

wick, N. J., in favor of an anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Resolution of the Weber Club, of Ogden City, Utah, relative to American merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of residents of Caldwell County, Ky., in favor of bill H. R. 3574—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLINE: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Mohrsville, Pa., relative to the nullification of State liquor laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of residents of Sacketts Harbor, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of bill H. R. 7033—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. LAMAR of Missouri: Resolution of Norwood Post, No. 274, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Missouri, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 12605, granting a pension to N. H. Dibble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to M. V. B. Amos—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 10544, granting an increase of pension to H. H. Rhoads—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 10542, to correct the military record of Robert W. Marr—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANNING: Petitions of Elwood Mathew and 29 others, and Frank Le Bar and 35 others, of Pennington, N. J., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Grand Lodge, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron-Ship Builders of America, in favor of bill S. 2259 and sundry other bills—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of J. W. Fonda and 36 others, of Luray, Mo., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of Thomas W. Wyne and 86 other voters of Thorofare, N. J.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Paper to accompany bill to increase pension of Charles H. Donihue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: Petition of Rev. C. E. Flanagan and 184 others, of Burlingame, Kans., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of Rev. William A. Cutter, against registry and money-order business in post-offices on Sunday—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Rev. William A. Cutter, of Milwaukee, Wis., in favor of Sunday closing of the Lewis and Clark Exposition—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. PUJO: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Frank J. D'Avy—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: Petition of T. A. Wilson and 88 others, of Collinsville, Tex., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 3989, for the relief of the estate of W. R. Hanserd, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: Petition of L. B. Jarmon and 33 others, of Wartrace, Tenn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Stephen Duncan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Fannie A. Hutchason—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Robert H. Shofner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNOOK: Resolution of Evans Post, No. 149, of Bryan, Ohio, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Petition of C. F. Greening and 17 other voters of Grand Meadow, Minn., for the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Robert Hobson and 17 other voters and F. H. McCulloch and 30 other voters of Austin, Minn., for the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of S. T. Christenson and 23 other voters of Lansing, Minn., for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of S. N. Wheaton and 5 other voters of Caledonia, Minn.; J. W. Pendergast and 26 other voters, and Frank Willis and 13 other voters, for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THAYER: Petition of the Southbridge (Mass.) Young

People's Christian Union, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Worcester Metal Trades Association, against passage of the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Worcester, Mass., against passage of anti-injunction bill, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. Everett Heammond and 10 others, of Blackstone, Mass.; A. H. Richardson and 36 others, of Gilbertville, Mass., and Leonard E. Taft and 9 others, of Mendon, Mass., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of W. H. Bocker, in favor of increasing appropriations for agricultural experiment stations—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union and citizens of Angelica, N. Y., and G. W. Adams and 27 others, of Andover, N. Y., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WACHTER: Petition of E. M. Spath and 21 others, and Rev. G. W. Hobbs and 45 others, of Baltimore, Md., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the American Shipowners, Shipbuilders, and Shipmasters, relative to denying American registry to foreign-built vessels, etc.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of Kendall, Orleans County, N. Y., route No. 29; Medina, Orleans County, N. Y., routes Nos. 10 and 17; Lockport, Niagara County, N. Y., routes Nos. 3, 4, 7, and 10, and Ransomville, Niagara County, N. Y., routes Nos. 23 and 24, urging increase of salaries for rural free-delivery carriers, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WARNOCK: Petition of Herman McClellan and 77 others, of Wayne, Ohio, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEISSE: Resolution of the Milwaukee Foundrymen's Association, against passage of the bill limiting the meaning of the word "conspiracy"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the American Association of Masters and Pilots of Steam Vessels, relative to a light-house on or near the Outer Diamond Shoal, on the coast of North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the Wisconsin Live Stock Breeders' Association, in favor of increase in appropriation for agricultural experiment stations—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Wisconsin, protesting against the passage of bill H. R. 7033—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of Rock River Lodge, No. 11, Independent Order of Good Templars, Waupun, Wis., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 29, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, if there be no objection. It is approved.

BUST OF HANDEL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, requesting that authority be given them to accept a bust of Handel from the United German Singing Societies of Washington, D. C.; which was referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

CANCELING MACHINES IN THE POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting certain information relative to the purchase and rental of canceling machines to be used in that Department, and recommending that an appropriation of \$200,000 be made for the rental of these machines; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

TARIFF ON PHILIPPINE TOBACCO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a translation of a petition to the President of the United States dated Manila, P. I., October 28, 1903, from the Tobacco Workers' Guild in the Philippines, respecting the tariff on Philippine tobacco and cigars imported into the United States; which, with the accompanying

paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3780) authorizing the Yankton, Norfolk and Southern Railway Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak.

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

A bill (H. R. 865) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Chase;

A bill (H. R. 2019) granting a pension to Mary Gwynn;

A bill (H. R. 4045) granting a pension to Minnie Gusler;

A bill (H. R. 6089) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Nagle; and

A bill (H. R. 6352) granting a pension to Mary Huff.

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

A bill (S. 121) granting additional lands adjacent to its site to the University of Montana;

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

A bill (S. 3274) granting an increase of pension to Jane I. Long.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills; asks conferences with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MIERS of Indiana, and Mr. SULLOWAY managers at the respective conferences on the part of the House:

A bill (H. R. 2477) granting an increase of pension to Frank J. McLaughlin;

A bill (H. R. 2809) granting an increase of pension to John Watt;

A bill (H. R. 2920) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Huffman;

A bill (H. R. 2923) granting an increase of pension to John G. Fairchild;

A bill (H. R. 3032) granting an increase of pension to William Pittenger;

A bill (H. R. 4136) granting an increase of pension to Caleb Arnett;

A bill (H. R. 4251) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hinkle;

A bill (H. R. 4526) granting an increase of pension to William J. Shepard;

A bill (H. R. 5367) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Moore;

A bill (H. R. 5555) granting an increase of pension to James R. Hauptly;

A bill (H. R. 5865) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Harlan;

A bill (H. R. 6025) granting an increase of pension to John Herzog;

A bill (H. R. 6426) granting an increase of pension to David Z. Beidler;

A bill (H. R. 6705) granting an increase of pension to Edwin A. Forman;

A bill (H. R. 8376) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan J. Smith;

A bill (H. R. 8058) granting an increase of pension to William M. Underhill; and

A bill (H. R. 9583) granting an increase of pension to James H. Hargis.

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

A bill (H. R. 133) granting an increase of pension to James W. Smith;

A bill (H. R. 153) granting a pension to Harriet Snyder;

A bill (H. R. 194) granting a pension to Mary J. Bradley;

A bill (H. R. 691) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca C. Shurlock;

A bill (H. R. 729) granting an increase of pension to Freeman O. Hodge;

A bill (H. R. 742) granting an increase of pension to George W. Darrah;

A bill (H. R. 790) granting an increase of pension to Oliver A. Filman;

A bill (H. R. 805) granting an increase of pension to George W. McConkey;

A bill (H. R. 967) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Gruber;

A bill (H. R. 1170) granting an increase of pension to Lewis L. Bean;

A bill (H. R. 1176) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kimble;

A bill (H. R. 1268) granting an increase of pension to John B. Hart;

A bill (H. R. 1285) granting an increase of pension to Adam Gosage;

A bill (H. R. 1515) granting a pension to Lucy Warren;

A bill (H. R. 1519) granting a pension to Thomas P. Moore;

A bill (H. R. 1528) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Jaralemon;

A bill (H. R. 1575) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Davis;

A bill (H. R. 1882) granting an increase of pension to James Durkee;

A bill (H. R. 1953) to provide for an additional associate justice of the supreme court of New Mexico;

A bill (H. R. 2110) granting a pension to Mary Farrell;

A bill (H. R. 2121) granting a pension to Gertrude Merrill;

A bill (H. R. 2189) granting an increase of pension to Henry Spindler;

A bill (H. R. 2371) granting a pension to Sarah J. Herman;

A bill (H. R. 2490) granting a pension to John Maynard;

A bill (H. R. 2491) granting a pension to Larkin Maynard;

A bill (H. R. 2529) to set apart certain lands in the Territory of Arizona as a public park, to be known as "The Petrified Forest National Park;"

A bill (H. R. 2557) granting an increase of pension to James Carr;

A bill (H. R. 2589) granting a pension to Susanna Cosgrove;

A bill (H. R. 2767) granting an increase of pension to John E. Neary;

A bill (H. R. 2855) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hill;

A bill (H. R. 2862) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta A. Pryce;

A bill (H. R. 2928) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Bushman;

A bill (H. R. 3035) granting an increase of pension to William D. Hall;

A bill (H. R. 3167) granting an increase of pension to James Littleton;

A bill (H. R. 3288) granting an increase of pension to Nathan L. Meands;

A bill (H. R. 3806) granting an increase of pension to George H. Sweet;

A bill (H. R. 3902) granting a pension to Martha J. Derrington;

A bill (H. R. 4252) granting an increase of pension to George M. Gibbons;

A bill (H. R. 4355) granting a pension to Martha A. Day;

A bill (H. R. 4405) to correct the military record of Carl W. Albrecht;

A bill (H. R. 4634) granting an increase of pension to Randolph T. Stoops;

A bill (H. R. 4798) granting an increase of pension to Margaret F. Harris;

A bill (H. R. 4874) granting a pension to Charles V. Billig;

A bill (H. R. 4889) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Beltz;

A bill (H. R. 4941) granting a pension to Mary J. Wilson;

A bill (H. R. 4968) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Clary;

A bill (H. R. 4994) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Sheets;

A bill (H. R. 4997) granting a pension to Franklin B. Lippincott;

A bill (H. R. 5008) granting an increase of pension to Henry McCord;

A bill (H. R. 5091) granting an increase of pension to William Kennedy, alias Leonard;

A bill (H. R. 5262) granting an increase of pension to Irving Holcomb;

A bill (H. R. 5296) granting an increase of pension to Horatio M. Price;

A bill (H. R. 5373) granting an increase of pension to Motem M. Pitts;

A bill (H. R. 5395) granting a pension to Mattie Aten;

A bill (H. R. 5476) granting an increase of pension to William Davis;

A bill (H. R. 5527) granting a pension to Frances Reck;

A bill (H. R. 5648) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Herold;

A bill (H. R. 5682) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Hunt;

A bill (H. R. 5693) granting an increase of pension to Joel M. Street;

- A bill (H. R. 5700) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Richards;
- A bill (H. R. 5824) granting an increase of pension to Casper J. Schoer;
- A bill (H. R. 5855) granting an increase of pension to Herbert M. Blackwell, alias Levi W. Moar;
- A bill (H. R. 5873) granting an increase of pension to Sirbrina Palmer;
- A bill (H. R. 5952) granting an increase of pension to William H. Kent;
- A bill (H. R. 6024) granting an increase of pension to Calistro Castro;
- A bill (H. R. 6087) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Bracklin;
- A bill (H. R. 6249) granting an increase of pension to Frederick J. Fairbrass;
- A bill (H. R. 6253) granting an increase of pension to Theodore C. Putnam;
- A bill (H. R. 6271) granting an increase of pension to Catharine M. Wonderly;
- A bill (H. R. 6416) granting an increase of pension to Anna S. Dunn;
- A bill (H. R. 6420) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Mehring;
- A bill (H. R. 6432) granting a pension to Ellender C. Miller;
- A bill (H. R. 6501) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Robinson, jr.;
- A bill (H. R. 6563) granting an increase of pension to John Baragar;
- A bill (H. R. 6589) granting a pension to Jacob B. Mock;
- A bill (H. R. 6611) granting an increase of pension to Austin Murphy;
- A bill (H. R. 6653) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Standley;
- A bill (H. R. 6780) authorizing the Union Pioneer Mining and Trading Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Catala Creek, in the District of Alaska;
- A bill (H. R. 6787) to confirm and validate patents to certain lands situated in the Bitter Root Valley, State of Montana, above the mouth of the Lo Lo Fork of the Bitter Root River;
- A bill (H. R. 6823) granting an increase of pension to Seneca R. Pollard;
- A bill (H. R. 6824) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Manning;
- A bill (H. R. 6848) granting an increase of pension to John W. Plattenburg;
- A bill (H. R. 6859) granting an increase of pension to William A. Sheridan;
- A bill (H. R. 6880) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. Preston;
- A bill (H. R. 6956) granting an increase of pension to Ellis House;
- A bill (H. R. 7244) granting an increase of pension to Williamina R. Allenbaugh;
- A bill (H. R. 7308) granting an increase of pension to Lucius E. Mills;
- A bill (H. R. 7353) granting an increase of pension to William H. Schreiner;
- A bill (H. R. 7394) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Hutchins;
- A bill (H. R. 7411) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Caldwell;
- A bill (H. R. 7438) granting an increase of pension to Corinne Tolman;
- A bill (H. R. 7470) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Goforth, alias Napoleon B. Gordon;
- A bill (H. R. 7500) granting a pension to Mary E. Springer;
- A bill (H. R. 7501) granting an increase of pension to Emily Catlin;
- A bill (H. R. 7568) granting an increase of pension to Albert Costigan;
- A bill (H. R. 7664) granting an increase of pension to George P. Malloch;
- A bill (H. R. 7698) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin R. W. Mockabee;
- A bill (H. R. 7726) granting a pension to Jasper N. W. Rogers;
- A bill (H. R. 7754) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Myers;
- A bill (H. R. 7778) granting a pension to Frank H. Clark;
- A bill (H. R. 8010) granting an increase of pension to Josiah B. Deeter;
- A bill (H. R. 8025) granting an increase of pension to James Payton;
- A bill (H. R. 8044) granting an increase of pension to Seymore F. Burlingame;
- A bill (H. R. 8050) granting an increase of pension to John I. Lose;
- A bill (H. R. 8078) granting an increase of pension to William J. Mosier;
- A bill (H. R. 8180) granting an increase of pension to William Smith;
- A bill (H. R. 8220) granting an increase of pension to Edward B. Nugent;
- A bill (H. R. 8287) granting an increase of pension to Abram T. Carney;
- A bill (H. R. 8387) granting an increase of pension to Emma R. Wallace;
- A bill (H. R. 8421) for the relief of Russel A. McKinley;
- A bill (H. R. 8482) granting an increase of pension to John C. Foos;
- A bill (H. R. 8611) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. De Motte;
- A bill (H. R. 8725) granting an increase of pension to John A. Parker;
- A bill (H. R. 8742) granting an increase of pension to Jason Robinson;
- A bill (H. R. 8789) granting an increase of pension to George K. Knowlton;
- A bill (H. R. 9081) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Miller;
- A bill (H. R. 9082) granting an increase of pension to Chester F. Kimball;
- A bill (H. R. 9117) granting a pension to George T. Young;
- A bill (H. R. 9390) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Louis Tyner;
- A bill (H. R. 9392) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Robbins;
- A bill (H. R. 9576) granting an increase of pension to Eli M. McElwain;
- A bill (H. R. 9581) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Lloyd;
- A bill (H. R. 9592) granting an increase of pension to William H. Steimann;
- A bill (H. R. 9709) granting a pension to Louis De Witt;
- A bill (H. R. 9726) granting an increase of pension to John McEliece;
- A bill (H. R. 9741) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Dale;
- A bill (H. R. 9756) granting an increase of pension to Jesse T. Bennett;
- A bill (H. R. 9789) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Morrison;
- A bill (H. R. 9801) granting a pension to Jane McNeil;
- A bill (H. R. 9807) granting an increase of pension to Hugh S. Smith;
- A bill (H. R. 9815) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim O. Gilbert;
- A bill (H. R. 9820) granting an increase of pension to Vincent Anderson;
- A bill (H. R. 9979) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Nichols;
- A bill (H. R. 9990) granting a pension to John Bartmann;
- A bill (H. R. 9996) granting a pension to Henry Mason;
- A bill (H. R. 10171) granting an increase of pension to Josiah H. Tyack;
- A bill (H. R. 10179) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bell;
- A bill (H. R. 10209) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Deaney;
- A bill (H. R. 10264) granting an increase of pension to Louis C. Amberg;
- A bill (H. R. 10399) granting an increase of pension to Francis Marshall;
- A bill (H. R. 10531) granting an increase of pension to George W. Farr;
- A bill (H. R. 10576) granting a pension to Lulu E. McKee;
- A bill (H. R. 10761) to authorize the Secretary of War to accept from the citizens of Missoula, Mont., deeds donating to the United States certain land for the enlargement of the military reservation of Fort Missoula, Mont.;
- A bill (H. R. 10792) granting an increase of pension to Frederic Lockley;
- A bill (H. R. 10822) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Smith;
- A bill (H. R. 10847) granting an increase of pension to James O. Knowles;
- A bill (H. R. 10901) granting an increase of pension to John Quinn;
- A bill (H. R. 10912) granting an increase of pension to Leonard J. Whitney;
- A bill (H. R. 10919) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Oliver;

