Frick under date of May 15, 1899, said:

VAST PROFITS OF THE "TARIFF-PROTECTED" TRUSTS.

As to the future, even on low prices, I am most sanguine. I know positively that England can not produce pig iron at the actual cost for less than \$11.50 per ton, even allowing no profit on raw materials, and can not put pig iron into a rail with their most efficient works for less than \$7.50 a ton. This would make rails at net cost to them at \$19. We can sell at this price and ship abroad so as to net us \$16 at works for foreign business, nearly as good as home business has been. What is true of rails is equally true of other steel products. As a result of this we are going to control the steel business of the world.

You know we can make rails for less than \$12 per ton, leaving a nice margin on foreign business. Besides this foreign costs are going to increase year by year, because they have not the raw material, while ours is going to decrease. The result of all this is that we will be able to sell our surplus abroad, run our works full all the time, and get the best practice and costs in this way.

The following is the comment of the New York Herald on Mr. Schwab's letter:

A time, when steel rails could be made here at \$12 a ton and sold abroad at \$16, the price of steel rails, according to the records of the American Iron and Steel Association, were \$28.12 a ton.

With the stockholders receiving 100 per cent on actual cost of plants, etc., or \$133,000,000, and 150,000 employees receiving \$120,000,000, one naturally asks, even in this case, who is getting

the "compensating" wages? Is it the stockholder or the employee? Only this very day an Associated Press dispatch reports:

STEEL TRUST CUTS WAGES—AN ERA OF RETRENCHMENT WILL BE ENTERED UPON JANUARY 1.

NEW YORK, December 14, 1903.

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.

The finance committee of the steel corporation has, it is understood, under consideration the dismissal of many high-salaried employees, in addition to those already discharged, but no statement on this point was forthcoming to-day.

It was asserted that, barring some unforeseen technicalities, employees of the corporation who participated in the profit-sharing plan will, in the coming month, receive a \$5 dividend on the preferred stock to which they subscribed at \$82.50.

"Unforeseen technicalities" is good. I suppose it was an unforeseen "technicality" that caused the stock, which the employees were graciously permitted as a favor to purchase at \$82.50, to fall to \$52.37½, when the insiders—the promoters—unloaded. It is probably also an "unforeseen technicality" that requires these 5 per cent to 20 per cent wage reductions, so as to bring them, I suppose, down to what the gentleman from Iowa calls a "compensating" wage. The New York Tribune's report says:

Information was received in this city [New York] from Pittsburg yesterday that by an arrangement between the Amalgamated Association and the independent sheet steel mills an increase of output will be allowed, while the workmen accept a cut in wages. This agreement is expected to lead to an amicable readjustment of the wage schedules at the plants of the steel corporation, so that the employees will be permitted to turn out more work to make up for the cut in wages, and the cost of production, therefore, will be decreased.

The italics are mine. What an admirable arrangement! The men are to be allowed to work harder to enable them to earn as much as formerly. We never hear of the stockholders being "allowed" a cut in dividend! It is always the employee who must suffer. Will my Republican friends maintain that their idolized system of "protection" compels the employer to pay the high rate of wages that that system of taxation "enables" them to pay?

As a result of this—the ability to produce steel rails in the United States at \$12 and less per ton, as against a net cost to produce in England of \$19—and as a result of "protection," the United States Steel Corporation was able to earn profits to the enormous amount of \$111,000,000 in 1901 and \$133,000,000 in 1902, a total of \$244,000,000, after making deductions for depreciation of plants, etc. The wages paid during these two years amounted to \$113,000,000 in 1901 and \$120,000,000 in 1902.

When it is considered that it is extremely doubtful if it would cost \$125,000,000 to duplicate all plants, machinery, wharves, railroads, etc., of the company, it will be seen that its earnings have really amounted about 100 per cent a year.

Innumerable instances of the great disparity between what labor receives in wages in a protected industry and the "compensation" which goes to the trust controlling such industry could be cited, but I admit that none are more glaring than—

BORAX.

Most of the borax produced in the world is obtained in the barren and sterile region of California, where Chinamen and Indians who dig it receive the high wage of \$1 to \$1.25 a day—when they work. Borax is controlled by a trust known as "Borax Limited," an English corporation whose stock, however, is largely owned by Americans. Because Great Britain has no tariff for "protection," "Borax Limited" sells its borax there for 2½ cents while charging 7½ cents a pound here.

Who gets the "compensating" wage in this case! The Chinaman or the Indian who dig the borax in as inhospitable a region as exists probably on the globe, where no vegetation can grow, and gets the munificent pay of \$1 to \$1.25 a day, or "Borax Limited" (unlimited as to its ability to squeeze the American people) which makes at least 300 per cent on the actual cost to it of every pound of borax it mines and manufactures?

If this prosperity of which we hear so much boasting as being due to Republican policies really exists, how is it that every weekly trade paper and almost every issue of our daily newspapers contain accounts of lockouts and shutdowns and reductions of wages? Is it that the wages heretofore paid in these industries have been more than "compensating?" Do the protected barons feel that the workingmen have been getting too large a proportion of this prosperity, even after they have paid 40 per cent more for the necessities of life, and they (the monopolists) have not been getting their share? If this is so, why do we hear that more millionaires were made in that garden spot, that very Alhambra of "protection" (Pittsburg) during 1900, 1901, and 1902 than previously existed in the entire country? Not so much boasting, I

know, is made of 1903, as it is currently reported that "oil and philanthropy" have been getting in some fine work, as a result of which some budding millionaires there are now counting their wealth in six or even five figures instead of in sevens as before.

I will not take the time of the House to read this imposing list of shut-downs, lockouts, and wage reductions, culled chiefly from good Republican newspapers. I will ask leave to insert them in the RECORD as part of my speech. I will, however, quote now what the International Mercantile Agency, of which ex-Director of the Census Merriam is the head, said, about December 5:

The week is characterized by further slackening industry. Wages of 200,000 industrial employees have been reduced 10 per cent or more, and preparations are making to effect a similar reduction with respect to 300,000 others in various lines on or about January 1.

As indicating the slackening in industry, we may note the falling off in the production of pig iron. The Iron Age of December 10 says that the production fell from an average of 1,600,000 tons a month for July, August, and September to 1,074,000 tons for November, and that "such a drop within the short space of two months is altogether unprecedented in the American iron industry." Yet it says that not only did the stock of iron greatly increase during November, but that for the first week in December there was a still further falling off in production.

On October 23 the Boston Transcript, a leading Republican paper, said:

Organized labor is facing the greatest wage crisis since the panic of 1893. * * * It has been estimated that before the close of the year the big employing concerns of the country will have discharged nearly 1,000,000 men.

On November 11 the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, the greatest journal of this class in this country, said:

It would be folly to shut our eyes to the fact that industrial and in turn commercial depression are following right along in the wake of the financial collapse. Mills are shutting down; mining is being restricted.

WORKINGMEN ARE ANXIOUS.

The National Labor Tribune, of Pittsburg, in its last issue, gives this pointer:

Wages are expected to come down at the first of the year in all directions. Many craft—iron and steel workers notably—have been reduced already. Justice requires that other things should come down in proportion. Let rent and taxes be lowered, if the workingman is not to be ground between the upper and the nether millstone.

Apparently a new idea has occurred to these labor papers. If it can be made to work, the wage-earners will not in the future have to carry the heavier end of the burden of industrial depressions. They will unload on somebody else. When the demand for goods falls off and the manufacturer's profits begin to diminish the manufacturer reduces his working force or reduces wages, or both. When the demand for labor slackens and labor's earnings grow less why can not he have his rent, taxes, and other costs of living reduced accordingly? How nice it would be if he could pass this trouble along.

But the workers will not get relief in these directions. Landlords refuse to reduce rents, because they know that there are just as many houses and as many people who have to live somewhere; that is, until they freeze or starve. The total taxes of the average family are about \$125 a year, of which \$10 goes for State and local taxes, \$25 for internal revenue, and \$90 for tariff taxes. Of the tariff taxes only about \$15 goes to the Government, the remaining \$75 going to the tariff trusts and other protected interests.

There is no good reason why this \$75 a year of tariff taxes which goes to the protected trusts should not be taken off even when times are good and when wages are high. When wages are low and men are out of work every unnecessary burden should be lifted from the laborer's back. This burden can be lightened only by the action of Congress; but, unfortunately for the workingman, they have elected the wrong set of men to Congress. The "stand patters" are now on deck here, and they would see the workingmen of this country sweat blood before they would think of offering the relief that could be given only by stopping the "graft" of the trusts.

President Roosevelt in his message has not mentioned the word tariff. He has joined the "stand patters." Every Republican now says that the tariff should not be disturbed until after the Presidential election. Of course the real reason for this is that the protected manufacturers have paid for the privilege of tariff taxing the people and will not consent to let go of the privilege.

WAGE REDUCTIONS, CLOSED MILLS, ETC.

As indicating the continued and rapidly increasing decline in wages and in the number of workers employed, the following additional news items are quoted:

[From the Iron Age, December 10, 1903.]

The independent sheet mills are demanding of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers that union wages in sheet mills be reduced 20 per cent, this being the reduction already made in the nonunion mills of the American Sheet Steel Company. In case the association refuse to accept

this reduction, the opinion is expressed that all but two or three of the mills will be closed down and all orders will be pooled and worked off at the mills running.

Where will union labor be then!

Effective on Tuesday, December 1, the wages of 321 men employed at the blast furnaces at the Ohio works of the Carnegie Steel Company, Youngstown, Ohio, were reduced 8.47 per cent. Common labor was reduced 6½ per cent.

How nicely graded these reductions are!

On December 16 wages will be reduced from 10 to 20 per cent in all blast furnaces in the Mahoning and Shenango valleys. All the furnaces of the United States Steel Corporation will make a corresponding reduction.

To help out the "bonus" plan, I suppose!

Three furnaces of the Carnegie Steel Company's Edgar Thompson group, at Bessemer, Pa., are now idle.

The Lake Shore Engine Works, Marquette, Mich., have reduced wages in all departments 10 per cent. At the shops of the Duluth and South Shore Railroad, in that city, hours of labor have been cut to nine daily, with a proportionate reduction in wages. Several hundred men are affected.

It is stated that poor trade conditions have caused the Brown & Sharp Manufacturing Company, Providence, R. I., to lay off 600 men for an indefinite period, and to reduce the hours of the remaining machinists from 60 to 50 per week.

Why does not this company "leave well enough alone" and "stand pat"—keep their works running?

The plant of the American Steel Foundries, at Sharon, Pa., which was closed down last week on account of scarcity of orders, has started up again. The wage scale has not been adjusted, but the men will continue at work until an agreement is reached. The molders have been notified of a reduction in wages from a basis of \$3.50 per day to \$3.15 per day.

Employees of the galvanizing department of the Wheeling Corrugating Works, Wheeling, W. Va., have been notified of a reduction in wages of 20 per cent, effective December 1.

RAILWAYS CUTTING DOWN.

About October 14 the New York Times, under the above headline, reported as follows:

Third Vice-President W. C. Brown, of the New York Central, admitted yesterday that large reductions were being made on his road.

"The forces are being reduced," he said, "partly for the reason that a material decrease in business is anticipated. That is but natural when steel mills are closing down, and in the present conditions of the building trades, owing to strikes. We understand that the output of pig iron will be reduced 25 per cent. That means 25 per cent less coke and also 25 per cent less business for us. The men let go for this reason will be mostly shop men."

Of course, those who choose to do so can accept the interested optimistic vapors of Republican statesmen and discard the disinterested warnings of our great trade and labor journals and of our financial and commercial authorities. But if, as has heretofore been supposed, the iron and steel industry is the barometer of business, then a great industrial storm will soon be upon us.

CREATOR AND PRESERVER OF PROSPERITY.

A significant letter appeared on November 23 in the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator. It is addressed to "Senator M. A. HANNA" (creator and preserver of prosperity), and reads as follows:

DEAR SIR: I am an employee of the Republic Iron and Steel Company, of Youngstown, in the Bessemer department. The works are closed since election for an uncertain length of time, and I am out of work. Most of the furnaces and many of the other mills in this valley have also been closed since election, so that I can not get work anywhere else, and the cost of living is higher than I have ever known it to be. I am sure you have not been informed of the condition of things or you would have prevented it; for you said in your speech here on October 15 last that if you were elected prosperity would continue, but if Johnson were elected the mills would be closed and wages reduced. I voted the Republican ticket because you said this and I believed you.

The "sorghum" Democrats among my neighbors are saying that you knew better when you made such a statement, that you made them to deceive the people into voting for you, and that you are no better than any other confidence man or fraud. Now, Mr. HANNA, what we want is for you to show these lying Democrats that your word is as good as your bond, as you said it was, and that you can give us back prosperity. Please order the mills to open and wages restored to the old figure by December 1 and oblige many of your admirers.

To this letter, which is signed "John Smith, vice-president Hanna meeting, October 15," there is a postscript admonishing that "if you don't do something soon there will be soup houses in this valley."

Soup houses! Why, the man must be crazy! Our Republican friends tell us that soup houses are only established when the Democrats are in power. And yet it does sound a little strange, does it not, that prosperity, which these Youngstown people were promised should be theirs (if they would only then forever politically bury the man whom the monopolists all over the country fear more than any other man—Tom L. Johnson), should have followed its self-constituted guardian out of town? For the sake of the people of Youngstown, and for the sake of the reputation of the Republican party, I hope prosperity's guardian will catch the first train to Youngstown and take prosperity back there with him, and thus avoid the charge that the Republican party is giving those people soup houses instead of prosperity.

These same gentlemen who were largely responsible for foisting a thousand million dollars of water upon an unsuspecting public were also guilty of exploiting another trust known as the "ship-building trust," which is practically all water. I suppose that was in order to enable the ships to have some of their natural element in which to float. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

What does the receiver of that corporation say? He says that

the formation of the company is an "artistic swindle." Just think of it!

A gentleman who has been a member of the other House, a gentleman who is sufficiently responsible in the great State of New Jersey to be selected as trustee for this defunct corporation and its few assets, says the formation of that company was an "artistic swindle," and it was to the gentleman who was mainly responsible for the flotation of that company that the Member from Ohio a year ago sent that frantic telegram, "There are 10,000 frantic miners in my district; for God's sake stop the strike!" He knew—the Member from Ohio knew—where was the seat of power in the United States. He did not send any telegram to the other end of Pennsylvania avenue. No! He sent his telegram to the corner of Wall street and Broad street. He knew that there was the seat of power in the United States, and he sent his telegram there beseeching that the influence of the power of government which was situated there should be used to settle the coal strike, which otherwise meant, in his judgment, the loss of his seat in Congress.

These gentlemen have been guilty not only of an "artistic swindle," according to the language used by ex-Senator Smith, but they have also been guilty of wholesale plunder. Even Republicans must admit that if there is any plunder going on, the men or body of men engaged in plunder can only plunder those who are in possession of wealth, and if the plunder is effected, then the men who previously had the wealth are shorn of it while the plunderers walk off with the booty.

Now, if plundering has been going on in the United States under the aegis of these great financial magnates, then it necessarily follows that the people have been plundered. But that does not surprise the gentlemen from Pennsylvania. You have been so accustomed for years to laying the whole American people under tribute that it does not surprise you that a financial magnate should only lay a few thousand investors in stocks under tribute. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am absolutely impartial in my denunciation of robbery. I not merely say that it is wicked under the so-called theory of "protection" for a few men to be given the power to put their hands into the pockets of the American people, but I also say it is equally wicked when a corporation does what it is charged by the present government of the city of New York with having done. The city of New York charges that one of the great trusts, not satisfied, I suppose, with putting its hands into the pockets of the American people to the extent of \$70,000,000 a year—the sugar trust—but because, I imagine, it needed a few more dollars to declare another one-fourth of 1 per cent dividend—has stolen \$525,000 worth of water from the city of New York.