A bill (H. R. 10935) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Mayo;
 A bill (H. R. 11066) granting an increase of pension to Joshua D. Griffith;
 A bill (H. R. 11074) granting a pension to Merritt R. Simpson;
 A bill (H. R. 11141) granting an increase of pension to John B. Keller;
 A bill (H. R. 11169) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Griffith Porter;
 A bill (H. R. 11175) granting an increase of pension to Isaac S. Drummond;
 A bill (H. R. 11229) granting a pension to Francis M. Good;
 A bill (H. R. 11428) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Fellows;
 A bill (H. R. 11557) granting a pension to Alfred D. Burton;
 A bill (H. R. 11558) granting an increase of pension to James B. Luckey;
 A bill (H. R. 11575) granting a pension to Abel N. Button;
 A bill (H. R. 11606) granting an increase of pension to Caleb J. May;
 A bill (H. R. 11649) granting an increase of pension to Malinda A. Myers;
 A bill (H. R. 11654) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Wagner;
 A bill (H. R. 11655) granting an increase of pension to James Lynch;
 A bill (H. R. 11660) granting an increase of pension to James Dasson;
 A bill (H. R. 11845) granting an increase of pension to David C. McVicker;
 A bill (H. R. 11894) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Sheldon;
 A bill (H. R. 12036) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Wetzel;
 A bill (H. R. 12050) granting an increase of pension to David R. Luttrell;
 A bill (H. R. 12053) granting an increase of pension to James Large;
 A bill (H. R. 12056) granting an increase of pension to Kezia Cherry;
 A bill (H. R. 12073) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Gardner;
 A bill (H. R. 12191) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Filkins;
 A bill (H. R. 12352) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cooper;
 A bill (H. R. 12417) granting a pension to Hiram Parker;
 A bill (H. R. 12457) granting an increase of pension to Nannie J. McGuckin;
 A bill (H. R. 12550) granting an increase of pension to Emma R. Lamb; and
 A bill (H. R. 12805) granting a pension to Margaret J. Snook.
 The foregoing pension bills were subsequently read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Salt Lake City, Utah, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of Donaldson Grange, No. 1160, Patrons of Husbandry, of Donaldson, Mich., praying for the passage of the so-called "Brownlow good-roads bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union, American Federation of Labor, of Saginaw, Mich., praying for the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Commerce of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against an appropriation being made for a pneumatic-tube service for the post-office at that place; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Anti-Saloon League of Lansing, Mich., and a petition of sundry citizens of Branch County, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CULLOM presented the petition of N. J. Hester and 24 other citizens of America, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called "Brownlow good-roads bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the Manufacturers and Shippers' Association of Rockford, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of John A. Logan Circle, No. 39, Department of Illinois, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Chicago, Ill., and a petition of J. W. Dodds Post, No. 370, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, of Auburn, Ill., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of F. A. McCarty and 105 other citizens of Mason City, Ill., and a petition of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Aledo, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Aledo, Ill., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of George Washington Circle, No. 2, Department of Washington and Alaska, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of South Bellingham, Wash., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Waitsburg, and of sundry citizens of Thornton and Waitsburg, all in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCCUMBER presented a petition of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Fargo, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of St. Paul, Marshall, and Le Roy, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the National Association of State Dairy and Food Departments and by sundry manufacturers and distributors of food products in the United States, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of the Farmers' Club and Benevolent Society of West Brookfield, Mass., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of Thomas N. Gardner Post, No. 207, Department of Massachusetts, Grand Army of the Republic, of Nantucket, and a petition of Charles Ward Post, No. 63, Department of Massachusetts, Grand Army of the Republic, of Newton, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of West Brookfield, Mass., and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bolton, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCCOMAS presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sharpsburg; of the congregation of the Columbia Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of Baltimore; of the congregation of the Harlem Park Methodist Episcopal Church, of Baltimore; of the congregation of the Emory Methodist Episcopal Church, of Baltimore; of the congregation of the West Baltimore Methodist Episcopal Church, of Baltimore; of the congregation of the Arlington Methodist Episcopal Church, of Baltimore County, and of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Westminster, all in the State of Maryland, 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. LONG presented a memorial of Lichty Brothers, of Wellington, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Mayflower Circle, No. 80, Department of Kansas, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Lawrence, and a petition of James Shields Post, No. 57, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, of Wellington, Kans., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Seneca, Wilson, Parsons, Arkansas City, Whitewater, and Chetopa, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to

regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ANKENY presented petitions of W. T. Kenney Circle, No. 12, Department of Washington and Alaska, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Blaine; of General Milroy Post, No. 62, Department of Washington and Alaska, and of George Washington Circle, No. 2, Department of Washington and Alaska, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bellingham, all in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LATIMER presented a petition of 80 citizens of Waterbury, Conn., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction and maintenance of public highways; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. QUARLES presented petitions of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Union Valley; of sundry citizens of Waupaca; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Waterloo; of Lodge No. 146, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Caldwell; of Lodge No. 128, of Auburn; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Whitewater; of Lodge No. 295, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Butternut; of Lodge No. 183, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Cambria; of the congregation of the Mount Hope Baptist Church, of Edmund; of Lodge No. 242, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Buena Vista; of the Wisconsin Sunday Rest Association, of Milwaukee; of sundry citizens of Columbus; of sundry citizens of Centerville; of sundry citizens of Trempolian; of sundry citizens of Racine; of the O. L. Packard Machinery Company, of Milwaukee, and of Nordon Lodge, No. 60, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Ashland, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

He also presented a petition of Council No. 155, United Order of Commercial Travelers, of Appleton, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to place the claims of traveling salesmen on the list of preferred creditors in bankruptcy cases; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., and a petition of the Western Association of Shoe Wholesalers, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Wisconsin Live Stock Breeders' Association, and a petition of the Wisconsin State Board of Agriculture, praying that an appropriation be made in aid of State agricultural experiment stations; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ripon, Wis., praying for the passage of the so-called "Brownlow good-roads bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the petition of Rev. W. A. Cutler, of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit postal order or registry business being done on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., declaring that they are "in hearty sympathy with the movement calling for encouragement and friendly legislation on the part of Congress to enlarge and extend the American merchant marine; to remove, as far as possible, any impediment or discrimination to the American merchant marine now existing, and to put it upon an equality before the law with any merchant marine sailing under the flag of the most favored nation: *Provided, however,* That this board of trade is unalterably and uncompromisingly opposed to any enactment by Congress that shall involve the payment of any subsidy, it being the firm conviction that the magnitude of the commerce to be carried, the unlimited supply of material within our own borders for the construction of vessels, and the unequalled ability of our people in the construction of the same, together with their recognized superior seamanship, place the people of this nation upon a footing on which they are able to cope with all the world without material aid." I move that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of Monroe City, Mo., and a petition of the Fortnightly Club, of Kirkwood, Mo., 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. DEPEW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Patchogue, of the Woman's Club of Sandy Hill, of the Young Woman's Industrial Club of Saratoga Springs, of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Kendall, of the congregation of the South Presbyterian Church of Syracuse, of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of York, and of sundry citizens of New Brighton, Port Richmond, and Graniteville, 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.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Onondaga, Mount Kisco, Carmel, Canton, Andover, Pike, Silver Creek, Canajoharie, Lewiston, Richmond, Richford, Mexico, Walworth, Northfield, West Hampton Beach, Bayport, Bloomfield, Genesee Falls, Dryden, Port Cluster, Lewis County, Lakewood, Chautauqua, Essex County, Warrensburg, Rochester, Horseheads, New York City, Steuben County, Little Genesee, Cabin Hill, Hagaman, Ontario, Prince Bay, Wellsville, Old Saratoga, Oswego, and Utica; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Fly Creek; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Lowville; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Lowville; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Morris-town; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Cobleskill; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Columbia County; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of West Hampton Beach; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Sidney; of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Rickford; of the Sixth Ward Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Rochester; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Silver Creek; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Malone; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Webster; of the congregation of the Universalist Church of Potsdam; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Lawrence; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Lawrence; of sundry citizens of Burke, Jamestown, and Port Jefferson, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a new custom-house at that city; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the Government inspection of grain at terminal points; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsburg, New Albany, West Finley, Sharon, Berks County, Honesdale, Port Allegheny, and Reading; of the congregation of the United Brethren Church of Reading; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Canton; of the Prohibition Alliance of Grover; of the congregation of the United Brethren Church of Everson; of the Christian Civic Union of Greensburg; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Milton; of the congregation of the Second United Presbyterian Church of Indiana; of the congregation of the First United Presbyterian Church of Indiana; of the General Assembly's Permanent Committee on Temperance of the Presbyterian Church of Pittsburg; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Mohrsville; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Oakmont; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Honesdale; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Honesdale; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Thompson; of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Sharon; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Sharon; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sharon, and of the Lawrence Local Sunday School Association, of Tioga County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of the congregation of the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mankato, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction and maintenance of public highways; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Lumber Trade Club, of Boston, Mass., praying for the establishment of a national

forest reserve in the White Mountains; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. McLAURIN presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1076) for the relief of U. Lunenberger; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented a petition of sundry citizens of Connecticut, in support of the bill (S. 4151) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Spencer; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARREN presented papers to accompany the bill (S. 4523) for the relief of James Roach, deceased, of Hinds County, Miss.; the bill (S. 4444) for the relief of John Moody, of Grainger County, Tenn.; the bill (S. 4447) for the relief of Dr. William O. Robards, of Boyle County, Ky.; the bill (S. 4465) for the relief of the estate of Francis Fisk, of Orleans Parish, La.; the bill (S. 4467) for the relief of the estate of Alexander Roth, of Iberville Parish, La.; the bill (S. 4468) for the relief of M. W. Stewart, of Morehouse Parish, La.; the bill (S. 4543) for the relief of W. J. Winsett, of Bedford County, Tenn.; the bill (S. 4539) for the relief of the estate of Robert Edwards, of Madison County, Tenn.; the bill (S. 1103) for the relief of the estate of Augustus Catchings, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.; the bill (S. 4461) for the relief of Joseph Brugere, of Orleans Parish, La.; the bill (S. 4292) for the relief of Raiford Brewington, of Sampson County, N. C.; the bill (S. 1105) for the relief of Julia A. Thomas, of Scotts County, Miss.; the bill (S. 1020) for the relief of Benjamin Hawes, of Union County, Miss.; the bill (S. 1152) for the relief of William L. Clearman, of Newton County, Miss.; the bill (S. 3816) for the relief of the heirs of Jabez Tanner and York & Hoover, of Rapides Parish, La.; the bill (S. 3806) for the relief of Mrs. A. T. Mason, of Benton County, Miss.; the bill (S. 1090) for the relief of Thomas S. Maben, of Hinds County, Miss.; the bill (S. 4464) for the relief of the estate of J. M. Charpentier, deceased, of St. Mary Parish, La.; the bill (S. 1340) for the relief of Thomas E. Robison, of Henderson County, Tenn.; the bill (S. 1470) for the relief of Belle M. Robards, of Boyle County, Ky.; the bill (S. 4537) for the relief of the estate of R. L. and Elizabeth P. Evans, of Shelby County, Tenn.; the bill (S. 993) for the relief of the estate of Purify Tingle, of Newton County, Miss.; the bill (S. 1167) for the relief of Isaac Jones, deceased, of Adams County, Miss.; the bill (S. 3756) for the relief of the estate of James Henderson, deceased, of Hinds County, Miss.; the bill (S. 3820) for the relief of Eli C. Brown, of East Baton Rouge Parish, La.; the bill (S. 1108) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Hull Wellford, of Marshall County, Miss.; the bill (S. 4443) for the relief of John Chandler, of Maury County, Tenn.; the bill (S. 4499) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Stolsworth, of Grainger County, Tenn.; the bill (S. 3669) for the relief of the estate of Isham G. Bailey, deceased, of Marshall County, Miss.; and the bill (S. 4498) for the relief of the estate of Matthew Brown, of Shelby County, Tenn.; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Bar Association of Chicago, Ill., praying for the ratification of a treaty of reciprocity between the United States and Great Britain; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of Local Division No. 3, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Portland, Me., remonstrating against the ratification of a treaty of reciprocity between the United States and Great Britain; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Associated Republican Clubs of Kings County, N. Y., and resolutions adopted by the German-American Republican Central Club of Cook County, Ill., expressing sympathy on the death of Hon. Marcus A. Hanna, late a Senator from the State of Ohio; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Womans' Christian Temperance Union of Bayou La Batre, Ala., 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

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

A bill (H. R. 7410) granting an increase of pension to Enos D. Hoge; and

A bill (H. R. 9035) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Branan.

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. 336) granting an increase of pension to William Lechleidner;

A bill (S. 4455) granting an increase of pension to Ancil J. Busby; and

A bill (S. 885) granting a pension to Sarah A. Gillham.

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. 3491) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Howe;

A bill (S. 447) granting an increase of pension to David H. George;

A bill (S. 450) granting an increase of pension to George H. Sutherland;

A bill (S. 3499) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Lookingbill; and

A bill (H. R. 8925) granting an increase of pension to John Weaver.

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. 556) granting an increase of pension to William Stall;

A bill (S. 4454) granting an increase of pension to John Seiler;

A bill (H. R. 6618) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Coffin;

A bill (H. R. 5610) granting a pension to Annie Dorfner;

A bill (H. R. 5999) granting an increase of pension to Ann Jennett Whitney;

A bill (H. R. 10194) granting an increase of pension to Marion Long;

A bill (H. R. 7248) granting a pension to Robert H. Cooke;

A bill (H. R. 11076) granting an increase of pension to Elvira Miller;

A bill (H. R. 10640) granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Wood;

A bill (H. R. 9064) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Tidd;

A bill (H. R. 7719) granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Cozine;

A bill (H. R. 7332) granting a pension to Ellen A. Harmon;

A bill (H. R. 7659) granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Elliott;

A bill (H. R. 7814) granting an increase of pension to James G. Andrews;

A bill (H. R. 7083) granting an increase of pension to Albert P. Jackson;

A bill (H. R. 9739) granting a pension to Lizzie M. Worster;

A bill (H. R. 2692) granting an increase of pension to Elwood Finley;

A bill (H. R. 8203) granting an increase of pension to James M. Hemphill;

A bill (H. R. 8272) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Elliott;

A bill (H. R. 9791) granting a pension to Abram Claypool;

A bill (H. R. 9999) granting an increase of pension to William Edgar; and

A bill (H. R. 9695) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Spears.

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

A bill (H. R. 5603) granting an increase of pension to William C. McCormick;

A bill (H. R. 5879) granting an increase of pension to Bennett Putnam;

A bill (H. R. 6038) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin George;

A bill (H. R. 6703) granting an increase of pension to Levi Remick;

A bill (H. R. 7680) granting an increase of pension to De Witt C. Folsom;

A bill (H. R. 8379) granting an increase of pension to Ira B. Wambaugh;

A bill (H. R. 8718) granting an increase of pension to Caswell P. Ford;

A bill (H. R. 8998) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Beach; and

A bill (H. R. 8811) granting an increase of pension to James Dougherty.

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

A bill (H. R. 10741) granting a pension to Mary Tate;

A bill (H. R. 11345) granting a pension to Joseph H. Huie; and

A bill (H. R. 8733) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. McGraw.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1394) granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Webster, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 6455) granting an increase of pension to Abraham W. Cochran;

A bill (H. R. 7096) granting an increase of pension to Eva A. Burgess;

A bill (H. R. 8966) granting an increase of pension to James M. Fink;

A bill (H. R. 7559) granting a pension to Caroline Hurley;

A bill (H. R. 8124) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hatfield;

A bill (H. R. 7444) granting an increase of pension to Washington J. Dutcher;

A bill (H. R. 9376) granting an increase of pension to Martin Renthler;

A bill (H. R. 10268) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Keller;

A bill (H. R. 11343) granting an increase of pension to Matthew S. Priest;

A bill (H. R. 9587) granting an increase of pension to Bartlett S. Haggard;

A bill (H. R. 9753) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Loomis;

A bill (H. R. 7737) granting an increase of pension to Howard McGuire;

A bill (H. R. 9273) granting an increase of pension to James H. Sackett;

A bill (H. R. 9037) granting a pension to Alice W. Clarke;

A bill (H. R. 10850) granting an increase of pension to Adaline L. Power;

A bill (H. R. 10706) granting an increase of pension to Alfred J. West;

A bill (H. R. 10694) granting an increase of pension to Alderson T. Keen;

A bill (H. R. 10748) granting an increase of pension to Kate Ridgway;

A bill (H. R. 11413) granting an increase of pension to Jasper F. Morton; and

A bill (H. R. 11319) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Arnold.

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

A bill (H. R. 7311) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Large;

A bill (H. R. 10063) granting an increase of pension to James G. Saims; and

A bill (H. R. 9421) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Marshall.

Mr. CARMACK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3573) granting an increase of pension to Calvin E. Myers, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2971) granting a pension to Amelia Walsh, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 305) granting an increase of pension to John R. Evans, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3946) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Bright;

A bill (H. R. 5155) granting an increase of pension to John J. Tompkins;

A bill (H. R. 8771) granting a pension to Walter F. Horner;

A bill (H. R. 10046) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Campton; and

A bill (H. R. 8970) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Hart.

Mr. BURNHAM, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3623) granting an increase of pension to Anna H. Lyman, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 11194) granting an increase of pension to Frank S. Nickerson;

A bill (H. R. 6869) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Elmer;

A bill (H. R. 11052) granting an increase of pension to Mary Eaton Livingston; and

A bill (H. R. 11113) granting an increase of pension to Silas Soules.

Mr. PETTUS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 44) as to the provisions of "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the payment of certain fees, purchase money, and commission paid on void entries of public lands," approved June 16, 1880, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3377) granting an increase of pension to John M. Tyree, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (S. 783) granting an increase of pension to William McGee; and

A bill (S. 4078) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Steele.