Gentlemen, any man that understands the influences that control men must know that when you confer the power on a man or a body of men to rob legally, just as sure as they get the opportunity to do it they will rob illegally, as the sugar trust is charged with doing. [Applause on the Democratic side.] While the demoralizing effect upon many who possess no legal power to rob, unless their moral nature has been fully developed, is to throw the glamour of respectability, of "shrewdness," over stealing when carried on on a large scale, which incites them to petty peculations and breaches of trust.

Incidentally I might call the attention of the gentlemen on the other side to the fact that there are some 75,000 textile workers whose wages have recently been reduced from 15 to 25 per cent. I am curious to know which the gentleman from Iowa regards as the compensating wage. Was it the wage paid before the reduction or that now paid? If it is the wage formerly paid to these textile workers, then how comes it that having performed their part of the bargain entered into between them and the boss of the Republican party in Ohio, if not of the country, when he invited them to stand "pat," to "leave well enough alone," and they have stood "pat" and voted for the Republicans and "prosperity"—why, I ask, is faith broken with them? Why are their wages reduced? Is it claimed that the wages these men received before the 15 per cent to 25 per cent reduction went into effect was more than "compensating?"

The newspaper which puts this item in circulation very properly suggests that it would be well for these men, the men employed in that industry, to "let well enough alone" and not rank themselves with those who are termed "agitators!" And yet, referring again to the remarks of the distinguished cardinal, I want to say, as he says in speaking of the condition that exists in the clothing business of Baltimore, "You can agitate the question; by agitation the air is stirred, the sky is cleared, healthy discussion is provoked, you arouse public attention to pressing grievances, you invoke popular sympathy." (I doubt, however, the ability of even a cardinal to invoke sympathy from the beneficiaries of protection.) "You remove the veil so that one-half of the world can know how the other half lives."

It is because a few individuals have the power conferred upon

them by legislation to rob the great mass of the people. It is because of that that one-half of the people do not know how the other half—the lower submerged tenth—live in this country.

Why is it that a "compensating" wage is not paid to the coal miner; to the worker in the clothing sweat shop; to the farm laborer; to the factory operative, whether in cotton, worsted, woolen, and paper goods, boots and shoes, or other industries; to the sales girl of our city department stores; even to the clerks and bookkeepers—most of whom regard themselves as superior to factory operatives—thousand of whom, even in New York, with its high cost of living, receive less than \$12 a week? Why is it that despite the manifold inventions which more than anything else mark the latter half of the nineteenth century, inventions which in some industries have increased the power of labor to produce ten, twenty, and, in some few instances, forty fold—why is it that capital even (capital not engaged in monopolistic enterprises or having some monopoly privileges) finds its return steadily diminishing, except, maybe, during a few years of particularly flush times? The answer to one is the answer to all of these queries—monopoly! I am well aware that in the public mind the word monopoly is associated almost exclusively with what has become known as the "trusts," but these combinations are merely the more glaring illustrations of the effects of monopoly. The ownership of valuable land in our large cities, of water powers and water privileges—wharves, etc.—of mineral and timber lands, constitute monopoly privileges, and their ownership confers a power quite distinct from the possession of capital by the same individuals.

The exclusive franchises to perform certain public functions in our cities, such as the supplying of gas, water, and electricity, street-car and elevated railroad service, as well as interstate transportation, are monopoly privileges of the highest value, the possession of which gives the power to continuously tax the people. Colossal fortunes have been secured ("earned" is the mistaken term most generally used) by the few men controlling these enormously valuable privileges, which have been used to lay the whole people under tribute. The factory girl and the sales lady of our great stores many of whom receive as little as from \$3.50 to \$5 per week, have their scanty earnings reduced by the extortionate toll which the street-car monopolies exact. A service which it requires a stretch of the mind to figure as costing one-half of the 5 cents collected (even if seats were provided for all), and for which a 3-cent fare would yield a generous dividend on the actual capital invested in the lines and their equipment. This 2-cent excess collected twice a day constitutes during the week a serious depletion of the meager wages which these girls receive, and has, undoubtedly, been the means of driving many of them to the streets.

How is this condition to be altered? By what means can we prevent the further appropriation by monopoly of an ever-increasing proportion of the wealth which labor and capital produces? The answer is simple. Complex as our present civilization appears to those who have not studied economic principles, it is complex only in the subdivision of labor. The effects of monopoly are as clearly apparent to those who will study the matter as though primitive civilization existed and all wealth was produced directly from the land. To secure a "compensating" wage to labor, to secure a just and full return to capital, we must strike at the causes which produce monopoly. We must strike at the roots. We can do this by substituting in place of the cumbersome, unintelligent, discordant, complex system—or lack of system—which taxes production and accumulation, which says, in effect, to every individual that the more industrious and more effective your methods of production, the greater judgment and skill displayed therein the greater burden of taxes shall you bear; while it says to monopolists, in effect, the more you monopolize natural opportunities (thereby depriving labor and capital of the means of production) the greater the extent and scope of your monopoly, and the less use you permit these opportunities to be put to the less burden of taxation shall you bear. To secure a "compensating" wage to every toiler it is but necessary to restore natural law, to institute the "natural" system of taxation—the single tax. No words that I can use can so clearly and graphically portray the benefits that would follow if this were done as those contained in *Ethics of Democracy*, by Louis F. Post, who in this book has illumined fundamental Democratic principles, and who, week by week, in the columns of the *Public* comments upon current events of the day from the standpoint of real Democracy in a manner that can not fail to clarify the thought of those who read his paper, and I therefore commend it to my Republican friends on the other side, who stand so much in need of it. He says on page 141:

By means of the single-tax principle the abolition of land monopoly can be fully accomplished. By means of the single-tax method it can be far advanced. Under this simple land reform, sound in economics and unassail-

able in morals, no one could hold any kind of land out of use without suffering serious and continual loss. Land would have to be used, and be well used, or be abandoned. There would be no profit in mere ownership. That goal being reached—indeed, long before it had been fully reached—trade having meanwhile and by the same method been freed by the abolition of commercial and industrial taxes and of highway obstacles, the benefits of economic improvement would be generally diffused and the evil spirit of the trust would be exorcised.

With the annual value of special landed advantages applied to common use and no longer retained by private owners; with taxes on industry thus made unnecessary, and consequently abolished; with highways freed from special privilege; with unused land everywhere made freely accessible, and the barriers of industrial corral thus broken down; with demand for productive work thereby made to exceed supply, and through the free interplay of all the economic forces of consumption and production perpetually to maintain that excess—with these demonstrable effects of the single tax realized, there would be no more possibility of subjugating labor and monopolizing business with paper agreements than of holding back the waters of Niagara with a paper dam.

GOD HELP RHODE ISLAND!

I now come to the political matter that I expressed a desire to discuss at the opening of my remarks. A few days ago I was impelled to ask the Member from Ohio this question on the occasion of his annual antelection prophecy: "Does the gentleman know that the reelected governor of Rhode Island is the same kind of a man as Tom L. Johnson—a Single-Tax Democrat?" and as the only reply he made was, "God help Rhode Island!" and as I now learn that that portion of his remarks wherein he spoke of the recent election in that State does not conform to the facts, I take this, the earliest opportunity, to state just what the facts are, and also why I, a resident of another State, deem it of importance that the country and also the prophet of the Republican party should know for what these men stand.

It will not do for my Republican friends to insinuate that the people of Rhode Island do not know for what Governor Garvin stands. They know he stands for—

EQUAL ELECTORAL REPRESENTATION.