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

A bill (H. R. 5568) granting an increase of pension to Emily Chapman;

A bill (H. R. 5749) granting a pension to James B. Combs;

A bill (H. R. 6977) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Graves;

A bill (H. R. 10378) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Shell;

A bill (H. R. 9903) granting an increase of pension to George W. Harlan;

A bill (H. R. 11310) granting an increase of pension to John W. Swisher;

A bill (H. R. 9024) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Laird;

A bill (H. R. 9426) granting an increase of pension to William S. Campbell;

A bill (H. R. 7992) granting an increase of pension to Isidore F. Chamberlain;

A bill (H. R. 8231) granting an increase of pension to John Gangwisch;

A bill (H. R. 9835) granting a pension to Maggie Fitzpatrick; and

A bill (H. R. 7999) granting an increase of pension to David W. Williamson.

Mr. PATTERSON, 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. 4285) granting an increase of pension to John H. Shands;

A bill (S. 4349) granting an increase of pension to Laura Ann Seaton; and

A bill (S. 2058) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Roof.

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

A bill (H. R. 5580) granting a pension to Cel'ia C. Owen;

A bill (H. R. 6999) granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Jones;

A bill (H. R. 10180) granting an increase of pension to William E. McDowell;

A bill (H. R. 5532) granting an increase of pension to Levi Vassar;

A bill (H. R. 8173) granting an increase of pension to Anna Waters;

A bill (H. R. 8648) granting a pension to Shadrach D. Bardin;

A bill (H. R. 7236) granting an increase of pension to William R. McCullough;

A bill (H. R. 9988) granting an increase of pension to William Ellis; and

A bill (H. R. 8849) granting a pension to James S. Lauderdale.

Mr. McCUMBER (for Mr. BALL), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon:

A bill (S. 2661) granting an increase of pension to John H. Klingler; and

A bill (S. 3810) granting an increase of pension to Virginia B. Mullan.

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

A bill (H. R. 5849) granting an increase of pension to Catharine R. Brown;

A bill (H. R. 6816) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Ratzel;

A bill (H. R. 6817) granting a pension to Rosa Glass;

A bill (H. R. 6335) granting an increase of pension to James A. Barnes;

A bill (H. R. 6814) granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Miller;

A bill (H. R. 9127) granting a pension to Moses Schuman;

A bill (H. R. 11556) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Tappen;

A bill (H. R. 10648) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Shearer;

A bill (H. R. 7712) granting a pension to Emma Crosier;

A bill (H. R. 7805) granting an increase of pension to William N. Hall;

A bill (H. R. 7418) granting an increase of pension to Peter Minkler;

A bill (H. R. 8185) granting a pension to Herman Lemmerman;

A bill (H. R. 8343) granting a pension to Annie P. Erving, formerly Cilla Zerbe;

A bill (H. R. 8991) granting an increase of pension to William E. Mattison;

A bill (H. R. 8992) granting an increase of pension to William C. Davis;

A bill (H. R. 8079) granting an increase of pension to Charles La Forest;

A bill (H. R. 8863) granting an increase of pension to Edward O'Malley;

A bill (H. R. 9610) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Halling; and

A bill (H. R. 9921) granting a pension to Virginia Boyd.

Mr. DILLINGHAM, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8692) to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CULBERSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10145) to provide for appeals, writs of error, and other appellate proceedings from the circuit and district courts of Beaumont, in the eastern district of Texas, reported it without amendment.

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

A bill (H. R. 9683) granting a pension to Henry Austin;

A bill (H. R. 5868) granting an increase of pension to William Simmons; and

A bill (H. R. 10904) granting an increase of pension to Edson H. Crawford.

JOSEPH WEEMS.

Mr. CARMACK. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11021) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Weems, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph Weems, late private, Company A, First Regiment Tennessee Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LUCIUS E. POLK.

Mr. CARMACK. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8227) granting a pension to Lucius E. Polk, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lucius E. Polk, late captain Company D, Forty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and to pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

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

COURTS IN VERMONT.

Mr. HOAR. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4165) to provide that a term of the circuit and district court of the United States for the district of Vermont may be held at Newport, to report it favorably with-

out amendment. The bill simply provides for an adjournment of the circuit and district courts of the United States to Newport, Vt., in case the judges shall see fit. I understand there is ample provision there in the way of a place for holding court, and no new building is asked for. I request that the bill be put upon its passage. I call the attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] to it.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that hereafter in each year one of the stated terms of the circuit and district court of the United States for the district of Vermont may, when adjourned, be adjourned to meet at Newport.

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

COURTS IN FLORIDA.

Mr. CULBERSON. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4503) to provide for sittings of the circuit and district courts of the southern district of Florida in the city of Fernandina, in said district, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that in addition to the times and places now fixed by law for the sitting of the circuit court of the United States for the southern district of Florida there shall be a session of the circuit court in the city of Fernandina on the first Monday in April in each year hereafter; and that there shall be a regular term of the district court of the United States for the southern district of Florida in the city of Fernandina on the first Monday in April in each year hereafter.

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

PUBLIC BUILDING IN BLUEFIELD, W. VA.

Mr. SCOTT. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 752) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Bluefield, W. Va., to report it favorably with an amendment, and I submit a report thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment of the committee was, in section 1, page 1, line 10, before the word "thousand," to strike out the words "and fifty;" so as to make the section read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be erected upon the site already selected and purchased by him in the city of Bluefield, W. Va., a building to be used as and for a post-office building, as a place for holding United States courts, and for other purposes of the Federal Government at the said city of Bluefield, W. Va., which said building shall cost, complete, not to exceed the sum of \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 4642) for the relief of the trustees of the Christian Church of Pleasant Hill, Cass County, Mo.; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the affidavit of R. L. Walker, L. A. Rayborn, and Earl Parker, trustees of the Christian Church at Pleasant Hill, Cass County, Mo. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 4643) granting an increase of pension to William Weddington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PATTERSON introduced a bill (S. 4644) to strengthen and rebuild the American merchant marine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

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

A bill (S. 4645) for the relief of the heirs of J. H. Peebles, deceased (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4646) for the relief of the heirs of J. B. Clark, deceased (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4647) for the relief of Matthew Burns (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. CARMACK introduced a bill (S. 4648) granting an increase of pension to John T. Rader; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DEPEW introduced a bill (S. 4649) granting a pension to Charles K. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4650) providing for the payment to the New York Marine Repair Company, of Brooklyn, N. Y., of the cost of the repairs to the steamship *Lindesfarne*, necessitated by injuries received from being fouled by the United States Army transport *Crook* in May, 1900; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4651) for the relief of James T. Barry and Richard Cushion, executors of the last will and testament of Martin Dowling, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

A bill (S. 4652) for the relief of Dr. Joseph P. Tunis; and

A bill (S. 4653) for the relief of Joseph Miles (with an accompanying paper).

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

A bill (S. 4654) granting an increase of pension to Vial A. Putnam; and

A bill (S. 4655) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Shipp (with accompanying papers).

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I introduce by request a bill to establish a court of patent appeals, and for other purposes. I have already introduced two or three bills touching this subject. There are differences of opinion in relation to the details of such a bill, and this is a bill which is different from either of the others which I have heretofore presented. I ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Patents.

The bill (S. 4656) to establish a court of patent appeals, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a bill (S. 4657) authorizing the payment of the Choctaw and Chickasaw town-site fund; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 4658) granting an increase of pension to Lemon H. Wiley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ANKENY introduced a bill (S. 4659) relating to annual assessment labor on placer-mining claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 4660) granting an increase of pension to Nellie B. Newton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4661) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Gainesville, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. McCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 4662) granting an increase of pension to William H. Staubs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4663) granting an increase of pension to William Hall; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 4664) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of William Viers Bowic, administrator of the estate of Elijah Thompson, deceased;

A bill (S. 4665) for the relief of Catherine C. McGowan, widow and administratrix of Michael A. McGowan, deceased;

A bill (S. 4666) for the relief of Kate Kearney Henry, widow and administratrix of James L. Henry, deceased; and

A bill (S. 4667) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Reichard, deceased.

Mr. McCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 4668) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. KITTREDGE introduced a bill (S. 4669) to correct the military record of George W. Samson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4670) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Devine; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 4671) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Peter Bougie; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a bill (S. 4672) to authorize the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Connecticut River; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. TELLER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$4,000 for grading and macadamizing Twentieth street NE., from Brentwood road to Queens Chapel road, in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HEYBURN submitted an amendment providing for the construction of fully completed models of each vessel of war of the Navy which now has or may hereafter be given the name of States and cities of the United States, said models to be deposited, when bearing the name of a State, in the capitol building of said State, and, when bearing the name of a city, in the city hall of said city, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CARMACK substituted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3682) to establish four permanent military camp grounds—in the vicinity of Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; Camp Douglas, Wis.; in the Conewago Valley, Pennsylvania; and at or near Nacimiento Ranch, California, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DANIEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2263) to require the employment of vessels of the United States for public purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—WILLIAM W. ARMSTRONG.

On motion of Mr. McCOMAS, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of William W. Armstrong accompanying Senate bill 457, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, there having been no adverse report on the same.

EUREKA INSURANCE COMPANY OF PITTSBURG.

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

Resolved by the Senate, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, required to reexamine settlement No. 5000 of 1884, reported by him in Senate Executive Document No. 5, Fifty-third Congress, third session, for insurance paid by the Eureka Insurance Company, of Pittsburg, on the steamer *Champion*, payable to W. L. Jones, receiver, and to report whether the award is of the same character as those provided for in the deficiency act of March 3, 1903, together with a detailed statement of the facts.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 26th instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 3400) to amend the act entitled "An act granting a pension to Flora Stanton Kalk," approved February 25, 1899;

An act (S. 783) granting a pension to Mary D. Duval;

An act (S. 797) granting a pension to Mary H. Allen;

An act (S. 1356) granting a pension to Robert Kelly;

An act (S. 1597) granting a pension to Rosa D. Mayhew;

An act (S. 1953) granting a pension to Susan Fenno;

An act (S. 2215) granting a pension to Sallie H. Hoffecker;

An act (S. 2245) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Fritz;

An act (S. 2298) granting a pension to Patrick J. Conway;

An act (S. 2418) granting a pension to Marit Johnson;

An act (S. 2557) granting a pension to Johniken L. Mynatt;

An act (S. 2559) granting a pension to James Graham;

An act (S. 2612) granting a pension to Sarah J. Bellamy;

An act (S. 2841) granting a pension to Jane Patterson;

An act (S. 38) granting an increase of pension to Miriam R. Adams;

An act (S. 70) granting an increase of pension to John G. Brown;

An act (S. 136) granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Strickland;

An act (S. 142) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Nichols;

An act (S. 189) granting an increase of pension to Edwin H. Wheeler;

An act (S. 191) granting an increase of pension to Francis Roy;

An act (S. 265) granting an increase of pension to Frances Gray;

An act (S. 593) granting an increase of pension to William H. Horn;

An act (S. 594) granting an increase of pension to Finley T. Johnson;

An act (S. 846) granting an increase of pension to Catharine W. Collins;

An act (S. 880) granting an increase of pension to Allen W. (alias Albert) Hall;

An act (S. 889) granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Brown;
 An act (S. 891) granting an increase of pension to Erwin R. Cole;
 An act (S. 895) granting an increase of pension to Charles Disbrow;
 An act (S. 897) granting an increase of pension to Lewis D. Frogge;
 An act (S. 962) granting an increase of pension to Jennet Thoits;
 An act (S. 980) granting an increase of pension to Mary Von Kusserrow;
 An act (S. 1239) granting an increase of pension to John Adamson;
 An act (S. 1241) granting an increase of pension to Hamlet F. Roberts;
 An act (S. 1242) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Davis;
 An act (S. 1358) granting an increase of pension to William W. Lackey;
 An act (S. 1428) granting an increase of pension to George Pennington;
 An act (S. 1451) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor H. Hord;
 An act (S. 1532) granting an increase of pension to Electa Allen;
 An act (S. 1688) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Bellman;
 An act (S. 1689) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Houghton;
 An act (S. 1799) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Decker;
 An act (S. 1802) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Couch;
 An act (S. 1911) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose W. Severance.
 An act (S. 1912) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Booker;
 An act (S. 1937) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Richards;
 An act (S. 1947) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Judge;
 An act (S. 1954) granting an increase of pension to Benton D. Bitner;
 An act (S. 1956) granting an increase of pension to Seth H. Craig;
 An act (S. 2061) granting an increase of pension to William H. Barlow;
 An act (S. 2068) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Roberts;
 An act (S. 2093) granting an increase of pension to Victoria M. Steele;
 An act (S. 2103) granting an increase of pension to John L. McVey;
 An act (S. 2126) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Williams, alias Thomas W. Lennox;
 An act (S. 2128) granting an increase of pension to George A. Seebold;
 An act (S. 2217) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Riggs;
 An act (S. 2222) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Kendall;
 An act (S. 2230) granting an increase of pension to Matilda C. Lathrop;
 An act (S. 2236) granting an increase of pension to James Reed;
 An act (S. 2250) granting an increase of pension to Anna Pritchard;
 An act (S. 2373) granting an increase of pension to Charles Cummings;
 An act (S. 2374) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Moses;
 An act (S. 2392) granting an increase of pension to William W. Misner;
 An act (S. 2416) granting an increase of pension to Mary Joanna Adams;
 An act (S. 2440) granting an increase of pension to George Olsen;
 An act (S. 2441) granting an increase of pension to Frank Lee;
 An act (S. 2496) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer Wing;
 An act (S. 2509) granting an increase of pension to Abner B. Edson;
 An act (S. 2517) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Farr;
 An act (S. 2527) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Roberts;
 An act (S. 2542) granting an increase of pension to James E. Larkin;

An act (S. 2543) granting an increase of pension to Ella B. Green;
 An act (S. 2544) granting an increase of pension to Albert T. Severance;
 An act (S. 2548) granting an increase of pension to Emma McFarland;
 An act (S. 2549) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Jellison;
 An act (S. 2558) granting an increase of pension to Sallie H. Kincaid;
 An act (S. 2561) granting an increase of pension to Mathias S. Friend;
 An act (S. 2576) granting an increase of pension to James Redshaw;
 An act (S. 2577) granting an increase of pension to Albert Marshall;
 An act (S. 2642) granting an increase of pension to Leonard G. Freeman;
 An act (S. 2643) granting an increase of pension to Malinda H. Chapman;
 An act (S. 2668) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Fawcett;
 An act (S. 2689) granting an increase of pension to David M. Kanouse;
 An act (S. 2712) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Billings;
 An act (S. 2797) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Cotting;
 An act (S. 2858) granting an increase of pension to Delia B. Stuart;
 An act (S. 2889) granting an increase of pension to John Beard;
 An act (S. 2924) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Cormany;
 An act (S. 2947) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bratton;
 An act (S. 2965) granting an increase of pension to John Herzinger; and
 An act (S. 3166) granting an increase of pension to Levi B. Lewis.
 The message also announced that the President of the United States had on the 27th instant approved and signed the following acts:
 An act (S. 486) granting a pension to Green B. Yawn; and
 An act (S. 1330) granting a pension to Jerry S. Fish.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 4405) to correct the military record of Carl W. Albrecht;

A bill (H. R. 8421) for the relief of Russel A. McKinley; and
 A bill (H. R. 10761) to authorize the Secretary of War to accept from the citizens of Missoula, Mont., deeds donating to the United States certain lands for the enlargement of the military reservation of Fort Missoula, Mont.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (H. R. 2529) to set apart certain lands in the Territory of Arizona as a public park, to be known as "The Petrified Forest National Park;" and

A bill (H. R. 6787) to confirm and validate patents to certain lands situated in the Bitter Root Valley, State of Montana, above the mouth of the Lo Lo Fork of the Bitter Root River.

The bill (H. R. 6780) authorizing the Union Pioneer Mining and Trading Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Catalla Creek, in the district of Alaska, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (H. R. 1953) to provide for an additional associate justice of the supreme court of New Mexico, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

J. HUDSON KIBBE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, and calls the attention of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. The message will be read.

The message was read, and ordered to lie on the table and be printed, as follows:

To the Senate:

In compliance with the resolution of the Senate of the 26th instant (the House of Representatives concurring), I return herewith Senate bill No. 167, entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to J. Hudson Kibbe."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, February 29, 1904.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the message should be followed up by a resolution to complete the record, and I submit a resolution and ask that it be immediately considered.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the action of the President pro tempore in signing the bill (S. 187) granting an increase of pension to J. Hudson Kibbe be rescinded, and that the bill be returned to the House of Representatives with the request that similar action be taken by the House with respect to the signature of the Speaker, and that the passage of the bill be reconsidered, and that it be postponed indefinitely, the beneficiary of the same being dead.

BUILDING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate Senate bill 1508, under the special order of the Senate.

Mr. McCREARY. I ask the Senator from Indiana to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Let the special order be laid before the Senate.

Mr. McCREARY. Very well.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 1508) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building to be used for a Department of State, a Department of Justice, and a Department of Commerce and Labor.

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

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I do.

JAMES DENTON.

Mr. McCREARY. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4079) for the relief of James Denton. The bill has been favorably reported by the Committee on Claims, and its passage is recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury and by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I yield to it if it does not lead to debate.

Mr. McCREARY. It will not.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to credit James Denton, collector of internal revenue for the eighth district of Kentucky, with the sum of \$57,189.77 (loss of tax-paid spirit stamps of the amount of \$49,401, and stubs or coupons to the amount of \$7,788.77) for stamps charged to him lost in transit.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think we ought to have some explanation of the bill. It involves a very considerable amount.

Mr. McCREARY. The bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Claims after it had been referred to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue recommend the relief proposed in the bill.

The bill is for the relief of James Denton, collector of internal revenue for the eighth collection district of Kentucky, and it directs the Secretary of the Treasury to credit James Denton, collector of internal revenue for the eighth district of Kentucky, with the sum of \$57,189.77 for loss of tax-paid spirit stamps of the amount of \$49,401, and stubs or coupons to the amount of \$7,788.77 for stamps charged to him and lost in transit.

Mr. President, the stamps and coupons were stolen without the fault of the collector, and the claim for the relief is, I think, certainly just. All who understand the business of the office of the collector will know that stubs or coupons of tax-paid spirit stamps are of no value unless they have the serial number on them, which is put upon them by the collector; and, again, they are marked by the stamp deputy, so called. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in his letter to me, and also in his letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, makes the following statement:

The stamps and coupons were stolen absolutely without fault of the collector. His claim for relief is entirely just, and there is no other means of crediting his account except through the passage of the bill.

Further on, he says:

These stamps are absolutely valueless in the hands of the one who committed the theft or to anyone to whom he might transfer them.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his letter to the chairman of the Committee on Claims, says:

In reply I have to state that the bill was referred to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and herewith find his report, in which he recommends the passage of the bill with a slight amendment; and in this I concur.

Mr. GALLINGER. Did I understand the Senator to say that these stamps can not be used by the party who took them? The Senator's word is all I desire.

Mr. McCREARY. I say that, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue says it also.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think, Mr. President, the bill ought to pass, by all means.

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

COURT IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President—

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator from Indiana yield to me for a very little bill for a court in the Indian Territory?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I have no objection, if the bill does not lead to debate.

Mr. BAILEY. I feel sure it will not. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 19) establishing a United States court at Marietta, Ind. T.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

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

PETER C. ASSERSON.

Mr. NELSON. I ask the Senator from Indiana to yield to me for the consideration of a bill which will not lead to debate.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3218) for the relief of Civil Engineer P. C. Asserson, retired.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust the pay of and pay to Civil Engineer Peter C. Asserson, United States Navy, retired, the full amount of the retired pay of a rear-admiral of the nine lower numbers for the time he has been on active duty since his retirement with that rank and whenever hereafter he shall be employed on active duty.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

COURTS IN TEXAS.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] has kindly yielded to me that I may ask unanimous consent of the Senate for the consideration of a very short court bill.

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

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I yield for the reason that I understand the bill of the Senator will not lead to any debate and the Senator is obliged to leave the Chamber.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 10145) to provide for appeals, writs of error, and other appellate proceedings from the circuit and district courts of Beaumont, in the eastern district of Texas, which was reported this morning by the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

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

BUILDING FOR DEPARTMENT OF STATE, ETC.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1508) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building to be used for a Department of State, a Department of Justice, and a Department of Commerce and Labor; which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of State, the Attorney-General, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives, be, and they are hereby, created a commission, and they are hereby authorized and directed to acquire by purchase, condemnation or otherwise, all of the land in either block 167, block 168, or block 221, in the northwest section of the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, which does not belong to the United States, for a site for the erection thereon of the building hereinafter provided for. The said commission, within sixty days after the approval of this act, shall determine in writing in which of said blocks land shall be acquired for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 2. That the said commission shall purchase the land authorized in section 1 of this act as soon as practicable after having determined upon such prices as may be fixed between the commission and the respective owners, not exceeding the cash value thereof, the same to be ascertained by said commission from the testimony of real-estate experts or otherwise, as they may deem necessary, and payment therefor shall be made to the respective owners by the Secretary of the Treasury upon requisition therefor by the said commission, and upon the release and conveyance of said lands to the United States by good and sufficient deeds executed in due form of law. That if condemnation proceedings are necessary to acquire any portion of the land authorized to be acquired in this act such proceedings shall be in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890, providing a site for the enlargement of the Government Printing Office (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 26, chap. 837), and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury shall have and exercise all the powers conferred upon the Public Printer by said act.

SEC. 3. That when said commission shall have secured a conveyance to the United States of the lands authorized to be acquired in this act, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor are authorized and directed to cause to be erected upon the block in which said lands shall be acquired, a suitable building, with fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Commerce and Labor, and for other governmental pur-

poses. That the construction of said building shall be in charge of the Secretary of State, the Attorney-General, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, who are hereby authorized and directed to select and adopt plans for the said building, and to make contracts for its construction, after proper advertisements and the reception of bids; and, if they shall invite plans by competition among architects, to pay to the person submitting the two sets of plans next in order of merit to those selected such sums as, in their judgment, shall be proper compensation for their preparation. The cost of said building, exclusive of site, shall not exceed \$5,000,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee, which has been read.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, in section 1, on page 4, line 10, of the amendment, before the word "block," I move to strike out "or;" and in the same line, after the words "two hundred and twenty-one," to insert "or a suitable block south of Pennsylvania avenue."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 1, page 4, line 10, before the word "block," it is proposed to strike out "or;" and in the same line, after the words "two hundred and twenty-one," to insert "or a suitable block south of Pennsylvania avenue."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to hear the amendment which was just submitted by the Senator from Indiana again read.

Mr. GORMAN. So should I.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be again stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 1, page 4, line 10, before the word "block," it is proposed to strike out the word "or;" and in the same line, after the words "two hundred and twenty-one," to insert "or a suitable block south of Pennsylvania avenue," so that, if amended, it will read:

All of the land in either block 167, block 169, block 221, or a suitable block south of Pennsylvania avenue, in the northwest section of the city of Washington.

Mr. GALLINGER. I would suggest to the Senator to add "east of Fifteenth street," so as to read "south of Pennsylvania avenue, east of Fifteenth street." That is the section of the city we want to improve—the south side of Pennsylvania avenue. I think it had better not be left open to go west of that point.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The amendment is entirely acceptable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the words "Pennsylvania avenue" it is proposed to insert "east of Fifteenth street."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. In section 3, on page 5, line 14—

Mr. GALLINGER. Let me make a suggestion relating to this particular matter.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Very well.

Mr. GALLINGER. I call the attention of the Senator to the language in lines 14, 15, and 16, of section 1, on page 4.

The said commission, within sixty days after the approval of this act, shall determine in writing in which of said blocks land shall be acquired for the purposes of this act.

That language was correct before the Senator's present amendment. I will suggest that the word "sites" be substituted for the words "blocks land" in line 16.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 1, on page 4, line 16, after the word "said," it is proposed to strike out "blocks land" and insert "sites."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. And in line 15 the word "in" should be stricken out where it reads "in writing in which of said blocks land shall be acquired." Let the word "in," where it occurs the second time, be stricken out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "writing," in line 15, it is proposed to strike out the word "in."

Mr. FAIRBANKS. That is necessary in consequence of the amendment already made.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. In line 14, page 5, section 3, at the beginning of the line, I move to strike out the three words, "a conveyance to" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the title for;" and in the same line to strike out the word "of," after the words "United States," and insert the word "to."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, section 3, line 14, before the words "the United States," it is proposed to strike out "a conveyance to" and insert "the title for;" and after the words "United States," in the same line, to strike out "of" and insert "to."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. I offer an amendment, after the word "commission," in section 2, page 4, line 22, to strike out the words

"from the testimony of real-estate experts, or otherwise, as they may deem necessary," and insert in lieu thereof the words "from competent evidence."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, section 2, line 22, after the word "commission," it is proposed to strike out "from the testimony of real-estate experts, or otherwise, as they may deem necessary," and insert "from competent evidence."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there are several reasons for wishing this amendment. I do not think that we should place too much force in the words—

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I will say to the Senator, if he will allow me to interrupt him, that the amendment is entirely proper.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand the amendment is accepted, and yet I think there should be some reason given for the amendment, and the reason which I think should guide this commission in its labors to some extent, and that is this: Heretofore in nearly all cases of this kind the testimony mainly has been that of experts, and very little consideration has been given to the value as assessed, and but little consideration has been given to the rental value of the property.

In going over the amounts we have paid for like property it is safe to say that the same property can not be rented for any possible purpose so as to bring in an income of 1 per cent upon the value placed on it, and this value has been obtained mainly from the testimony of experts. In other words, we have, as a rule, paid from three to four times the actual cash value of the property for use in any other business.

I do hope, Mr. President, that we can find some way by which the Government will not be compelled to pay from three to five times the real value of property in order to secure property in the city of Washington on which we can place our public buildings.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator allow me before he takes his seat?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. There is great force in what the Senator says. The trouble has been that Congress has made no examination and has had no actual knowledge of what land is to cost until it is too late. There ought not to be a public building erected in Washington upon land that we have to buy until, by a commission, a preliminary examination has been made and it can be reported to Congress what the land can be bought for; so that the point so well raised by the Senator can be dealt with before we go on and commit ourselves to the erection of a public building.

It is true, as the Senator says, that we have gone on and found ourselves in the end compelled to pay extravagant sums because we have put bills through that leave no time, no chance for examination; and when we come to appropriate the money, as we do in the Committee on Appropriations, the same question is raised there that the Senator raises here, that the amount is extravagant and enormous; and the only answer is that it is too late.

Then Senators say, when the matter comes up, "Why do you not provide beforehand that before any work is done a commission shall investigate and report to Congress what certain lots can be bought for, and what other lots can be bought for." I am glad the Senator has called attention to it; because if we do not scrutinize these things carefully we are very likely to fall into all the errors we have fallen into heretofore and to pay three or four times as much as we ought to pay.

Mr. McCUMBER. We are met here, Mr. President, with a condition that must be solved at the present time. This building is absolutely necessary. The same condition would arise no matter how many commissions passed upon the facts. We are so situated that it is necessary for us to have certain property. Heretofore it has made no difference whether we have purchased property outright from the owners or whether we have condemned it. In condemnation proceedings there has been no difficulty in securing the testimony of any number of experts who will place the value of the property so much higher than the cash value for any rental purpose that we are paying the same amount whether a jury assess the damages or whether a commission determines the value of the property.

But I think in this case the proposition of the Senator from Maine has been answered, for the reason that the committee has appointed a subcommittee, who have investigated into the question of what the property can be purchased for, and I have no doubt that they have ascertained that the claim for the property is several times the real value considered in the matter of using the same property for any other possible purpose.

I merely make these suggestions for the reason that it seems to me that the Government ought to be able to secure property at its real value, instead of paying such enormous prices for it. In every State in the Union we have the same methods of condemning property, and we have never heard in those States of such exorbitant prices being paid as we are compelled to pay here. When a

commission or when a jury to assess damages passes upon the question, the evidence of the assessed valuation of that property is produced, and the evidence of its rental value for any purpose is taken into consideration, with its situation, etc. That is produced before such a jury; and upon that is determined the real price that the Government ought to pay. It seems to me that the Government ought not to be compelled to pay a price the interest on which at 6 per cent would amount to more than the rental value of the property itself.

Mr. President, I understand that there is no objection to this particular amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. In line 5, page 6, section 3, after the word "architects," I move to strike out the word "to" and insert the words I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 3, on page 6, line 5, after the word "architects," it is proposed to strike out the word "to" and insert "the successful architect shall receive compensation in full at a rate not exceeding 2½ per cent of the total cost of said building and shall also;" so that if amended it will read:

If they shall invite plans by competition among architects, the successful architect shall receive compensation in full at a rate not exceeding 2½ per cent of the total cost of said building, and shall also pay to the persons submitting the two sets of plans next in order of merit to those selected such sums as, in their judgment, shall be proper compensation for their preparation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HALE. Let that be read again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be again stated.

The Secretary again read the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, this is another instance which shows the danger of proceeding too hurriedly in these matters. We have been already caught in the provision for the buildings at Annapolis, where contracts were made at percentages with an architect, who is going to get \$400,000 out of our funds for his work, and if this bill—

Mr. FAIRBANKS rose.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator who has charge of the bill, and who is a conservative legislator, will allow me, he has provided here a bill which gives Congress no opportunity to regulate vicious practices attending the construction of public buildings.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator, as an old and experienced legislator, if the bill in this respect differs from other similar bills whose passage the Senator has secured?

Mr. HALE. That is just what I have said, Mr. President. We have learned by experience. This leaves open the same thing that we have been caught in before, and having learned by experience, we ought to apply a remedy.

I have a little instance here. We appropriated in just such a way as this bill provides for a large increase to the insane asylum across the river—St. Elizabeth's. We provided that such property should be taken; that the commission or the superintendent of the buildings should go on, just as was done at Annapolis, and make his contracts and we would appropriate the money. This is a sample of what is done under the kind of legislation we have had before.

I will say to the Senator I accept my part of the responsibility. I have been delinquent heretofore, and all of us have been. Not with my consent will we go into such an enormous project as this—for this is to be the biggest Department building that we have in Washington—until we have guarded and kept out these vicious attendants upon the construction of our public buildings.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator yields to me to modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HALE. Yes. The Senator is working in the right direction.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to modify my amendment so that it shall read:

The successful architect shall receive compensation in full for plans and superintendence—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. "And specifications."

Mr. CULLOM. Yes; "specifications" should be inserted.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then I will say "for plans, specifications, and superintendence."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be so modified.

Mr. HALE. Now, here is what took place—

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, do I

understand the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has been adopted?

Mr. HALE. I did not so understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the proposed amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is now pending.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations, in the case to which I have alluded, had a suspicion of what was going on. I had, having been caught at Annapolis, and we sent for information.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question for information?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Under whose charge was the work done at Annapolis?

Mr. HALE. The general control and overlooking of it was done by the superintendent down there. It was all done by act of Congress. We did not tie it up.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. This bill provides for a committee that can tie it up.

Mr. HALE. I want to see that the committee does tie it up. Heretofore we have lodged this discretion elsewhere, and now this is what happened in one case, as it has been developed in a little investigation. I would go further than the Senator from New Hampshire about this matter of architects and everything else in relation to it.

I inclose herewith a statement of payments made to Shepley, Ruten & Coolidge, architects, for plans and commission on extension of hospital. These payments do not include traveling expenses and fees for time lost in traveling

All of which the architects charged for. Here is a sample of what they have got out of that appropriation:

Shepley, Ruten & Coolidge, for plans, \$9,000.

The whole appropriation was something like five or six hundred thousand dollars, I think.

For plans, \$9,000.

Two and a half per cent on contract, \$13,750.

That is bad enough, but in addition, following that, is 2½ per cent on every payment that was made by appropriation from Congress. First they charged for plans, then a percentage on the contract, and then a percentage on every payment under the contract, and for what an individual could easily have had done for \$10,000 they have already received \$44,036.54.

Mr. GALLINGER. Ten per cent of the appropriation.

Mr. HALE. Yes; and they are not through by any means. They came for some additional items, and the Committee on Appropriations struck them out.

Mr. BACON. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that under the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire the compensation for the architect in this case will be \$125,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Precisely that.

Mr. HALE. That is a very large sum.

Mr. BACON. I should say so.

Mr. HALE. Now, let me say about architects, Mr. President, that all this has come in within a few years. We have a large establishment in the Treasury Department which is nothing but an architect's establishment. We have there a large force of draftsmen and everything else that is in a private architect's office, and this year we have given them additional room and are to give them additional clerks. Up to a few years ago no outside private architect was allowed to intrude himself and make these heavy charges. It was all done by the bureau which we have established for this very purpose, and they ought to do it. There is not any reason in the world why they should not, except the practice. The architect is intrusive. He says, "You can not get a good building without me." Four years ago a commission was appointed, rather unwarily, and paid out of the contingent fund, and we knew nothing about it. It had practically as its head one of these fashionable architects from New York, and they traversed Europe, broad and large, and they came in with a proposition for improving this city which involved over \$200,000,000.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is not this a part of that plan?

Mr. HALE. This bill selects certain lots that that commission provided in the residential part of the city, where the land is the highest and where the owners of the property protest against being driven off. But that is the architect's plan. The architect sees but one thing. He lives in a lofty domain. All that he considers that the Government is running for is to adopt his great projects.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is he the man who built that magnificent office for the President?

Mr. HALE. He is the man; and I never have been able to find out—

Mr. COCKRELL. That is a second-class lawyer's office all over the country, if it is as good as that.

Mr. HALE. We tried to provide in the bill so that we could have there a respectable building, and to have it built so that it could have an additional story put on it, but the architect was bent at that time. The Senator from Indiana in the last Congress, my recollection is, although we have many things on our minds from his committee, reported a project for a building on this same lot, and provided that the executive offices should be put in it. Is not that so, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. That was done, and it was done at the request of the executive department.

Mr. HALE. It was done. I do not know what the department requested. I know the President receded from that; that he did not want it.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senate was advised fully about it at the time.

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. BACON. At the request of the executive department the bill to provide for executive offices was afterwards amended by eliminating that feature, and a different provision was made by the Committee on Appropriations for the present very elaborate and commodious quarters of the executive office.

Mr. HALE. I was not finding fault with the Senator. Only it was a part of the scheme to build this enormous building.

This building, which it is said will cost \$5,000,000, will cost \$12,000,000. It will be the largest building in all Washington. It will have three Departments in it, an experiment which never has come out well.

We made the State, War, and Navy building for three Departments, and it has got so now that it has not room enough to answer to the wants of the War Department alone. I do not want myself for one to see these over-big buildings. I would rather have a good, reasonable building for the Department of Justice put in a proper place where land can be bought cheaply, but the plan of this New York architect involved all this, involved taking all these squares and certain other squares down below, and a programme was laid out looking to the expenditure of \$200,000,000.

Now, the Senator from New Hampshire is acting in the right way, but he does not go far enough.