So that 200 votes in a Republican rural community shall not have equal political representation with 10,000 Democratic votes in Providence.

THE INITIATIVE.

So that not more than 5,000 voters shall be required to initiate amendments to the Constitution, to be submitted directly to the people.

TAXATION OF PUBLIC FRANCHISES.

So that the exploiters of special privileges shall not escape taxation—the farmer and workingman now bearing nearly all the burden of taxation.

THREE-CENT RAILWAY FARES IN PROVIDENCE.

So that shop girls shall not be forced to give quite so large a proportion of their scanty earnings to monopoly.

TEN HOURS' LABOR IN TWELVE HOURS FOR MOTORMEN AND CONDUCTORS.

So that these men can occasionally see their children during daylight.

THE REFERENDUM.

So that no franchise shall be valid until approved by a majority vote of the electors.

He has been several times a member of the State senate as well as of the lower house, having been elected some thirteen times, as well as having been a candidate for Congress at four successive Congressional elections, while as the Democratic candidate for governor in 1902 and 1903 he polled on each occasion from two to five thousand more votes than the other Democratic candidates for State offices.

General GROSVENOR, among other things, said that the Republicans last year elected the lieutenant-governor by 700 or 800 and this year by some 8,000. I have here a letter from Governor Garvin's secretary, in which he gives the figures which show that the Democratic candidate for lieutenant-governor was elected in 1902 by 2,164, and that so far from the Republicans electing their candidate in 1903 by 7,000 to 8,000 he only had a plurality of 381, sufficient, it is true, to elect him, but indicating no such change of political sentiment in Rhode Island as the gentleman would have the country believe.

"God help Rhode Island!" It would seem that this appeal is unnecessary, as the people of that State at the last two elections have given the best evidence of their ability to help themselves. For years that little State has been the happy hunting ground of the boodler and corruptionist. Immense sums have been annually spent to make certain that the State would remain in the "right" column, the column which the gentleman from Ohio states is to aggregate some 260 votes in the electoral college.

Like Tom L. Johnson, in Ohio, Governor Garvin is one of those few men in public life who will not spend one illegal or corrupt dollar to influence political results, not even to secure his own election. As he is by repute a poor man, it is very doubtful whether, even if he had the disposition, he could raise pennies

where the Republicans raise dollars. The beneficiaries of "protection" are not contributing to the support of real Democrats—those who oppose every form of special privilege. But the gentleman from Ohio says, "We have not only both branches of the legislature, but we have them by a larger majority than we elected them by one year ago." What does the gentleman mean by a larger majority? Does he mean to imply that a majority or even plurality of the voters in Rhode Island last year, or even this year, voted for the Republican candidates for the senate and the assembly? I imagine not. Yet I can not see how the uninitiated could draw any other inference from his language.

What are the facts? We find that in 1902 twenty towns—with a total population of 36,672 and but 8,994 voters, and in which the aggregate vote cast for all these twenty Republican senators was but 3,855, or 43 per cent of the vote of those towns—elected a majority of the senate, which consists of thirty-eight members. While 3,855 Republican voters were able, under the grossly unfair apportionment existing in Rhode Island, to elect twenty senators, it took 22,579 Democratic votes to elect ten—not twenty—senators in Democratic districts. We thus get a glimpse of what the Democrats, under the leadership of Governor Garvin, have been "up against" in that State. Under the law there, as amended in 1901, these twenty senators, a majority of the senate, in effect, constitute the government of the State of Rhode Island, as the senate is really the executive power. All that these twenty men have to do is to refuse to confirm any appointment by Governor Garvin, and then, under this strange law, they can in the course of a stated number of days (very few) proceed to nominate and confirm whoever they may select.

Incidentally, and for the information of the gentleman from Ohio, I wish to call attention to the fact that it took 10,997 Democratic votes in the city of Providence to elect the one Senator which this Republican apportionment permits that city to have.

The marvel is, not that the Republicans have a majority of both houses of the legislature, but that the Democratic representation is half as large as it is where such gross inequality prevails.

It is entirely true that, as the General says, they—the Republicans—have the legislature, and that is what they wanted. Of course they wanted the legislature. Without it "oil and philanthropy" would be deprived of their most skillful leader and strongest supporter at the other end of the Capitol. But the Rockefellerers do not boast of the methods employed to retain control of "their" legislature, while I notice that the gentleman from Ohio is content to let that phase of the subject severely alone. Even he will not boast of the saturnalia of corruption and political debauchery which the Republicans have resorted to to retain control of the legislature of that State, for without wholesale corruption, without the expenditure of an immense boodle fund—the extent and persistent use of which one would think should make even Republicans blush with shame—they could not, even with their shockingly indecent apportionment, elect a majority of the legislature.

WHAT JOHNSON AND GARVIN STAND FOR.

But why is it that I am so interested in the governor of Rhode Island, and what induced me to call attention to the fact that he is the same kind of a Democrat as the last Democratic candidate for governor of Ohio? It is because these two men represent the highest ideals of Democracy, because they stand for its noblest aspirations, because of all the candidates of the Democratic party in the United States at the last election, who were known outside of their own districts, these two men alone stand unreservedly, unequivocally, and unqualifiedly for that fundamental Democratic principle—"equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

It is because the United States has strayed far from this principle; it is because the people have not been alert to the insidious attacks that have from time to time been made upon that principle; it is because as a whole they have never yet fully realized its great import; it is because they have listened to the siren song of those who wished to emasculate it; it is because the people have permitted this and other legislative bodies to nullify it by granting special privileges to this and to that special interest, until they became drunk with the power and immense wealth which the possession of special privileges has enabled them to wring from the people; that monopolists have become so insolent and domineering that they have come to regard these special privileges as their inherent and inalienable rights, threatening with annihilation, political and commercial, any who may have the temerity to challenge their right to continue to oppress the people.

It is because these two men, Tom L. Johnson and Lucius C. F. Garvin, are devoting their lives to the endeavor of educating the people to see the causes which produce monopoly, well knowing that, once its primal cause is understood, the people will make

short work of the whole system of special privilege, that I hope the public will know more of them.

It has been said that the recent election in Ohio means the political death of Tom L. Johnson. Those who thus prophesy do not know the man nor the power of the truths for which he stands. To such men, imbued with a great moral purpose, the determination to devote their lives to the uplifting of humanity in the only effective way that mankind can be permanently benefited, by abolishing monopoly, defeat is nothing more than a temporary obstacle.

Johnson and Garvin, as well as less conspicuous workers in the cause for which Henry George gave his life, know full well the forces massed against them. They well know that every artifice of which shrewd, able, unscrupulous and extremely wealthy men are capable are and will be exerted to deceive the people as to the principles for which they contend. They know that all the power that monopolistic wealth can control—financial, commercial, and social—is being organized and marshaled against them. That the great daily and weekly newspapers with few exceptions are likewise so controlled and are used to misrepresent them and their cause. But even this combination does not appall them. No temporary defeat will deter them from continuing the battle against every form of special privilege, against every law which gives one man an advantage over his fellow, and for the establishment upon this earth here and now of an order of universal justice which shall secure to even the weakest and poorest the full value of his toil.

The leading monopolists of this country, the men who during recent years have piled up fortunes of scores and hundreds of millions of dollars, know them, whether the Members of this House do or not, and they also know that the principles for which Governor Garvin and Tom L. Johnson contend, and of which they are the most conspicuous advocates in the United States, would, if applied, solve the anthracite-coal problem as well as any and all other monopoly problems. It is because of this knowledge that these two men were especially singled out for attack in the last campaign by all the great exploiters of special privileges, whether Republicans or whether masquerading as Democrats, whether residents of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago, or residents of Ohio and Rhode Island.

Of one thing the Members of this House may be assured—that the big monopolists of this country have a keen perception of the danger to their monopolies that would follow the complete triumph of men like Tom L. Johnson and Governor Garvin. The monopolists fully realize that these two men mean business, that no sneers or calumnies will deter them from their purpose to aid in overthrowing every monopoly in the country, and that the way to accomplish this is to deprive them of their special privileges, for it is through the possession of special privileges that men obtain the power to rob their fellow-men.

These men are two of the most conspicuous of those in the United States of whom Henry George, with that profound faith in man's inherent sense of justice which was his most marked characteristic, with a seer's vision, prophesied in the closing chapter of Progress and Poverty when he said:

The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be it would have been accepted long ago; if that could be it would never have been obscured; but it will find friends, those who will toil for it; suffer for it; if need be die for it; for this is the power of truth.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LAWRENCE, 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. 6758, the pension appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL AND RESOLUTION REFERRED.

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

An act (S. 833) for the relief of Joseph M. Simms, captain, United States Revenue-Cutter Service (retired)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 23:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed in paper covers, at the Government Printing Office, 5,500 additional copies of the Annual Report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration for the year ended June 30, 1903, with illustrations, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 2,500 copies shall be delivered to the Bureau of Immigration for distribution—

to the Committee on Printing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BROOKS, for an indefinite time, on account of sickness in family.

To Mr. FULTON, for ten days, on account of important business. Then, on motion of Mr. VAN VOORHIS (at 4 o'clock and 14 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 Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting an estimate of appropriation for clerical force in the General Land Office—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting reports of inspections of disbursements and transfers by officers of the Army during the past fiscal year—to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting papers relating to the claim of Rittenhouse Moore—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a letter from the Commissioner of Pensions, papers in the case of Sarah A. Haney, now Pitt, and a favorable recommendation thereof—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and letters of officials only ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a letter from the Commissioner of Pensions, and with a favorable recommendation, papers in the pension case of Julia Doty, now Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and letters of officials only ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting papers relating to an investigation of the Sailors' Home at San Francisco and relating also to the status of said institution—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting copies of notes from the representatives of certain foreign governments in relation to the export duty on Manila hemp or fiber—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a communication from the Commissioner of Pensions, papers showing the fraudulent nature of testimony in the pension case of Henry E. Van Trees—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and letters of officials only ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting draft of a resolution authorizing the reception of Don Luis Bográn H. as a student of the Military Academy—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a communication from the Commissioner of Pensions, and with favorable recommendation, papers in the case of Patrick Fitzpatrick, father of Dennis Fitzpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and letters of officials only ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect, submitting an estimate of increase of limit of cost for extension of custom-house and post-office building at Bangor, Me.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Auditor of the Post-Office Department, submitting an estimate of appropriation for additional laborers—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 Commerce and Labor, submitting an estimate of appropriation for construction of steam light-house tender for the Eleventh light-house district—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting memorial of W. H. Ansley, chairman of a committee of the Five Civilized Tribes, in relation to statehood for the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for Bureau of Chemistry, Agricultural Department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting list of awards made by the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission—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 Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of increase of cost of building at Stillwater, Minn.—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 Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for rent of offices at Rome, Ga.—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 Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for increase of limit of cost of post-office building at Salem, Oreg.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for repair work at the post-office building at Annapolis, Md.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Rosanna Griffin against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Henry E. Hilliard against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Kilbourn H. Rowsey against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John Schuman, administrator of estate of August Schuman, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for acquiring or renting legation property in Constantinople—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. COOPER of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3540) to provide for a Delegate to the House of Representatives of the United States from Porto Rico, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5030) granting a pension to William H. Mount, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. KALANIANOALE: A bill (H. R. 7266) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the manufacture, distribution, and supply of electric light and power on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: A bill (H. R. 7267) for the erection of a public building at Paris, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7268) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in north central Kentucky (Seventh Congressional district)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 7269) to set apart certain lands

in the Territory of New Mexico as a public park, to be known as the Pajarito Cliff Dwellers' National Park, for the purpose of preserving the prehistoric caves and ruins and other works and relics therein—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 7270) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to survey and construct a military wagon road from Valdez to Eagle City, in Alaska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7271) granting an increase in salary to the foreman of printing and foreman of binding in the Government Printing Office, and changing the names of said positions to superintendent of printing and superintendent of binding, respectively—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 7272) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Turtle Mountain band of Chippewa Indians, in the State of North Dakota, and to make appropriations for carrying the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 7273) to enable the city of Phoenix, the town of Tempe, and the town of Mesa, all in Maricopa County, Arizona Territory, severally to issue the bonds of said municipalities for the purpose of aiding in the construction of a freighting and wagon road from any convenient point in the Salt River Valley to the Salt River reservoir dam site in Maricopa County, Ariz.—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7274) to amend section 76 of an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii"—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 7275) for the erection of a public building at Grand Island, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7276) for the erection of a public building at Bloomington, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 7277) to complete the Jefferson Memorial Object-lesson road—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 7278) to amend section 953 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7279) for an additional circuit judge in the first judicial circuit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 7280) for the improvement of Sulphur River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 7281) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure suitable medals for the survivors, and the families of such as may be dead, of the forlorn-hope storming party of Port Hudson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KYLE: A bill (H. R. 7282) for the remodeling and enlarging of the Government building at Springfield, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 7283) for the extension of School street southward to Kenesaw avenue, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 7284) for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the White Mountains, to be known as the National White Mountain Forest Reserve—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 7285) to remove the restrictions upon the sale of lands in the Indian Territory in certain cases—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7286) to create recording district No. 26 in the western district of the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR: A bill (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—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7288) to authorize the Mobile and West Alabama Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Warrior River in Tuscaloosa County, Ala., in section 3, township 21 south, range 9 west of Huntsville meridian—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 7289) to extend to citizens of the United States who were owners, charterers, masters, officers, and crews of certain vessels registered under the laws of the United States, and to citizens of the United States whose claims were rejected because of the American citizenship of the claimants, or of one or more of the owners, by the international commission appointed pursuant to the convention of February 8, 1896, between the United States and Great Britain, the relief heretofore granted to and received by British subjects in respect of damages for unlawful seizures of vessels or cargoes, or both, or for damnifying interference with the vessels or the

voyages of vessels engaged in sealing beyond the 3-mile limit, and beyond the jurisdiction of the United States, in accordance with the judgment of the fur-seal arbitration, at Paris, in its award of August 15, 1893, and so that justice shall not be denied to American citizens which has been so freely meted out to British subjects—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 7290) providing for the erection of a public building at Manistee, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WALLACE: A bill (H. R. 7291) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7292) making Vinalhaven, Me., a subport of entry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 7293) for the erection of a post-office building at Sharon, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WALLACE: A bill (H. R. 7294) to regulate the practice, pleadings, forms, and mode of proceeding in civil causes in equity in the circuit courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7295) to provide for the sale of the timber and other material growing or being on public forest reserves and for renting or leasing of the lands therein—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7296) for the protection of the public forest reserves and national parks of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 7297) to quiet certain land titles in the State of Louisiana—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7298) to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels in the coasting trade—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 7299) to amend section 13 of an act entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States," approved March 3, 1899—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 7300) for the continuance of experiments by the Department of Agriculture in reference to the boll worm and for investigation of the cotton wilt disease—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 7301) to establish a soldiers' home near Denver, Colo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 7302) to recognize and promote the efficiency of army chaplains—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 7303) for the widening of V street northwest—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 7304) for the establishment of agrostological stations and demonstration farms in Texas, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WÄCHTER: A bill (H. R. 7305) to acquire title to additional property for the erection and completion of the new United States custom-house now being erected in the city of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 7614) for the establishment of a food bureau in the Department of Agriculture, and for preventing the adulteration and misbranding of foods in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and for regulating interstate commerce therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 16) that the Secretary of War be authorized and directed to present a report showing the estimated cost of continuing the harbor improvements at Everett, Wash.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 17) that the Secretary of War be directed to cause a survey to be made and estimate of cost of removing Starr Rock, Bellingham Bay, Washington—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 18) that the Secretary of War be authorized and directed to present a report showing cost of removing obstructions to navigation of upper Columbia River, Washington, etc.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 19) that the Secretary of War be authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made and estimates of cost of dredging and improving harbor of South Bend, Wash., etc.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 20) that the Secretary of War be directed to cause an examination and survey to be

made and estimate of cost of improving Chehalis River, Washington—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JENKINS: A resolution (H. Res. 93) that the Clerk of the House furnish the Committee on Judiciary with the following works and books, namely: Three sets of United States Compiled Statutes and Supplement, three sets of United States Compiled Statutes and Supplement, Rose's Notes (13 volumes) of United States Reports, Rose's Digest (3 volumes), United States Reports, and Russell & Winslow's Syllabus-Digest of United States Supreme Court Reports—to the Committee on Accounts.