I would have nothing done about these large buildings in a hurry. I would have a good commission appointed. I do not find fault with this commission, although most of them will be away. We have generally had a commission composed of such persons as the Architect of the Capitol, the Architect of the Treasury, and we have sometimes put on a very accomplished man, a very good business man, Mr. Bernard Green, who superintended the Library. I would have a good commission (I will not have any contest with the Senator about who shall constitute it); I would provide that the commission in the recess shall examine into whatever tracts or squares we direct them to examine and report to us at the next session of Congress, six or eight months off, which soon goes away, what the different sections and locations can be bought for by the Government, so that we may know, as the Senator from South Dakota has suggested, what we are embarking in.

Then I would also have it provided that no contract should be made with any architect until the necessity for the same was reported to Congress and the rate fixed at which the architect should be employed, because I think it will be found that the architects of the Government—these three men whom we employ—will say, "We can build that building."

There rises off the eastward here a very noble and imposing structure that pleases the eye of the citizen and the visitor and the beholder. It was built for a sum less than the limit fixed by the act, and money was turned back into the Treasury. It was built without a dollar of percentage being paid to an outside architect. But Gen. Thomas L. Casey, who was an engineer and a man of experience and good taste, conducted that whole business in addition to his offices and services as an engineer officer, and the only thing outside that we paid, where we are paying \$44,000 to an architect for this little addition to the insane asylum, was a little amount, I think, of some \$17,000 to General Casey the architect had not got in.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Maine yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator has fallen into an error in regard to that. The original architects of the Congressional Library were Smithmeyer & Pelz.

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. They made the original plans, and while General Casey departed somewhat from those plans, beyond a question, those architects were paid something, I do not know how much—the Senator from Maryland may remember—but a very considerable amount, and there is now pending a bill for additional compensation to those architects.

Mr. HALE. I was going to say, because that is a part of my statement, that when we came to build the building and erect the noble edifice and make it commodious and suitable for the public needs, we dropped every architect, and General Casey did it. If he wanted sketches and plans he paid for them, so many hundred dollars for little things at the time.

We did have an old claim that an architect set up for plans that he had made, and we paid him first, I guess, \$30,000, and then \$40,000, and then another bill which was worked through here. But when it came to the work General Casey would have nothing to do with it, and that architect was not allowed even, except so far as concerned the right of a citizen, to enter upon the premises and never had the slightest thing to do with it. General Casey went on and built this fine building, as we have always until late years built buildings, and as for one I hope we will do in the future.

We had this same kind of a question come up last year on another important matter, the building of a hall of records, and we provided in that act a clause shutting off architects and declaring that no contract should be made with any architect that runs with the building. There is where they get in their charges. They charge for the plans, and then they have a contract that runs with the building, and they charge a percentage on the contract price and then on every payment. We provided that nothing of that kind should be done until it was reported to Congress. That is what we ought to do here.

I have no feeling about the matter, but my attention has been called to it by the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from New Hampshire, and it brings up just what the situation is, and I take it before this matter passes from the Senate there will be a proposition submitted here by some Senator that we shall not hurry in this matter, but that the whole matter shall at the next session be laid before us, and we will know for what we can get lots in different places and know what propositions are made by architects, or we will find out that the architects that we have now are ample to do this work.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am in full sympathy with the general proposition advanced by the Senator from Maine, and will support him in any reasonable amendment to the bill looking to the control of the architects' fees. I have myself frequently called attention in the Senate and very many times in committee to the fact that we have a large bureau in the Treasury Department, the title of the chief being Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, and I have often wondered why it was that we did not place a man there with sufficient competency, if the present occupant does not possess it, to superintend the erection of all public buildings.

However, I rose more particularly—

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me for a question?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. Do we not intrust to him the erection of every public building in the whole United States outside of the city of Washington?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have an impression that in recent years public buildings outside of Washington are being placed at the mercy of architects who are bidding upon them, and that he is not taking charge of all the public buildings outside of the city of Washington. I think the Senator from Missouri will find that to be true if he investigates the matter.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does he not make the plans, and all that, and simply select a superintendent to attend to it at places where he can not be present?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say this to the Senator: We are going to build a little building in New Hampshire. I think the appropriation is \$90,000; possibly a little less. It is in the second largest city in my State, and is to be for post-office purposes. Recent inquiry of the Supervising Architect as to when the construction of the building was to begin revealed this fact: The bill was passed at the last session, and nothing has been done apparently except the purchase of a site. He replied to me that the plans would soon be submitted by the Boston architect, who had them in charge, and that as soon as those plans were received he would then take up the matter and push it along. So it is very evident that the plans of that little building, costing \$90,000, are in the hands of an architect in Boston, who is making those plans and receiving compensation.

Mr. HALE. While the Architect here has nominal and legal control of all buildings outside of Washington, under this practice he is giving way to outside architects?

Mr. GALLINGER. Precisely.

Mr. HALE. I think that is so.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. The statement the Senator makes is rather a remarkable one, and I should like to know the whole matter concerning it. In other words, I should like to know under what authority and how it comes that the Supervising Architect of the Treasury designates somebody in Boston to superintend a building in New Hampshire? Have you not some people in New Hampshire who are architects?

Mr. GALLINGER. He does not put the construction of the building in the hands of Boston parties, but he does put the matter of plans in the hands of at least one Boston architect. Possibly he has had competition. I do not know.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does he hire the Boston architect?

Mr. GALLINGER. I assume that somebody pays the Boston architect.

Mr. TILLMAN. I know; but under what rule of law or regulation of the Treasury Department does he pay this money in that way? If he is employed to do it here, and has all these clerks and draftsmen and other assistants to prepare plans for buildings, how does he find the money to go off to Boston and hire somebody?

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HOPKINS. My remembrance is that some years ago Congress provided by appropriate legislation that, at the instance of a Senator or Representative having the building especially in charge in his district or State, a local architect could be designated to draw the plans. I think in every instance where an outside architect has prepared plans for a public building it has been at the request of the Senator from the State or the Representative from the district wherein the building was to be constructed. I think the present architect—

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator please get that statute and let us examine it? I suppose he can find it. He knows there is some such law, but I should like to know it, because we have occasionally got a little appropriation for a public building down our way, and I am sure no local talent ever has had a chance to smell of it, much less to get any money.

Mr. GALLINGER. I would say in this connection—

Mr. HOPKINS. I will look up the statute—

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish the Senator would, and let us know.

Mr. HOPKINS. And call the Senator's attention to it.

Mr. DRYDEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. GALLINGER. With pleasure.

Mr. DRYDEN. Is the Senator through?

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not through, but I will yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. DRYDEN. I will wait until the Senator from New Hampshire gets through.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in response to the suggestion made by the Senator from Illinois, I will say to him that the public building at Nashua, N. H., is one of my pets, and I never have been consulted as to the matter of the architect who is to be employed. Had I been, if it was to be taken out of the hands of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, I certainly would have designated an architect in New Hampshire, because we have very competent ones.

Mr. TILLMAN. It seems to me the Senator from Massachusetts ought to make an explanation as to how this Boston man got that job.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senator from Illinois is entirely correct. Some years ago there was a bill passed known as the Tarsney Act—I am not able to put my hands on it at this moment—under which it was made competent for the Secretary of the Treasury to submit to competition among architects the preparation of plans for public buildings. It is within his discretion. The Representatives from different districts in which buildings are to be built, or the Senators from the different States, have from time to time asked the Treasury Department to have plans prepared for their respective buildings under the Tarsney Act, taking it out of the direct control of the Supervising Architect.

That law was passed, if the Senator will indulge me a moment further—

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Because there was some dissatisfaction with the character of the work which was being done in the Treasury Department. I will say further that the Treasury Department has been very free in acting under the Tarsney Act where Senators or Representatives have requested it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, undoubtedly this official

has gone beyond that, because I am entirely positive that no representative in either branch of Congress has made any request in regard to the New Hampshire building to which I have called attention.

I rose more particularly, Mr. President, to say a word concerning the Congressional Library and a few words on the general proposition. General Casey was one of the most competent men who has ever been in the employ of the Government, but he was an engineer and not an architect, and it is unfair to the very distinguished firm of architects who made those original plans to say that they were of no account and that an engineer went in and constructed the building on plans of his own. That is not correct. The plans of Smithmeyer & Pelz were adopted to a very large extent, and General Casey made such changes in them as he thought wise, and beyond a question he did improve upon them in the construction of the building.

In reference to the general proposition, Mr. President, my sole purpose is to keep this matter, to some extent, in the control of Congress. If this proposed building costs \$5,000,000, and that certainly is the minimum cost, and if the architects get 2½ per cent for plans and specifications and supervision, they will get \$125,000; and it does seem to me that that is a very large rate of compensation.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me for a question?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Suppose in a building of this importance it is necessary or proper to get more than one architect to furnish plans and specifications for a beautiful building, such as we would take pride in and such as we ought to have in this city. Assuming that to be the fact, is there not proper force in the Treasury Department, and can not the Supervising Architect in the Treasury Department take charge of the construction of the building? Is it necessary to pay 2½ per cent or any per cent to any architect who furnishes the plans? I understand the architect will get his pay for his plans to a sufficient amount. Is it necessary, therefore, for us to employ this same architect or any outside architect to supervise the construction of the building?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as Kipling says, "that is another story." The architect always does have some degree of supervision. That is true of every small building in the country. The Supervising Architect of the Treasury will appoint a man who will have direct supervision, and he will be responsible for the construction of the building. Outside of Washington that man is always appointed in the city where the building is being constructed.

I think it will do no harm to insert the word "supervision" in this amendment. Two and a half per cent is the rate that is allowed ordinarily to architects. Of course if we can dispense with architects entirely in the construction of this building and all other buildings and put these matters in the hands of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, it is entirely agreeable to me, and I think that is the way we ought to do it, provided we have men of sufficient competency to do the work that is required.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me again?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the architect is to receive 2½ per cent upon the cost of the building, is that not paying him a premium to make the building cost as much as possible? It has been intimated here that this building will cost us \$12,000,000 before we get through with it. Therefore the architect will receive double the amount, or a quarter of a million dollars, for his services in supervising the building alone. Is not that an exorbitant price?

Mr. GALLINGER. I take it that the character of the building will be in the hands of the commission.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Right here, will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. There is no authority, so far as the record is concerned, for the statement of the Senator from Maine that it will cost \$12,000,000. I call the attention of my honorable colleague upon the committee to the fact that the evidence before the committee was that it would cost from five to six million dollars.

Mr. BACON. I desire to say to the Senator from Indiana that we on this side could not hear what he said, but that the records show that the present State, War, and Navy building cost over \$16,000,000—\$16,500,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator from Georgia, the attention of the Senator from Indiana being diverted for the moment, that the Senator from Indiana stated that the expectation is that this building will cost from five to six million dollars.

Mr. BACON. Yes; I do not know what the history of the State, War, and Navy building was in that regard, but the possibility is that the anticipation was that it would not exceed that amount.

But it in fact cost \$16,500,000. I understand this building which is proposed to be erected will be a building equal in size to that building.

Mr. HALE. It will be much larger.

Mr. BACON. Larger.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senator from Georgia is in error in his information about the State, War, and Navy building. It cost \$10,038,432.

Mr. BACON. I do not know from what source the information was obtained, but it has been reported to me by one who appears to have made an examination that the total cost of that building to the Government of the United States was \$16,500,000, which may include some items not embraced in the statement made by the Senator from Indiana. It may have something to do with some other expenses.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The reports of the Government, which are accessible to the Senator, give the amount at the figure I have quoted.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I merely wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire, although perhaps he has it there already—

Mr. GALLINGER. I have the act.

Mr. LODGE. That the act approved February 20, 1893, provides for the competition of five architects.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have the act before me, and inasmuch as I raised this question I think I will read the act and let it go into the RECORD.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes; read the whole of it.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is as follows:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion to obtain plans, drawings, and specifications for the erection of public buildings for the United States, authorized by Congress to be erected under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and the local supervision of the construction thereof by competition among architects under such conditions as he may prescribe and to make payment for the services of the architect whose plan may be selected out of the appropriations for the respective buildings: *Provided*, That not less than five architects shall be invited by the said Secretary to compete for the furnishing of such plans and specifications and the supervision of such construction: *And provided further*, That the general supervision of the work shall continue in the office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, the Supervising Architect to be the representative of the Government in all matters connected with the erection and completion of such buildings, the receipt of proposals, the award of contracts therefor, and the disbursement of moneys thereunder, and perform all the duties that now pertain to his office, except the preparation of drawings and specifications for such buildings and the local supervision of the construction thereof, the said drawings and specifications, however, to be subject at all times to modification and change relating to plan or arrangement of building and selection of material therefor as may be directed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

That act was approved February 20, 1893.

Now, Mr. President, I have only a single word further to say in this connection. I think we ought not to be in great haste to make provision for this very costly building; and I think we ought to pause before we determine to place it especially upon those squares opposite the White House. I am very much impressed with the view which has been agitated in Congress and out of Congress, that we ought, in placing our public buildings, to put them on the south side of Pennsylvania avenue, between Fifteenth street and the Botanical Gardens, and get rid of that unsightly portion of our city, erecting a succession of public buildings upon the south side of that avenue as the necessities of the Government may require.

I have hoped that that might be done, and I wish very much indeed that the Senator from Indiana could see the propriety of eliminating from the bill all provisions relating to the site and providing specifically that this building shall be put on the south side of the avenue. I know that the Park Commission suggested in their report that those blocks around that beautiful square might be utilized for the purpose of public buildings, but already there are fine and costly buildings there, private residences. Some of the people occupying them are entering earnest protests against being deprived of their homes, and I sympathize with them. One of them is connected with people in my own State, a woman, who feels that she can not give up her home, and yet she will have to do so if this building is authorized to be placed on that site. That is all I care to say on that point now.

As to the matter of the architects, my only desire is that if we have that provision in the bill we shall limit it in some way. I became familiar with the instance the Senator from Maine has cited in looking over the construction of the buildings for the St. Elizabeth Asylum, finding, out of an appropriation of between \$500,000 and \$600,000, that \$47,000 had been paid to architects; and they are a very common kind of buildings at that. There is not an architect in a town of 15,000 people in this country who could not have made the plans for those buildings. It did not require any great skill, and yet we paid out 8 per cent of the entire

appropriation to architects to construct those buildings for the insane wards of the Government.

I simply want to in some way limit this matter so that if we do make an appropriation of \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 for this magnificent structure, wherever it may be located, we may not have to pay half a million dollars of that amount to the architects who will make the plans.

Mr. President, I do not want to detain the Senate; and that is all I care to say at present on this question.

Mr. DRYDEN. Mr. President, on the proposition which has been made here to postpone the erection of these buildings I have nothing to say. I do not know anything about the matter as to whether the committee have matured their plans so that they are ready to begin the preliminary work or not. I assume, of course, that they are or they would not have reported this bill.

But upon the question of architects' fees I should like to say that in my judgment that would begin the work of economy at the wrong end. You can not secure the services of any competent experienced architect with an organization at his command sufficient to do a work of this magnitude at any such percentage.

I suppose it will be readily conceded that private enterprises—buildings which are erected by individuals and corporations—in point of economy, in point of usefulness, in point of attractiveness, and as to their working qualities and facilities, far exceed those erected by the Government.

In my judgment, the Government, in the erection of these proposed buildings, should proceed along precisely the same lines that individuals and corporations proceed on in the construction of great buildings in the large cities. You can not secure the services, as I have stated, of a competent architect with a well-organized office at less than 5 per cent. You can get men who will say, "We will act as architects for 2½ per cent," or 2 per cent.

Mr. HALE. My attention was diverted there. From what I did hear I think the Senator is right about it. But did he say that we can not get an architect for 2½ per cent?

Mr. DRYDEN. I say we can not get competent architects with sufficient office organization to carry on a work of this kind for less than 5 per cent.

Mr. HALE. Yes, I have no doubt the architects would claim that.

Mr. DRYDEN. I have had a good deal of experience in that line.

Mr. HALE. I have no doubt the Senator is right about it. The architects claim that, and they have a right to ask what they please in private matters. For buildings that are going up in the Senator's State, in New York, or elsewhere they have a right to ask what they please and to make their own trade. But here we are dealing with a public building in Washington.

Mr. DRYDEN. But the question is whether you can get an architect with sufficient ability to undertake the designing and the erection of a great building of this kind at the percentage proposed in the bill. I say that private individuals can not do it.

Mr. LODGE. The Government can.

Mr. DRYDEN. You can get architects, but not architects with the equipment behind them, with the experience requisite to put up buildings of this kind.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, I venture to say that we can get the best architects in this country, the very best that anybody can name, to erect a great monumental building like this for the Government at this great expenditure for 2½ per cent. I have not the slightest doubt of it.

Mr. DRYDEN. I differ with the Senator from Massachusetts in that opinion.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If the Senator will allow me, in support of the Senator's argument, I wish to have read a letter from the Supervising Architect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. DRYDEN. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 9, 1904.

HON. CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS,
United States Senate.

SIR: Pursuing the subject discussed at our recent interview, I have now the honor to state the points with regard to which you desire information: The compensation paid by the Department to private architects selected by competition is 5 per cent upon the cost of the work executed from their drawings and specifications for full professional services, including the supervision of the work of construction. This fee (5 per cent) is that fixed by the American Institute of Architects, and is the standard fee charged by architects in good standing throughout this and foreign countries.

The service rendered to the Government by the architect selected under competition, in consideration of this fee (5 per cent), is the same service which he would render for the same fee to clients in his private practice.