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:

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7306) for the relief of Laura A. Wagner—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 7307) granting an increase of pension to Mary Tichenor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 7308) granting an increase of pension to Lucius E. Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 7309) granting a pension to Johan Frank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7310) granting a pension to Maria V. E. Biters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 7311) granting a pension to Thomas Large—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 7312) granting a pension to Horace W. Gleason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 7313) for the relief of C. E. Moore—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 7314) for the relief of Dr. O. R. Early, of Lowndes County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7315) for the relief of the estate of Richard Mann, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7316) for the relief of the estate of Andrew J. Kincaid—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7317) for the relief of the Methodist Church of Kossuth, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7318) for relief of heirs of Coleman Rogers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7319) for the relief of heirs of Sylvia Cannon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7320) for the relief of the heirs of M. A. McNulty, deceased, late of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7321) for the relief of estate of D. R. Hubbard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7322) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Gardner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7323) for the relief of Jeremiah Walton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7324) for relief of estate of W. R. Smith, of Burnsville, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7325) for the relief of estate of W. F. Young, of Burnsville, Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7326) for the relief of the heirs of Abel Walker, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7327) for the relief of J. R. Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7328) for the relief of Nancy H. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7329) for the relief of the estate of J. W. Hopkins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7330) for the relief of Mrs. E. A. Hubbard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7331) for the relief of Mrs. E. A. Hubbard, of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7332) for the relief of the estate of Josiah White, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7333) for the relief of the estate of R. C. Bumpass, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7334) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7335) for the relief of the estate of Mary H. Moore, deceased, Iuka, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7336) for the relief of the estate of William Clement, deceased, late of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7337) for the relief of Matilda H. Reed, of Iuka, Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7338) for relief of George Kimberley and Sam Kimberley, heirs of M. P. Kimberley, deceased, late of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7339) for the relief of Francis E. Whitfield and Lucy G. Whitfield, of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7340) for the relief of David Ingram, of Itawamba County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7341) for the relief of Isabella Rowsey, of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7342) for the relief of the estate of W. F. Young—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7343) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Kossuth, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7344) for the relief of A. W. McClure, of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7345) for the relief of the estate of J. K. Morrison, deceased, late of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7346) for the relief of the estate of Richard D. Fielder, of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7347) for the relief of Susan C. Robinson, Iuka, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 7348) granting an increase of pension to Ira Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7349) granting an increase of pension to Riley Stroud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7350) granting an increase of pension to John C. Besier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7351) granting an increase of pension to William Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 7352) to restore to the active list of the Navy the name of Homer Lycurgus Law—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CASSEL: A bill (H. R. 7353) granting an increase of pension to William H. Shreiner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7354) granting an increase of pension to John Shisler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 7355) granting an increase of pension to Henry Barrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK: A bill (H. R. 7356) for the relief of Benjamin F. Massie—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 7357) granting a pension to Georgia A. Whitehead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7358) granting a pension to Martha E. Nolen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7359) granting a pension to Mary Degnan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COWHERD: A bill (H. R. 7360) granting a pension to William T. Mefford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 7361) granting an increase of pension to James A. Murch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7362) granting an increase of pension to Philetus G. Burch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7363) granting an increase of pension to Frank Gibbons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7364) granting an increase of pension to Leonard M. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7365) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Samuel Gordon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 7366) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Cannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7367) granting an increase of pension to John M. Barron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7368) granting a pension to Annie G. Norwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 7369) for the relief of John N. Trussell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 7370) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Ivory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANIELS: A bill (H. R. 7371) granting an increase of pension to Maj. William Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 7372) granting a pension to Albert J. Webster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7373) granting a pension to Harriet J. Woodbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7374) granting an increase of pension to Jabez Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 7375) removing charges of desertion and granting an honorable discharge to Samuel Pheasant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7376) granting a pension to Josephine Colbath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7377) granting an increase of pension to Virginia B. Mullan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7378) granting an increase of pension to Israel Purdy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7379) granting an increase of pension to Henry Zimmerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 7380) granting a pension to Harrison S. Crites—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7381) granting a pension to Susan E. Potter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 7382) granting a pension to Ellen A. Harmon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 7383) 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—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7384) granting an increase of pension to Wiloughby R. Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 7385) granting an increase of pension to Robert McMullen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7386) granting an increase of pension to Elisha Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7387) granting an increase of pension to John L. Files—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7388) granting an increase of pension to John Baer, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7389) granting an increase of pension to David M. Haskell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7390) granting a pension to Elymas F. Wilkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 7391) for the relief of the widow and heirs of John A. Stephens, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7392) for the relief of the widow and heirs of John A. Stephens, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7393) to grant a pension to Gevert Schutte—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 7394) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Hutchins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7395) for the relief of Emile M. Blum—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 7396) for the relief of Edgar M. Wilson, administrator of Thomas B. Van Buren, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 7397) granting a pension to John Eskew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7398) granting a pension to Mary Ettie Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 7399) for the relief of John Wesley Miller, of Portland, Oreg.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 7400) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7401) to correct the military record of James Watson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7402) for the relief of the Indiana State board of agriculture—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 7403) granting a pension to Walter L. Hammand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7404) for the relief of the estate of Thomas O. Marrs, of Pike County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7405) for the relief of the estates of J. M. Fidler and T. O. Marrs, of Pike County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7406) for the benefit of Emily Byrd, of Wolfe County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7407) for the benefit of Elizabeth Bevins, of Pike County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7408) for the benefit of the estate of B. S. Hamilton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 7409) to place Elias H. Parsons on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7410) granting an increase of pension to Enos D. Hoge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7411) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Caldwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 7412) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Potter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 7413) granting an increase of pension to J. C. Beckwith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7414) for the relief of William H. Howard and Oliver D. Lewis—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 7415) for the relief of Robert Barnett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7416) for the relief of Henry C. Prater—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7417) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson S. Keeton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 7418) granting an increase of pension to Peter Minkler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7419) granting a pension to Alice R. Cronkite—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 7420) granting an increase of pension to Ira D. Marston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 7421) granting a pension to William Penn Mack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 7422) to pay Orville Jennings, of Fulton, N. Y., for work done under contract of March 25, 1889—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KYLE: A bill (H. R. 7423) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Fitch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7424) granting an increase of pension to John V. Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7425) granting an increase of pension to William Wiggins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7426) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Rodarmel—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7427) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Wall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7428) granting an increase of pension to William A. Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7429) granting an increase of pension to John Q. Converse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7430) granting an increase of pension to David L. Yarnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7431) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7432) granting a pension to Hannah Dowd Vanderford—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 7433) granting an increase of pension to Alexander E. Fine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7434) granting an increase of pension to Milton T. Dougherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7435) granting an increase of pension to James D. Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7436) granting an increase of pension to James Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7437) granting a pension to Everett Jonte—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7438) granting an increase of pension to Corinne Tolman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 7439) granting a pension to Helen M. Bates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7440) granting a pension to Lewis Goulding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7441) granting a pension to Charles W. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 7442) granting an increase of pension to Marcus Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7443) granting an increase of pension to William Henry Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7444) granting a pension to Washington Dutcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUCKING: A bill (H. R. 7445) granting a pension to Alfred Rauland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7446) granting a pension to Abijah J. Whitmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 7447) granting an increase of pension to William Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 7448) for the relief of George Rea, deceased, late of Copiah County, Miss.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7449) for the relief of James H. Shannon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7450) for the relief of Ann M. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7451) for the relief of the estate of George G. Noland, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7452) for the relief of the estate of William R. Tinsley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7453) for the relief of the estate of John R. Powers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7454) for the relief of the estate of William M. Bowles, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7455) for the relief of Samuel S. Coon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7456) for the relief of D. O. Perkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7457) for the relief of Mrs. Catherine P. Byrnes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7458) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Nancy Mitchell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7459) for the relief of the estate of William E. Bolls, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7460) for the relief of Caleb Perkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7461) for the relief of the estate of Claham Blackman, deceased, late of Claiborne County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7462) granting an increase of pension to Eli Cooperider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7463) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Nugent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7464) granting an increase of pension to Annis Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7465) granting a pension to Abigail Tharp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7466) for relief of the estate of Sewell Coulson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7467) for the relief of Martin All—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 7468) granting a pension to Joseph A. Dudgeon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 7469) granting an increase of pension to Gustave Freudenthal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7470) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Goforth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7471) granting an increase of pension to John Schade, sr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7472) granting an increase of pension to Henry McQuirter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 7473) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Correll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDALL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 7474) granting an increase of pension to Fannie C. Morey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 7475) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Oldson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7476) granting a pension to August W. Diercks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 7477) granting an increase of pension to Cyrenius Dennis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7478) granting a pension to Eli Tippet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7479) granting a pension to Eli Tippet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIDER: A bill (H. R. 7480) for the relief of Joseph Mahon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 7481) fixing the status of Louis Weber, under section 4756, Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBB: A bill (H. R. 7482) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Pittit Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 7483) granting an increase of pension to Richmond G. Howlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7484) granting a pension to Caroline C. Kuhn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7485) for the relief of James W. Kingon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 7486) granting an increase of pension to Frank B. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7487) granting an increase of pension to Francis Knapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7488) granting an increase of pension to Albert Grayem—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 7489) granting an increase of pension to Safford R. Hamer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7490) granting an increase of pension to John H. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7491) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7492) granting an increase of pension to Angeline E. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7493) granting an increase of pension to William H. Seip—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7494) granting a pension to Richard J. Van Valkenburg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7495) granting a pension to Charles J. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 7496) granting a pension to Emeline Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7497) granting a pension to Emma A. Webster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7498) granting a pension to Miranda Berkhead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7499) granting a pension to A. Hausman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7500) granting a pension to Mary E. Springer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7501) granting an increase of pension to Emily Catlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7502) granting an increase of pension to John W. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOBER: A bill (H. R. 7503) granting an increase of pension to Leroy S. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHULL: A bill (H. R. 7504) granting an increase of pension to Morris H. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 7505) for the relief of Henry H. Wynn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7506) for the relief of the estate of John Avritt, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7507) to correct the military record of Daniel F. Tracey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7508) granting a pension to W. B. Scroggy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7509) granting a pension to William L. Chamberlain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7510) granting an increase of pension to Humphrey Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7511) granting an increase of pension to John T. Stosel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7512) granting an increase of pension to Larkin Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7513) granting an increase of pension to Wiley R. Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7514) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Turney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 7515) granting a pension to Rebecca A. Mathias—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 7516) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Banks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7517) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel N. Bishop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 7518) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Flynn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7519) granting an increase of pension to James Lyons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7520) for the relief of W. W. Norris—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 7521) granting a pension to Julia Elgie—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 7522) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hanley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7523) granting an increase of pension to Aaron D. S. Knisley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7524) granting an increase of pension to George F. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7525) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7526) granting an increase of pension to Orville W. Sage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7527) granting a pension to David E. Boyse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7528) granting a pension to Lizzie S. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7529) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Edward H. Beebe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7530) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Edward Montgomery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7531) for the relief of Robert M. Jack, Daniel F. Jack, Henry Hayden, John Kennedy, Wright H. Calkins, and James E. Barrett—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7532) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Henry D. Cutting, alias Henry C. Stratton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: A bill (H. R. 7533) to correct the military record of Charles Wells—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7534) authorizing and directing the repayment to George W. Jordon, of Skinnersburg, Scott County, Ky., the sum of \$1,000, that he paid to avoid the draft in 1864—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7535) for the relief of Jacob Swigert, late deputy collector, seventh Kentucky district—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7536) for the relief of Oldham County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7537) for relief of J. S. Janus, of Shelby County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7538) for the relief of Irene E. Johnson, administratrix of the estate of Leo L. Johnson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7539) for the relief of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7540) for the relief of the Colored Baptist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7541) for the relief of Mrs. Joanna Edwards—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7542) for the relief of J. R. Roberts—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7543) for the relief of Uriah Edwards—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7544) for the relief of D. W. Price—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7545) for the relief of Frank H. Church, administrator of the estate of Cornelius Clay Cox—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7546) for the relief of James Miller, of Bourbon County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7547) for the relief of Mrs. Lizzie R. Ashurst, administratrix of the estate of William Ashurst, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7548) for the relief of Robert Langston—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7549) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John C. Kane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7550) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Turner Rogers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7551) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Henry Linn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7552) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Samuel I. Pearce—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7553) granting a pension to Mary E. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7554) granting a pension to Cynthia A. Embry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7555) granting a pension to William P. Hanlon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7556) granting a pension to Mary A. Weigand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7557) granting a pension to William G. Mandeville—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7558) granting a pension to Francina Walker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7559) granting a pension to Caroline Hurley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7560) granting a pension to Martha Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7561) granting a pension to Elizabeth King—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7562) granting a pension to John Hedrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7563) granting an increase of pension to W. W. Rowlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7564) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. McMeekin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7565) granting an increase of pension to James Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7566) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Walsh, widow of John Walsh, late private Company D, Fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7567) to increase the pension of John F. Rodgers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7568) granting an increase of pension to Albert Costigan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7569) granting an increase of pension to Waller G. Bond—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7570) granting an increase of pension to William Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7571) granting an increase of pension to Davis Preston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7572) granting an increase of pension to Jason M. Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 7573) for the relief of the estate of Ramsay Crooks—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7574) for the relief of the estate of Ramsay Crooks—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALLACE: a bill (H. R. 7575) for the relief of Jacob P. Stroope—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7576) for the relief of William Crow—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7577) for the relief of E. C. Young, O. P. Young, and the estate of J. A. McGinnis, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7578) for the relief of the heirs of John W. Barton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7579) for the relief of the heirs of John C. Eckels—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7580) for the relief of J. C. Karr—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7581) for the relief of the heirs of William T. Stone, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7582) for the relief of S. N. Caughey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7583) for relief of estate of Joshua Hill—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7584) for the relief of Nathaniel S. Word, deceased, late of Ouachita County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WARNOCK: A bill (H. R. 7585) to correct the military record of Larkin Tonguet—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7586) to correct the military record of William Loar—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7587) for the relief of the estate of John H. Piatt, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 7588) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William A. Stewart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 7589) granting a pension to Nancy Peltz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7590) for the relief of Francis M. Watrous—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7591) granting an increase of pension to John L. Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7592) granting an increase of pension to William V. Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7593) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. McGee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 7594) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7595) granting a pension to Ella Hatfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7596) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius C. Maynis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7597) granting an increase of pension to John M. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7598) granting a pension to Mastin W. Bond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7599) granting a pension to Lucinda McCorkle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 7600) granting a pension to Nelson Thomas—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 7601) granting an increase of pension to Eleazar Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 7602) granting a pension to Mary A. Dickson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7603) granting a pension to James Foltz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7604) granting a pension to Mary Amanda Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7605) granting a pension to Nancy Hawkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7606) granting a pension to Sarah E. Haynes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7607) granting a pension to Rev. Joel W. Nye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7608) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Swan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7609) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Ryon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7610) for the relief of the heirs of Alpha A. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7611) for relief of William Martin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUNWELL: A bill (H. R. 7612) for the relief of the estate of Brig. Gen. Wager Swayne, in charge of the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 7613) granting a pension to Caroline Bittrolff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Papers relating to the eight-hour bill and the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Grain Dealers' National Convention, relative to legislation to render the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission effective—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: Paper to accompany bill (H. R. 5250) granting increase of pension to Levi G. Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petition of citizens of Verdon, Nebr., favoring passage of the McCumber bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Resolution of the executive committee of the Southwestern Lumbermen's Association, of Kansas City, Mo., relating to an amendment to Senate bill 1261, which denies use of the mails to certain class of literature—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the settlers of the Indian Pasture Reserve, No. 3, Comanche County, Okla., relating to the treaty between the Kiowa and Apache tribes of Indians, in Oklahoma, and the United States regarding the Neutral Strip and other lands in Oklahoma—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Duncan, Ind. T., favoring passage of a bill opening to settlement the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indian Pasture Reserve, No. 3, in Comanche County, Okla.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Resolution of Colonel Givens Post, No. 200, Grand Army of the Republic, Hallowell, Department of Kansas, favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the executive committee of the Southwestern Lumbermen's Association, relating to an amendment to Senate bill 1261—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Convention at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring enlargement of power of Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAPRON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Homer Lycurgus Law—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COWHERD: Paper to accompany bill granting a pension to William T. Mefford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANIELS: Paper to accompany bill to increase pension of William Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petition of J. S. Wilson, trustee, Mineral County, W. Va., praying for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany claim of John N. Trussell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Convention at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring enlargement of power of Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of citizens of La Crosse, Wis., favoring the improvement of upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the La Crosse (Wis.) Manufacturers and Jobbers' Union, favoring enlargement of power of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of La Crosse, Wis., relative to the improvement of the upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension Nicholas Gruber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Grain Dealers' National Convention, at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring enlargement of power of Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: Resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Convention, at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring enlargement of power of Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the National Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers, in favor of the appointment of a permanent nonpartisan tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEDGE: Petition of citizens of Keokuk, Iowa, for improvement of upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of Rev. Francis Z. Rossiter, against sale of liquor in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Papers to accompany bill to increase the pension of John L. Files—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of officers of Twenty-seventh Indiana Regiment, in favor of bill to increase the pension of John L. Files—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Lieut. Elymas F. Wilkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to John Baer, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE: Petition of Board of Trade and citizens of New Bedford, Mass., for breakwater in Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of William Stone, heir of Mark Stone, Maury County, Tenn., praying for reference of claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Mitchell H. Butt, Maury County, Tenn., administrator on the estate of Diana Butt, praying for reference of claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of John M. Speed, Maury County, Tenn., praying for reference of claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of J. W. Wallis, Clayton County, Ga., praying for reference of claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of S. J. Carmichael, Loudon, Tenn., praying for reference of claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of Rev. Charles E. Dunn, of Freeport, Ill., favoring Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of business men of Ashton, Ill., protesting against passage of parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Rev. M. S. Newcomer and others, of Mount Carroll, Ill., favoring the anticanteen bill, the McCumber bill, and urging investigation of delay in building gymnasiums at army posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of W. S. Smith, of Elmoville, Ill., favoring Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUFF: Resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Association Convention, at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring enlargement of power of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of citizens, favoring passage of McCumber bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of Hamilton Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., favoring the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of residents of Fulton, N. Y., praying for legislation prohibiting the use of intoxicating liquors in Government institutions—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTLE: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 6633, granting an increase of pension to Clark Tritt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 6632, claim of W. R. Lee against United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill H. R.