It should be noted here, however, that the architect so employed by the Government is burdened with a considerable amount of clerical work and correspondence with the Department which does not devolve upon him in

private practice. This grows out of the fact that the expenditures, being of public funds, must be made under the requirements of law and of the Department regulations. So far, then, the Government employment is not so profitable to the architect as his private practice.

I think that there is in the public mind a prevailing misconception as to the proportion of profit realized by architects who have charge of public buildings at the above-mentioned percentage. Modern methods of construction and the introduction of complicated heating and mechanical appliances and electric equipment now compel the employment by architects of specialists in the several branches. The cost of these drawings and specifications is usually not less than 2½ per cent on the cost of the special work. This expense falls upon the architect, whether he has the drawings prepared on a percentage or whether he conducts work on such a scale that he can employ regularly such specialists in his own office.

In my opinion in a large city office, counting the cost of rent, the hire of clerks and typewriters, and of the outside men who look after superintendence, the proportion of the 5 per cent which remains to the architect as a profit when business is good would not usually be more than 2 per cent.

The business of the architect is subject to the same fluctuations with all other business, and his profits in good years must go in some measure to make up the losses of bad years.

Respectfully,

J. K. TAYLOR, *Supervising Architect.*

Mr. DRYDEN. That letter, which seems to speak with authority, only confirms the statement I have made, which was based upon my own knowledge in such cases. I know from practical experience (and I have dealt with the largest and most important architects in this country) that no great architect will take a fee of less than 5 per cent. That is fixed, as the letter states, by the American Institute of Architects, and they are bound by that rate and will not accept any less commission.

It has been said, "Why the fee upon this building would amount to \$125,000." Why? Because of the enormous structure, the magnitude of the undertaking. But \$125,000 is no temptation to an architect who has got to do \$200,000 worth of work.

My contention about the fee of the architect is that the most wasteful, the most extravagant thing that can be done in connection with erecting a great building of this kind is to employ a cheap architect. Every man who has had experience knows that an architect with an organization skillful in drawing plans, skillful in preparing specifications, skillful in laying the project before the contractors for bids, can make a vast difference in the result as to the cost.

I say here now that as between a poor architect, who does not know how to draw his specifications properly, and a skillful and experienced architect, who does know how to do that thing, if you were to put this structure out to contractors for bids, the difference would amount to probably more than a million dollars.

Every man who has had much experience knows that it is of the first importance that the architect should know how to draw his specifications; and having drawn his specifications and the construction of the building having been gotten under way, it is next of the first importance that his drawings should be perfected so that when his iron beams, steel columns, etc., come to the ground to be put into place they will fit in their places. Now, a young, inexperienced, incompetent architect, who would take this job gladly for 2½ per cent, or 2 per cent, or 1½ per cent, can not do that. He has not the facilities, he has not the organization, he has not the experience.

In my opinion the place to begin to economize is not with the architect. You want the best possible talent that you can get for that purpose, and to get it you must pay the fixed scale—5 per cent.

I should like, if it is in order, to propose an amendment to the amendment. I should like to see it amended so as to provide that the fee to the architect should not exceed 5 per cent. Some of our friends here think we can get the great architects to do this at a less fee. Private individuals can not do it, and I think that they look after business with as much care at least as the Government.

Now, let us see if we can get the great architects of the country to lend their talent to this work. I think the provisions of the law, as read by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], are wise in that they provide for competition by not less than five architects to be selected. Those architects should be paid for their preliminary plans or proposed plans, so as to make an inducement for them to enter the competition. The comparatively small sums that the Government will pay for the architects' fees is not to be thought of or talked about at all, in my judgment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, just one word in addition. I do not at all agree with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN] that it is necessary to pay 5 per cent, and if his proposed amendment should be adopted that we shall pay not exceeding 5 per cent, we will pay 5 per cent. There is no doubt about that.

I wish to call attention to the fact that if this building costs \$5,000,000, at 2½ per cent we will pay \$125,000 to the architects. Then there is a further provision that we shall pay to the persons—it is "person" in the bill; it ought to be plural—that we shall pay to the persons "submitting the two sets of plans next in order of merit to those selected such sums as, in their judgment," that

is, in the judgment of the committee, "shall be proper compensation for their preparation." I do not know how much that will be, probably \$25,000, or \$30,000, or \$40,000, or \$50,000.

Mr. DRYDEN. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. DRYDEN. The Senator, of course, recognizes that the question of the gross amount which the architect will receive will weigh only in consideration of the amount of work that he has to do. If he has to do \$200,000 worth of work, a gross fee of \$125,000 is no temptation to the architect.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course; we all admit that. But I do not believe there is any danger of the architect doing \$200,000 worth of work in making plans for this building.

Mr. President, we reconstructed the White House a year or two ago, and one of these very distinguished architects had charge of it. I do not know how much it cost. I think it perhaps has never been stated; but it cost a very large amount. If there is no architect in New Hampshire who can do that work just as well for a much less amount, then I miss my guess.

Mr. COCKRELL. Do you think you have an architect in New Hampshire who could equal the building for the President?

Mr. GALLINGER. I perhaps might draw the line at that; but that building was constructed under the supervision of a distinguished architect.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. One of the men the Senator from New Jersey has reference to, who has this great outfit and who is in this combine, whereby they are going, I suppose, to hold up private individuals as well as the Government to 5 per cent. He has come here and he has done that job. He reconstructed the White House, and spoiled some of it. He built an office for the President of the United States, and as the Senator from Missouri suggests, any second-rate lawyer or third-rate doctor in the country could reasonably ask for just as good accommodations. It is an eyesore. Any man who may go down the Avenue and look at that excrescence which has been added to the White House by this very distinguished architectural firm will wish that some architect of some country town in Missouri or New Hampshire had been employed to do the job.

Now, Mr. President, I am not at war with these gentlemen. They are going to get all the money they can; there is no doubt about that. If we give them 2½ per cent and then compensate the two next architects in order, we will get rid of \$175,000 out of this appropriation.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does the Senator give his consent and will he vote to give these additional architects any compensation? If we are going to have competition in this matter, and the longest pole shall get the persimmon—in other words, if the brightest brains and ability as an architect shall secure employment for this purpose—why should the fellow who loses get anything?

Mr. GALLINGER. That question would of course be properly before the Senate if the Senator should move to strike out that provision from the bill.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the Senator will permit an interruption, let me say to the Senator from South Carolina that there is an immense amount of work involved in drawing up these competitive plans, and not only—

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not objecting to competitive plans.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Not only is there a large amount of work involved, but every architect who draws up a competitive plan has to pay out a very large sum of money to subordinates, to artists, to draftsmen, to designers, etc., for the purpose of presenting a proper plan. The Senator, I imagine, has very little conception of the amount of labor that is expended. I have often been told by able and conscientious architects that they have been prevented from going into these competitions by a knowledge of the fact that they would be obliged to expend from five thousand to ten thousand dollars out of their own pockets in the payment of employees in the preparation of competitive plans which after all might fail of success.

It does seem to me, if the Senator will permit me, it is desirable that we should get the very best plans, and that in a matter involving an expenditure of \$5,000,000 the extra expense of ten, fifteen, twenty-five, one hundred, one hundred and fifty, or two hundred thousand dollars in securing the best plans and the best art is not to be considered.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me—

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I agree with the Senator entirely in the view that we ought to have the very best plans we can get. We do not want any more abominations, if I may use the term, such as the executive offices and the Post-Office building up the street here. If I am any judge of a building, that is an abortion in architecture. If we are going to have something else opposite the State, War, and Navy building, I think we had better go slowly.

While I am willing to appropriate \$100,000 or \$150,000 or \$200,000 in a lump sum for the preparation of plans and specifications and supervision and for division among competing architects upon some agreed programme, I do not believe that we ought to go into the business of donating to somebody \$5,000, \$10,000, or \$20,000 because he sees fit to come into the competition. I do not think that is a good business proposition.

You might say give \$150,000 for the preparation of the plans to the man who wins; you might say give \$10,000 to the next man whose plan was second in the estimation of the commission, and \$5,000 for the third; but I do not want to leave it in the power of any commission, however high it may be, to pick out some favorite somewhere in this competition and make a contribution to his finances ad limitum.

Mr. DRYDEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. DRYDEN. I should like to explain to the Senator from South Carolina the usual course in cases of competition. A certain number of architects are selected and invited to submit competitive plans, generally upon the condition that if one plan is accepted the architect whose plan is accepted shall receive the appointment as architect to prepare the plans and specifications and supervise the construction of the work.

The compensation of the other architects who are unsuccessful in the competition is an amount agreed upon, some small sum—perhaps \$1,000 each, or something like that—simply enough to pay them for their actual expenses and outlay in preparing the drawings which they submit. They receive no percentage; they have no interest in the building whatever after the appointment has been made of one of the architects.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to ask him if he is not rather giving his argument away when he says that there is a large expense connected with the preparation of these plans and we ought to allow 5 per cent, and now says that we will give to the second and third competitors a thousand or two thousand dollars to reimburse them?

Mr. DRYDEN. Not by any means; and I think I can make that clear to my friend from New Hampshire. The preliminary plans or drawings submitted by the architect for decision are simply an exhibition of the exterior of the building, of the sides. He submits a style of architecture which he recommends. To do that is comparatively an inexpensive and trifling matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. But then he will likewise submit a plan for the interior of the building.

Mr. DRYDEN. By no means.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, I know that in some instances that is the case. I am not guessing.

Mr. DRYDEN. That might be done, of course, by agreement, and of course that would involve a further expense; but that was not within my contemplation in the statement which I made a moment ago.

Now, just one word more, if my friend will pardon me.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. DRYDEN. The addition to the White House has been criticised. I am not going to defend it, but it is only fair to say that the architects who put on that addition have done some of the most beautiful architectural work in the world. I make no exception, and I realize the breadth and force of the statement when I say "the world." An architect is often at a disadvantage, and his work is sometimes a reflection upon himself because he is cramped, restricted, dictated to, by his employer and he does not have his own way.

I do not know who decided upon the plans for the addition to the White House. I know that I do not like them. But in my judgment that does not militate one iota against the claim I am making here, that the Government in the prosecution of these great enterprises ought to select the best talent in the land and the best talent is the cheapest.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as the ground has been pretty well traversed, I do not know that I want to add anything further. Yet I will venture to say just this, that I hope the time is not far distant when the office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department will be made sufficiently competent to take

charge of all our public buildings and not put us at the mercy of private architectural firms.

I venture to say that there is not a handsomer public building in this country than the building in the little city in which I live. It cost only \$200,000, but it is beautiful. It is admired by every visitor to that city. It was constructed directly under the supervision and upon plans made in the office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department. We then had a very competent Supervising Architect.

I trust the present Supervising Architect is equally as competent. He was selected upon a civil-service examination, which to my mind is an utter absurdity. As to his competency I will not speak; I know nothing about it; but I do know that under the present arrangement we are having substantially all our public buildings constructed upon plans made by private architects, and I do not think it ought to be so.

Whether that office is sufficiently equipped to take charge of this building or not I am unable to say, but I will repeat that in my opinion it is an extravagant waste of public money for us to vote a larger appropriation to the firm of architects who may get this contract than the amount I have named in my amendment, which I trust may be adopted.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I think a different rule might well apply, and ought to apply, to a building of this kind from that which applies in the case of any private structure. This is a building that will occupy several years in its construction. The ordinary fee of architects, as has been stated in the letter of the Supervising Architect, is 5 per cent for the plans and for supervision. The Government will require but very little in the way of supervision, because we shall have a superintendent of construction, who will be himself a skilled architect and engineer. Take the buildings which have been recently constructed—the building for the Library of Congress, for instance, of which Mr. Green was the superintendent, and the Printing Office building, where Captain Sewall, of the Engineer Corps of the Army, was superintendent, and I have understood from Senators who have visited that building that it was admirably constructed.

Under the rule which we shall adopt of having a skilled superintendent there will be very little need of an architect in the way of supervision. Architects have this arrangement, as I know: They charge a certain fee for the plans, which is much less than the full fee of 5 per cent, then they make an arrangement by which they can be consulted occasionally; and all we shall need with an architect in the construction of a building of this kind will be the preparation of plans and such a supervision as we should doubtless have under such a man as either one of the two men I have named, Mr. Green or Captain Sewall, who have a very superior knowledge of material. They are expert judges of every item of material which goes into a building; they are entirely familiar with plans, and would carry out the minutest details without needing to go to an architect. I think the quotation of the rule has not any great bearing upon this case.

In regard to what the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] said about the recent construction of public buildings, that arrangement was perhaps wisely adopted by Congress, and I think one reason given for it was that when all the public buildings were planned by one architect we fell into a rut of uniformity in architecture. That argument was made I know, and many buildings were cited as illustrations of it. Then the particular fad of the Supervising Architect was mansard roofs, and we had no public building in the country without a mansard roof on it.

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

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

Mr. PROCTOR. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator think that there is a finer or a more pleasing structure in Washington—one that gratifies good taste, that gratifies the eye in every particular—than the Treasury Department building? That was built before the day of the intrusion of the professional architect.

Mr. GALLINGER. And so was the Patent Office.

Mr. HALE. The Patent Office, as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] suggests, was also built before that time. Visitors in Washington pause before that building and look with satisfaction and pleasure upon its symmetrical proportions.

Mr. GALLINGER. And there was the old Smithsonian Institution building, which was another instance.

Mr. HALE. Yes; and there are others; but I refer to the Patent Office especially. That was built before the 5-per cent architect invaded this domain. We had good engineer officers. We had men that were competent, like Captain Sewall, to whom the Senator from Vermont has referred, and also General Casey, to erect those buildings.

The Senator from New Hampshire has called my attention to the old Smithsonian building, one, certainly, that is the very

finest of our public buildings. The White House itself, as it stood before there was put up the little shanty which this architect has built for the accommodation of the Presidential business, was a most pleasing edifice. The time will come pretty soon—I would be in favor of it now, but I do not want to move it on the pending bill—to repeal that provision which lets in these architects. It was enacted unadvisedly. Very few Senators or Members of the House realized what it was, but it grew out of the impertunity of the architects. We would be better off without it, but I will not embarrass the Senator's bill by moving that amendment at this time. Some day, however, we ought to wipe it out.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the Senator from Maine in regard to the character of the buildings that he has cited. We had not then arrived at that point of perfection where we could improve upon the classic style of the ancients, and I do not think we have yet arrived at it.

Mr. HALE. What led me to say what I did say so inadequately was the suggestion of the Senator that, while this was done under authority of the Government and we had the help of outside architects, we were falling into a sameness and an uninteresting period of architecture. But what I called his attention to was these buildings which, I am sure, do not lie open to criticism on the part of the Senator, and which he would not visit upon them. They are very graceful and very complete and are fine specimens of architecture, each of its own kind.

Mr. PROCTOR. If the Senator will allow me, I was referring to a later period, since we have had a Supervising Architect, who had charge for so many years of the planning of the public buildings. I quite agree with the Senator in what he says as to the buildings to which he has referred. We then had no such plan. I do not believe now in going back to the system of having one architect plan all of the public buildings. That was not the system which prevailed when the buildings to which the Senator refers were erected. Under our present arrangement it would be plainly impossible for the Supervising Architect's Office to make all the plans, and therefore some other arrangement must be made, unless we continue to employ outside architects.

There are, I think, with our liberal appropriations, a very large number of public buildings under construction, and it would be entirely beyond the power of any one architect to take proper charge of the plans for all of them. There would be danger that he would imitate himself in one building after another and that the style would be too uniform.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I quite sympathize with any effort which tends to secure economy of expenditure in any Government improvement, provided the efficiency of that expenditure is not impaired.

Years ago I used to have the same views regarding architects which seem to be entertained by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]; but after some years of experience in connection with building upon a large scale, matters in which I was personally interested, and matters in which corporations in which I was interested were engaged, I have come to the conclusion that there is no body of men in the United States more maligned than the architects of the United States—not intentionally, but simply because of unfamiliarity with the subject.

With reference to the compensation that is to be paid to these architects, I understand that such compensation is fixed by the rule of the Association of Architects. Their charge, I believe, is 1 per cent for preliminary drawings, 3½ per cent for plans without supervision, and 5 per cent for plans with supervision. That is the rule of all the architects of the United States, as I understand it. So, when you fix a less compensation in the bill, you necessarily exclude, it seems to me, from its operation these educated and trained men who belong to this association.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator mean to say that all the architects in the United States are in that trust?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I believe that every architect of good standing in the United States belongs to these architectural associations; that they are all in some measure allied to the National Institute of Architecture; and that the purpose of that organization is not spoliation or monopoly, but simply to advance art itself by securing able, competent, skilled, and trained men for this profession.

Mr. GALLINGER. To promote art itself, and at the same time increase their bank account. Is that the object?

Mr. NEWLANDS. As to bank accounts, I have never known an architect within my experience who has reached large fortune. I have always found that the great architects are much more interested in the perfection of their work than they are in the amount which they receive. I am sure that some of the greatest of our architects who have engaged in great works, involving very large expenditure of money, have paid out in the elaboration of their plans almost all they have received.

I had occasion the other day to go to New York—

Mr. HOAR. With the permission of the Senator, I wish to ask him if he thinks that the association of architects is any more of a trust or any different from the law or the bar associations or the medical associations?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I imagine not.

Mr. HOAR. Or other professional association?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Of course not.

Mr. HOAR. I do not suppose my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] meant to say that architects in general were engaged in association for any unworthy purpose.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I did not. But I think the Senator will permit me to say, as we hear a great deal in debate in these modern times about combinations and trusts, and a good deal of denunciatory talk, that I do not see any difference between a combination in a commercial or a manufacturing sense and a combination of architects to hold up to their terms the men who are constructing buildings. I use the word "trust" advisedly, for I think it is as much a trust as anything else that can be imagined. That is my judgment.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I do not care to be diverted from the present trend of my views by a discussion of the trust question. I assume that this association of architects resembles the bar associations, the associations of medical men, and other associations which are intended to advance the efficiency of certain professions. I am sure that any reasonable rule laid down by these professions regarding the nature and compensation of their services ought not to be regarded as assuming the aspect of a trust or a monopoly.

I was saying that if it be the fact that all of the eminent architects of the country belong to this association, and if we fix a compensation below that provided by their rules, we necessarily eliminate them from the competition and submit this whole matter to men who, as a rule, are inferior.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, supposing that the association next week should conclude that 10 per cent was the right thing, ought we to continue this system and pay that sum?

Mr. NEWLANDS. There is an unreasonable exaction and a reasonable charge.

Mr. GALLINGER. Unquestionably.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I propose in a moment to get to the question of the reasonableness of the charge.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope the Senator will; for I am very much afraid that as to the next public building we construct we shall be called upon to pay 7½ or 10 per cent. There is no logic against it. All the association has got to do is to so resolve, and we are at their mercy.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The present rates have existed for years, and there has been no protest on the part of private builders.

So far as I am concerned, with a large experience in these matters, I have to say that every architect with whom I have had any connection has fully earned his money, whether the enterprise in which he was engaged was a small one or a large one. I assume, Mr. President, that the great corporations that are engaged in putting up large and expensive buildings, far surpassing in expense and in beauty most of our public buildings, and the great men of wealth who are engaged in putting up large and expensive buildings in our great cities, would not be likely to submit to an exaction, and yet they all pay these rates.

We have an improvement contemplated in Washington, the construction of a great station building which has been provided for by Congress, a structure to be put up by the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad companies, at a cost exceeding \$3,000,000, I believe. What do those corporations do? They go to one of the best architects in the country, Mr. Burnham, of Chicago—not, perhaps, so strong in his artistic sense as some of the other architects of the country, but uniting with artistic sense the highest business capacity, the qualities of an engineer, of a constructor, and of a financier.

We had an instance of the work of that great architect in the Chicago Exposition, which opened the eyes of the world to the possibilities of American architecture, advanced by the very architects belonging to this association, graduates of the art schools of this country, graduates of the art schools of Paris, men who had spent years and large amounts of money in their training. It is these men of whom the Senator from New Hampshire complains.

I will warrant that the railroad companies do not haggle with Mr. Burnham regarding his commission. I will warrant that they pay him the percentage provided for by the rules of the association to which he belongs.

So it was when Boston was about to construct its public library, one of the most beautiful buildings in the United States, constructed at a cost of only \$1,000,000, I believe, but yet in the expenditure representing more in the way of art than any other

building in the United States. That building was constructed by Mr. McKim, the architect of the White House, who is now the object of criticism. Did the city of Boston haggle with Mr. McKim then as to the compensation he received? I will warrant they paid him the 5 per cent provided for by the rules of this association.

Some time ago I was in New York, and I went into the office of Carrere & Hastings, noted architects of this country, standing upon an equality with the firm of McKim, Mead & White, of New York, the architects who laid out the great Buffalo Exposition, which certainly was a thing of beauty. Carrere & Hastings had undertaken the construction of the great public library in New York, and I found them occupying two buildings with an army of men engaged in the work of designing that one building.

I imagine that the mere compensation which they receive counts nothing with those men as compared with the excellence of the work which they propose to do. I will warrant that they will spend every cent of their compensation, if it is necessary, in securing the best talent in the way of designers, in the way of constructors, in the way of engineers, and in the way of artists that may be necessary for the completion of that great work.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. NEWLANDS. So far as wealth is concerned—I beg the Senator's pardon; I yield to him.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator says that all the competent architects in the country are in this association; that outside of this association no good work can be secured. Now, if that be so, the architect who made the plans for the addition to the St. Elizabeth's Asylum belongs to this association, and yet he has received 8 per cent on the amount appropriated by Congress—\$48,000 or \$44,000, I have forgotten which—on an expenditure of a little over \$500,000.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will say that the charge of architects—

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Nevada—

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that under the rules of the association the charge of architects for alterations and improvements of an existing building is 10 per cent.

Mr. GALLINGER. But these were new buildings.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is much harder to change a building already existing than to plan one anew.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that these were new buildings of very common character—common brick buildings—and yet we have paid the architect for those buildings—and if the Senator will cross the river he will see them as he goes over—8 per cent, I think, and there is still a bill pending. We should limit in some way the compensation of these gentlemen, accomplished as they are. I quite agree with the Senator in his tribute to them. They believe in high art, and give us a little too much of it. That is the trouble with many of our buildings; they are too elegant for public use, in my judgment. But, if the Senator will go over to St. Elizabeth's Asylum he will see a very common set of brick buildings that these distinguished architects are responsible for, so far as the plans are concerned, and we paid out 8 per cent for them. Does the Senator want this bill left open so that when we have expended \$500,000, these gentlemen will get \$40,000 of that sum, and a like proportion on any additional sum expended? Does he not think we ought to limit it in some way?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will say to the Senator that I know nothing of the improvement to which he refers. I have not seen the building, and so I am unable to form a judgment. I certainly do not want to see inferior work, and I do not want to see extravagant compensation for it.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Under the bill the responsibility of contracting with the architects will rest upon three Cabinet officers—the Secretary of State, the Attorney-General, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor; and I ask the Senator if we may not all repose confidence in that commission? Is there anyone here who has any suspicion whatever that those three Cabinet officers, constituting the commission of construction, will be derelict in performing their duty?

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I will answer that by saying that I do not think they will pay any attention to it at all. That is my judgment.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I assume, Mr. President, that there must be some executive body to attend to this thing. I believe the matter of an agreement for the compensation for the architect's fees is an executive matter; and, whilst I recognize the right of Congress to limit the compensation which can be paid, I only oppose that kind of a limitation which, in my judgment, will prevent efficient service and prevent the securing of the proper talent for this work. I take it for granted that the gentlemen to whom the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] has referred—able, as

able as any of us are; economical, as economical as any of us are—will guard the interests of the Government in the discharge of their executive work just as well as we can; and I think they will be in a much better position to adjust this matter properly than we are, for they will have the means of judgment and they can secure the information that is necessary for them to arrive at a proper judgment.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has referred to the architectural history of this city in aid of his contention that it is unnecessary to go to trained architects for work, and he has referred to the Treasury Department, to the Patent Office, and to the Post-Office, I believe, as specimens of good architecture.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not the Post-Office.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Not the Post-Office?

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope not.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I mean the old Post-Office building, which is recognized as a very pure specimen of Grecian architecture.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Maine referred, at my suggestion, to the old Smithsonian building, which, in my judgment, is the finest specimen of architecture in Washington.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not know the history of the Smithsonian building, but I feel sure that if you will inquire into the history of the construction of that building you will find that one of the best architects of the time was secured in its construction. Its very proportions indicate that a trained, experienced, and artistic architect accomplished that work.

So far as this Capitol is concerned, it was intrusted to the best architects of the time. Doctor Thornton, I believe, one of the great architects of this region, made the original design. His work was followed up by Mr. Walter, one of the great architects of the time; probably the greatest architect of the time. That work was not done under the supervision of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury.

I am not familiar with the history of the Treasury building or with the history of the old Post-Office building or the Patent Office, but I am sure that the best architects must have been connected with those great works.

In the early history of the Republic the architecture of this country was very much better than it has been in later years. Why? Because our architects were under the influence of the traditions of the European architects. They followed the European architecture. The colonial style of architecture, which is so much admired to-day, was simply a repetition of the continental architecture of that time, some of the colonial buildings being designed by great architects and some of them simply copied after existing plans, and almost all of them excellent. As to public architecture, you have only to read Jefferson's letters to see how solicitous he was that we should follow the best classic models.

But in the middle of the last century we fell upon a most unfortunate era in which, disregarding all the traditions of this art and of this profession, trusting ourselves to carpenters and builders and stone masons, we erected all over this country the most amazing structures of hideousness. It has only been since the Chicago Exposition that there has been a revival of architecture in this country. That revival was due to the enthusiastic and public-spirited acts of the men belonging to this institute of architects which is so much criticised here to-day.

You will find that during the middle of the century and up until recent years almost all the buildings of Washington of a public character were inferior in their architectural effect. The Pension building—a monstrosity—the new Post-Office, designed in the office of the Supervising Architect, which we all admit is inferior, and the State, War, and Navy building, also designed in the office of the Supervising Architect, which, while perhaps not so bad, certainly will not compare with the Capitol or with the Patent Office or with the Treasury or the White House in artistic effect, though it involved a very large expenditure of money.

It does seem to me that we are fortunate to have so large, able, public spirited, and capable a body of men banded together in this association, not for the purpose of spoliating the public, not for the purpose of monopoly, but simply for the purpose of guarding the profession itself in the interest of art, and protecting the public itself from spoliation by men who otherwise would charge what they choose.

Recollect that the association limits the man of genius and talent as well as the inferior man, and that the compensation is the same, the only difference between them being that the man of recognized talent gets the great work. No man of talent can continue to secure such work unless he does the work well, unless he does good service.

These great corporations, like the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, like the Pennsylvania Railroad, like the great insurance corporations of New York, and these great banking companies, which are putting up these monumental structures throughout the United States—companies composed of men of business who meas-

ure every cent—certainly would not yield to this association of architects if they were a band of robbers simply gotten together for spoliation and robbery. It seems to me a word ought to be said in behalf of these men who are doing more in this country to make it beautiful and attractive than any other body of men in the country and who, in my judgment, are doing a higher public service to the country than any other association of men.

Now, criticism is passed upon the work in the White House. We limited the appropriation. They had to get along with \$500,000, I believe, for the entire work, and the question was whether they should put on additions to that building which would entirely subordinate the old building and destroy its individuality in the beauty and the grandeur of the new, or whether they should maintain the simple individuality of that historic building; and we owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. McKim, if for nothing else, that he decided to hold to the individualized White House as it existed for a hundred years, not changing it or altering it at all, but completing it according to the original plans.

Mr. ALLISON. The law required him to do it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very well. The law probably required him to do it, but it was at the suggestion, I have no doubt, of Mr. McKim. Mr. McKim, I understand, was in communication with the White House.

Mr. BACON. I may be mistaken, but is not the contrary true, that Congress had reason to apprehend that there were going to be some undesirable changes, and Congress put this limitation on him to prevent him? Am I not correct, I will ask the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not remember the circumstances. I remember very well that the law required him not to change the exterior appearance of that building or to add to it or take from it.

Mr. BACON. I will ask the Senator this: Was not that law passed after it was shown that the changes were about to be undertaken?

Mr. ALLISON. The law was passed because there was a consensus of opinion that no one should interfere with the appearance of that old building.

Mr. BACON. And Congress had reason to believe that there was about to be such interference?

Mr. ALLISON. There may have been people who had that fear; I do not know.

Mr. BACON. And there was foundation for that apprehension.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that in fact a plan had been made and exhibited in the White House showing the proposed changes.

Mr. BACON. It did change the exterior?

Mr. GALLINGER. Very materially.

Mr. BACON. Very materially changing the exterior, and at that time some of our leading Senators, as I recollect, who are very much to be thanked for the service performed, saw the necessity for such legislation and initiated it and carried it through. I think the thanks of the country are due to them for the protection of the White House against those changes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether Mr. McKim was not in consultation with somebody regarding that building before the Senate took this action?

Mr. BACON. I think so, undoubtedly. That is exactly what I have allusion to. Of course I have no definite knowledge other than that which is generally shared by Senators and Representatives—

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will ask the Senator from Iowa whether it is not true that Mr. McKim was in consultation either with the President or some one else in regard to that structure before the appropriation was made?

Mr. ALLISON. I have no doubt he was in such consultation. Of course there were many plans and suggestions as respects what should be done with that building, and Mr. McKim, among others, was consulted on the subject. The superintendent of public buildings and grounds at that time also had some decided views on the subject, but those views were all laid aside, if I may use that expression, by the committees having charge of the matter, and the request was made that an estimate be provided which would declare that the building should not be disturbed or the harmony of it or its general appearance changed, and that it should not be added to or taken from.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will ask the Senator from Iowa whether that conclusion was not in accordance with the views of Mr. McKim?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know as to that. Mr. McKim did not appear before the Committee on Appropriations, which dealt with this subject, although they had his estimates before them. But there was sufficient reason, so far as concerns the committee and the Senate, to induce the committee to restrict these changes in such a way that the exterior of the building should not be disturbed.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I think the committee acted very wisely. All I contend is that I have always understood that Mr. McKim was brought into consultation regarding that building before the appropriation was made, and that the general views of the committee coincided with the views of Mr. McKim, or, if you wish to put it the other way, that the views of Mr. McKim coincided with the views of the committee.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I can add a little something to the testimony of the Senator from Iowa with reference to this matter, not in any way contradicting it.

When the matter finally came up, as these things do, on the question of the money, the appropriation to pay the bills, a subcommittee waited upon the President. I will say to the Senator that instead of in any way assenting to his general proposition, that not only a distinctive suggestion, but I may say an adjuration was imposed upon the President that this man McKim should not be allowed in any way to interfere with the architectural beauty of the White House; and the only man from whom any danger was contemplated as likely to arise was this same architect.

I am free to say that I believe had not the committee jealously guarded that building and kept it in a way intact, preserved its fine, beautiful features, it would have been stripped, dismantled, ransacked, changed, and perverted and practically destroyed if we had let it go into the hands of the architect.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Do you base that upon any statement of Mr. McKim's?

Mr. HALE. Knowing what was generally in view, knowing that his scheme was to carry the Executive office over to a new building on Jackson Square, we were very careful in every way to exclude the idea. We knew enough. I did not want any statement from Mr. McKim that he knew more about that building and what ought to be done than I did. No member of the committee wanted it. We did not go near him.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Let me suggest to the Senator from Maine that if he had no statement from Mr. McKim it is hardly fair for him to state that he has no doubt that Mr. McKim would have dismantled that building and changed its whole structure.

Mr. HALE. I have no doubt whatever of it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very well. It is hardly fair, it seems to me, unless the Senator had some information from Mr. McKim to that effect, so to charge.

Mr. President, I am very glad to be corrected regarding the history of the White House construction. If the retention of that building in all its old simplicity is entirely due to the committee, great credit is due them. If any part of it is due to the President, credit is due him. If any part of it is due to Mr. McKim, credit is due him; but I do say that an appropriation of \$500,000 was made, and with that appropriation it would have been possible for an architect to have departed very considerably from the present individualized appearance of the White House.

Mr. HALE. Not under the injunctions that we laid down, and we never should have appropriated unless we had had the assurance that none of those changes would be made.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It would have been very easy, had an inferior architect been selected, to have put up the Executive building right adjoining the White House, and in such a way as to interfere with its architectural completeness, and yet the architect would have done it under the appropriation. No particular place was designated where a particular structure or improvement was to be made. You gave general instructions, it is true—

Mr. GALLINGER. Does not the Senator think it would have looked better if it had been put in the rear of the White House instead of where it is?

Mr. NEWLANDS. So far as that building is concerned, I was going to say that all lines pointed out by the original architect of the White House were pursued. The original plans were looked up. Those original plans provided for the arcade upon each side which has been the subject of criticism. They were in the original plans of the White House, and in providing for them Mr. McKim only carried out the original design.

It was essential that there should be Executive offices. The White House was crowded and was almost deprived of its character as a home by reason of the Executive offices. They had to be placed somewhere, and where it would be convenient. Now, architecturally that structure, I say, was located at the right place. I do not say that simply from my own judgment, but the judgment of the best architects of the country—I state that the architects of the country have come to the protection of Mr. McKim against the assaults which have been made upon him.

He is the president of the Institute of Architects of this country. Do you suppose that that great body of men would select an inferior man as their chief official? He is the man who de-

signed the public library in Boston, where they have greater taste for art than in any other city in the United States, and he has done the very best work in the country. He is so generally recognized, not only in this country, but throughout the world, that he received some decoration at the hands of the King of England only a short time ago. This decoration was regarded as a proper tribute to the character and the artistic quality of the man by architects all over the world.

Now, then, as you view the White House from Jackson Square, so far as proportion is concerned, there is nothing to find fault with.

Mr. BACON. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether that decoration was conferred before or after the construction of the Executive office? Was a photograph of it submitted to His Majesty before the decoration was conferred?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not know about that.

Now, so far as the material is concerned, it is the only thing you can question about the Executive office. If he had put a high structure there, it would have subordinated the White House. It had to be a low structure, almost unobservable. So far as the color is concerned, it is just as is the White House. So far as proportions are concerned, it is perfect in its proportions.

Now, you can criticize the material because it is made of brick, painted white. I have no doubt the architect would have used marble if you had given him the money to do it, but he was limited by the appropriation, and he had to put it up. It is regarded simply as a temporary structure, costing, I think, only fifteen or twenty thousand dollars.

Mr. BACON. Sixty thousand dollars.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Perhaps \$60,000; I do not know.

Mr. BACON. The Senator's suggestion as to the cost, I suppose, is controlled largely by the view, from looking at the building, he would take as to what would be the proper cost. But that is only one-fourth the cost.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should think myself—

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. I understood him to say just now that that structure cost not to exceed fifteen or twenty thousand dollars.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That was my impression.