5609. granting a pension to B. F. Grigsby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: Resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Convention, relative to legislation to render the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission effective—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition relative to the eight-hour bill and the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Annis Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Nugent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petition of citizens of Marine City, Mich., against passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PORTER: Petition of the Outdoor Art League, of California, urging that legislation be enacted to preserve the Calaveras trees of California—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 7217, granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Schultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Grain Dealers' National Association, relative to legislation to render the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission effective—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Nora Stokes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Cyrenius Dennis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIDER: Paper to accompany bill to remove charge of desertion from record of Joseph Mahon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Ira Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBB: Petition of Jennie Pettit Morrison for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Convention, at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring enlargement of power of Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 6994, granting increase of pension to Theresa Nebrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 6699, to pension Oscar W. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 6995, granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Steel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 6698, granting a pension to Mary L. Adler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: Resolution of Woodson Post, No. 185, Grand Army of the Republic, Yates Center, Kans., favoring the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of the executive committee of the Southwestern Lumberman's Association, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1261—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of residents of New York Mills, N. Y., praying for legislation against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLEMP: Paper to accompany bill to correct military record of Henry H. Wynn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING: Petition of merchants of Colfax, Ill., against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SULLIVAN: Paper to accompany bill granting increase of pension to Ira Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Resolution of Booth Post, No. 130, Grand Army of the Republic, Grand Meadow, Minn., favoring passage of bill granting a pension of \$12 a month to soldiers who served ninety days or more in the war of 1861-1865—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Resolution of citizens of North Carolina, asking for legislation against the cotton-boll weevil—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WACHTER: Resolution of Board of Trade of Baltimore city, relating to the deepening of the main ship channel from the port of Baltimore to a depth of 35 feet—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WADE: Petition of East Davenport Turnverein, of Davenport, Iowa, against the passage of the Hepburn bill, relative to interstate liquor traffic—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WARNER: Petitions of citizens of Bement, Piatt

County; of citizens of Strasburg, Shelby County; of citizens of Cowden, Shelby County, and of Philo, Champaign County, Ill., protesting against the passage of any parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: Papers to accompany bill granting pension to Mrs. Hedwig A. Maas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Paper to accompany bill to increase pension of Lucinda McCorkle; also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of John M. Stevens; also, papers to accompany bill to pension John Whitehead; also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Cornelius C. Mangis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, December 15, 1903.

Prayer by Rev. J. WESLEY SULLIVAN, chaplain of the State senate, Harrisburg, Pa.

Mr. ANSELM J. McLAURIN, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in his seat to-day.

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

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

KIOWA INDIAN AGENCY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the results of the investigation into the affairs of the Kiowa Indian Agency; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Plains Lodge, No. 135, Free and Accepted Masons, of East Baton Rouge Parish, La., v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BURROWS presented petitions of sundry citizens of West Bay City and Lyons, and of the Ladies' Literary Club of Grand Rapids, all in the State of Michigan, 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. PLATT of New York presented petitions of B. Frank Maxson Post, No. 428, of Alfred; of L. O. Morris Post, No. 121, of Albany; of William E. Avery Post, No. 438, of New York City; of A. A. Curtin Post, No. 392, of Geneseo; of Abraham Vosburg Post, No. 95, of Peekskill; of Gordon Granger Post, No. 7, of Clifton Springs; of Swift Post, No. 94, of Geneva; of C. L. Willard Post, No. 34, of Troy, and of D. F. Schenck Post, No. 271, of Fulton, all of the Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church of Mechanicsville; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dobbs Ferry; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Pinebush; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Halsey Valley; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Westtown; of sundry citizens of Frankfort and Schuyler; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Rensselaer; of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Coila; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Angelica; of the Sabbath School of the Presbyterian Church of Catskill; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Lake George; of the National Sabbath Alliance, of New York City; of sundry citizens of Corinth; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Brunswick; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Brookhaven, and of sundry citizens of New York Mills and Troy, all in the State of New York, 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. FAIRBANKS presented memorials of the New Albany Ice Company, of New Albany; of the Retail Merchants' Association of Evansville, and of E. E. Perry, of Indianapolis, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relative to the use of the mails for certain classes of literature and for contracts of insurance; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.