Mr. FORAKER. I hope that is true. I have heard it stated, however, and repeatedly, that it cost \$65,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is correct.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Well, it may be so.

Mr. FORAKER. Senators sitting about me say that it is correct.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then, it seems to me, it cost too much.

Mr. FORAKER. Yes; that is the popular impression.

Mr. NEWLANDS. But so far as the design itself is concerned, its proportions, its relation to the White House itself, I insist upon it that it could not have been more perfect, and that the only thing to be complained of, regardless of the question of cost, is as to the material of which it is composed. Doubtless many would have been better pleased had a striking structure been placed there, but its very merit is its simplicity and unobtrusiveness.

Senators have spoken of a plan that was on exhibition there, the plan that was gotten up by the army engineer in charge of public buildings. That elaborate design, involving an extensive wing upon each side, as did the design that was presented to Congress at one time by the wife of President Harrison, involved a very large expenditure of money and involved almost a destruction of the individuality of the White House itself.

Now, here is a sample of a design cheaply secured. The army engineer in charge of the public buildings had in his employ at that time a designer, not an independent architect, not a man who could go out in the world and wrestle with others and secure work, but a man who, having had an architectural training, lacked the peculiar qualities which would have given him success in his profession, and therefore could be secured for a very small salary; and he made that great design which would have cost a very large sum. Suppose you had accepted it. You would have saved in the architects' fees and you would have lost in the great expenditure for the building. That is what I say is the advantage to be secured by getting these men of training and experience. You not only get art, you not only get efficiency, you not only get perfect construction, but you also get the most economical construction.

Senators have referred to the Supervising Architect's Office. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] referred to it as if that office were almost conducted without cost, and he hopes the time will come when the construction of these buildings will be turned into the Supervising Architect's Office. The present Supervising Architect is one of the very best men who has ever occupied that position, but I assume he would not accept a position yielding only \$5,000 a year if he could contend in the world

with such men as Carrere & Hastings or McKim, Meade & White. I suppose he will not assume that he stands in the same grade with them. He runs this office, and he has an expenditure in this office—

Mr. GALLINGER. I interrupt the Senator to say, if that be so, why should not the Government get in that office this high talent for which the Senator is contending?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very well. Pay a man \$50,000 and you will get it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Why should we keep an inferior man there who is really in charge of our public buildings?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Pay a man \$50,000 and you will get him.

As to the cost of that office, I do not know what the annual expenditure for public buildings is. I have had no opportunity to prepare myself on this subject. I came into this Chamber only a few moments ago and found this matter under discussion. It is a new question to me, but I imagine that the total expenditures of this country for public buildings does not exceed \$5,000,000. Am I right, may I ask the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. ALLISON. The appropriation for the Supervising Architect's Office is a very small sum relatively; but the custom of the Supervising Architect's Office is to retain 5 per cent of every appropriation for supervision, plans, etc., and therefore I should say that the annual expenditure would be more than 5 per cent upon the amount expended annually.

Mr. NEWLANDS. So it seems that now the Government is paying 5 per cent for the work that is done in the Supervising Architect's Office. From every appropriation that is made for a public building, costing, say, a million dollars, \$50,000, 5 per cent, is set aside by the Supervising Architect for the expenses of the plans and supervision. How can you object to 5 per cent being paid to men of talent outside?

Mr. HALE. That is done for emergencies, general supervision, janitors, and this fee that the architect gets is besides that. It is in addition to it. That is the whole point of the matter. There is not a dollar of this sum saved by employing an architect. It is a wise thing in a large building to reserve something for emergencies, things that come up which are unanticipated, and that is always done. But the architect's fee is aside and independent of that entirely, and it does not cut off a cent from the building—not one cent—if you employ an architect.

Mr. NEWLANDS. As I understand, the architect's fees cover not only the plans, but the supervision.

Mr. HALE. Only what they call the "architectural" work.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes; construction.

Mr. HALE. After a building is started the architect does not go near it more than once in several weeks.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Well, he would—

Mr. HALE. Well, he does not. But we do have a superintendent of buildings, and if it is a large building he has his subordinates, he has janitors, he has everybody else, and the 5 per cent is reserved to cover all that. But the architect has nothing to do with that.

As I said, he does not appear, he does not show himself near the building after he has put his plan in and got his fees started; at least not often.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Senator from Maine has had an entirely different experience among architects than I have.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, in the Tarsney Act it is specifically provided that the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department shall superintend these buildings.

Mr. DRYDEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. DRYDEN. I should like to state what my information is as to the practice of architects in superintending the construction of a structure.

He enters into a contract with his employer that he will not only prepare the plans and designs and prepare the specifications, but that he will superintend the work. Now, it is true that a great architect does not personally go every day and walk over the beams and climb onto the different stories to look at the work, but he keeps his superintendents there to do it, men who are in his employment, men who are paid by him, and they do the work and they are skilled men in their work. If a contract is made with one of these big architects, those men take the place of the very force which it has been stated here the Government keeps in its architectural office.

Mr. HALE. That is not experience, nor is it my experience in the erection of private structures. I have had to build, from the desires and the necessities and the ravages of fire within the last fifteen years, three pretty good sized houses. I paid the architect for the plans, and just paid him his percentage, a big price, but I had a contractor to manage the whole thing and I had to pay him. The architect never in any way reduced by one dollar the ex-

penses that I was at with reference to the supervision of the structure. It was all extra. And I say that the architect who furnishes plans for Government buildings is all additional. It does not take the place of anything. Five per cent is reserved by the Government, as it always was before.

Mr. DRYDEN. My experience has been directly contrary to that of the Senator from Maine. I know it is customary when large structures are to be erected to stipulate such a condition in the contract with the architect, that he shall furnish these men to examine the work as it goes on and certify to its correctness, and if the work is found to be improper it is rejected, and rejected on the certificate of these men whom the architect keeps there to act for him. If the Government was to enter into a contract with any of these big architects who construct these enormous buildings, it can make such a condition in the contract, and the architect will agree to it.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I wish to say what the Senator from New Jersey would be too modest to say, that there is nowhere, neither in the Senate nor anywhere else, a person more capable of speaking upon this subject than the honorable Senator from New Jersey. One of the most splendid office buildings in the United States—yes, one of the finest in the world—has been constructed by him, and while I have no certain knowledge upon the subject, I am very well satisfied to follow the better opinion of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator from Maine permit me to inquire whether or not he paid the architect to whom he referred 5 per cent commission?

Mr. HALE. Two and a half per cent.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then you paid two and a half per cent simply for the plans which did not involve supervision.

Mr. HALE. I was younger then than I am now, and greener. I paid him what he asked.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Two and a half per cent for all these structures that you referred to? You spoke of having put up three.

Mr. HALE. I paid all expenses, all incidental expenses. I found no fault with him. He was a very competent, bright architect, one of the very best, but he did not manage the construction of the building.

Mr. NEWLANDS. What is that?

Mr. HALE. He did not manage the construction of the building. He turned over his plans to the builder. The builder employed his joiners, his carpenters, his day laborers, and built the building, and when he had a bill to present he presented it to me and I paid it. But the architect did not manage it, and there is no necessity in these cases, with this bureau that we have there, for the architect charging for the management of the building.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is very clear to me that the Senator must have made an arrangement such as is often made covering simply the plans and involving no supervision whatever as to details and no responsibility whatever as to construction.

Now, the architect's duties are defined in the annual report of the Supervising Architect, in which he speaks of the Tarsney Act:

The law that authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to adopt this method of procuring designs, known as the "Tarsney Act," provides that in carrying it into effect the successful architect is to have local supervision of the construction, the function of the office of the Supervising Architect being of an advisory or a supervisory nature.

So that the architect is to have the local supervision of the construction. He is to have supervision of the contract, and if the contractor puts in inferior material he orders it to be taken out; and my experience is that a very valuable part of the architect's work is that which comes under this head.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President, at that point—

Mr. NEWLANDS. Let me keep the floor just one moment longer and I will yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to call the Senator's attention to something on that very point. He has the report of the Supervising Architect on that point, from which he reads?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Supervising Architect had turned to the statute enacted in 1893 he would have found this provision, which relates directly to his office:

That the general supervision of the work shall continue in the office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, the Supervising Architect to be the representative of the Government in all matters connected with the erection and completion of such buildings, the receipt of proposals, the award of the contracts therefor, and the disbursements of moneys thereunder, and perform all the duties that now pertain to his office, except the preparation of drawings and specifications for such buildings.

It seems to me that so far as the supervision is concerned, under this statute, which provides for competition between outside

architects, the Supervising Architect is specifically charged with the supervision of the construction.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Supervising Architect does not say so in his report.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, he forgot to quote the language.

Mr. NEWLANDS. He says "the architect is to have local supervision of the construction, the function of the office of the Supervising Architect being of an advisory or supervisory nature." It is true that the Supervising Architect represents the Government, just as my agent would act for me if I were putting up a building. I would have a certain degree of control over the architect, but that would not involve my assumption of his duty in the supervision of the construction itself.

Now, Mr. President, I was just getting to one point. I sent to the room of the Committee on Appropriations a few moments ago to inquire what amount was allowed the Supervising Architect's Office for the supervision of the construction of the various public buildings of this country. I find that while the specific allowance to that Office is only \$5,220, yet there is authorized to be paid from public-building appropriations \$300,000, making a total of \$305,000, which is 5 per cent on—

Mr. ALLISON. Six million dollars.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is 5 per cent on \$6,000,000, and I assume that the annual expenditures of the Government for public buildings in this country does not exceed that amount. So it seems that even when we assign this work of making plans to the Supervising Architect, the plans and supervision of the Government buildings involve an expenditure of 5 per cent.

It is true that you can pay an architect, if you choose, simply for his plans, and you can get them for a less sum than 5 per cent; but it seems to me that no greater mistake could be conceived than to get a great design for a great building from a great architect, and then when the time for construction comes absolutely absolve him from all responsibility regarding it. I should call that in the highest degree unbusinesslike, involving possibly great defects in construction, great defects in design, and great defects in the artistic perfection of the building.

Mr. QUARLES. Mr. President, I have not sufficient artistic taste nor yet the experience to throw any light on the question which has engaged the attention of the Senate now for a considerable time. To one claiming to know something on that subject, it would seem entirely safe if we fixed a maximum compensation—say, 5 per cent—and left it to a committee of three members of the Cabinet, as is proposed in this bill. But upon the major proposition, as to whether this measure should pass, I have very decided convictions.

Mr. CLAY. If the Senator will permit me just on that point, I will ask him a question. Does he know how much we are paying at this time for rental of offices for Government officials? Is it not true that we are paying about \$315,000 or \$320,000 a year, and that is equal to 2 per cent on \$15,000,000?

Mr. QUARLES. Three hundred and sixteen thousand dollars, I am advised, the Government is paying annually in this city for the rental of additional facilities for its departmental force. I shall come to that presently.

Mr. President, I should not have asked the attention of the Senate at all on this question had it not been for a suggestion made by my distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. HALE]. He is always deliberate, always persuasive, and generally wise; but he dropped one remark which challenged my attention and to which I wish to direct the attention of the Senate for a moment.

His suggestion was that, before passing a bill of this magnitude, there ought to be a preliminary commission organized, whose function it should be to investigate and report to Congress at the next session the probable cost of the several proposed sites. Now, that delay means death to this measure; and when my distinguished friend urges delay and deliberation, I beg to remind him that this bill involves no sudden impulse or spasm; that it is the result of five years of deliberate reflection and investigation on the part of the committee of this body to whom is intrusted this subject-matter.

When I came to the Senate five years ago I was assigned to this committee, and I believe I have attended every meeting of the committee from that time until now. One of the very first propositions made to that committee after I had the honor of joining it was the imperative necessity of another large departmental building, such as is contemplated by this bill, and that committee then undertook that task. You may have noticed, if you have read the report of the committee, that it was in 1899 that, responding to the universal conviction that another great building was necessary, the Attorney-General was authorized to expend a million dollars on one of the squares named in this bill for a judiciary building. You know the history of that proposition. It failed.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds in the Senate have considered no end of propositions with a view of relieving

this great demand on the part of the Departments, but it has been necessary to adopt some scheme which was considered wise by the corresponding committee in another place. We had also to consult the convenience and wishes and preferences of the several Departments; and this bill, notwithstanding that continued investigation on the part of the committee, is the very first tangible proposition that has ever found its way into this body.

Now, referring again to the suggestion of my distinguished friend from Maine that we should ascertain the cost of these several sites as a matter of precaution, I want to say that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has repeatedly endeavored to ascertain the cost of all the sites that are named in this bill; and we went far enough to determine in our minds one great fact—that is, that the owners of these several pieces of property put such an excessive valuation upon them that it is utterly impossible to hope for an agreement with them as to the price of their property, and that condemnation must necessarily be resorted to in each and every case.

So, if my distinguished friend were to carry his proposition through and defeat the consideration of this bill, his commission would only learn that which our committee has had enforced upon us time and time again, that it is utterly idle to make the attempt to buy this property. You have got to condemn it, and we shall simply lose time if we undertake to pursue the other course.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will allow me, I do not quite see why he says that if this particular proposition is not carried through now it is the death of this enterprise. Granted that we need accommodations for these three Departments, certainly there is no harm coming to the public service, aside from the fact of the payment of some rent, that will conflict with the public business. The scrutiny, investigation, and report as to what property can be bought for aids Congress in deciding whether it will take it. Six months go very quickly, and it is not any such investigation as the committee has been able to make that is contemplated.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senator may have overlooked the fact that the measure was before a former Congress. The Senator opposed its consideration then. If he had been eager to have expedited the measure, his suggestions made now might have been made then.

Mr. HALE. I wish it had occurred to me then. I did oppose it because it was then a worse scheme than it is now. If it had occurred to me, I certainly would have made the proposition I have in my mind now. I do not say that it is my proposition, because other Senators have that in view. But I was going on to say—I do not want to take the Senator off his feet, but we have a way of talking back and forth—

Mr. QUARLES. That is all right.

Mr. HALE. I do not condemn such investigation as the committee has been able to make. If I frame the amendment providing for an examination into that triangle south of the avenue, the place where, evidently, most Senators, so far as we can judge from what they have said, believe Government buildings ought to be erected, we shall get a thorough investigation; we shall get a commission that will take it in hand; we will see and hear every man who has property south of the Avenue, and we will get his proposition.

When Senators or the commission come to deal with the tracts south of the Avenue they will not find such a condition as we have on the lot that it is proposed to take on the opposite side of Jackson Square. There almost everybody objects to selling and does not want to sell. They want to stay where they are. It is a residential part. South of the Avenue everybody wants to sell out, and when they are confronted with the fact that they have got to make reasonable offers the Senator's committee will find when we come together at the next session of this Congress that they will be able to mark out a plan and will be able to say what not only one square will cost, but what the whole of that triangle will cost, and when we get that, Mr. President, it will be a good investment; we can put every public building that we build for thirty years on it, and all these questions will be saved.

Now, there is some rent saved, but the amount that is paid for rent in Washington not only applies to these three Departments; it applies to all the Departments. It is \$350,000 in all. There is only a portion of that—not the largest portion—that comes under these Departments. That is the entire amount, and for these three Departments it is not so large as people state.

The Senator from Indiana, if he got his bill through—which I suppose he will not—would not consent that a proviso should be put in it that no contract shall be made until contracts for the entire building shall be made, not exceeding \$5,000,000. This building can not be constructed for that amount. It can not be built for \$10,000,000, Mr. President. Nobody supposes that it can.

The amount saved in rent on these three Departments, suppose it is half of \$350,000, is only \$175,000, and that is a very small per cent on what the cost of this building will be.

But I only rose to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that by proceeding carefully, by providing for what we ought to do, and what I ought to have had the foresight two years ago to propose—which I did not—this scheme will not be destroyed; it will be all the better, and we will get good buildings south of the Avenue and help make that a noble avenue. We will have the park brought up on the southern side and every public building will have two fine fronts, one on the park south and one on the Avenue north. It will not be in the way of residences; it will not be in anybody's way. It will not chill the whole square round about, as a great building does when built in a residential part. It will be by itself, where it ought to be, and it will be a great, noble, grand feature.

Mr. QUARLES. Mr. President, as far as the last suggestion made by my distinguished friend is concerned, I beg to inform him that this committee has gone down along the south side of Pennsylvania avenue. It has negotiated with owners of property there, and it has in its committee room to-day the very figures which the learned Senator would wait a year or two to obtain through the medium of a commission. The result was, as I said a moment since, that the figures are simply excessive in every case, and we have got to condemn this property.

Now, I do not understand why my distinguished friend, notwithstanding the amendment that has been made to the bill, still lingers around square 167 as though there were some fatal fascination about that square. The commission certainly have been authorized to go down on the south side of Pennsylvania avenue and get that property, if they can, and if it has all the advantages so graphically described by the Senator from Maine, why should they not do so?

My distinguished friend asks me to tell the Senate why his proposition of delay means the death of this bill, and I am glad to state it in a few words. It throws this measure over into the short session, which will be so congested with other measures that consideration of this great measure would be absolutely hopeless. We have no river and harbor bill in the long session; we have no general public-building bill; we are considering no general legislation of any kind; everything is being thrown over into the short session; and does any Senator here think that, with all the pressing needs of all those great bills, this bill is going to receive consideration in that short session?

Mr. HALE. Does not the Senator expect—because there will be none at this session—that there will be a public-building bill at the next session?

Mr. QUARLES. I say there may be.

Mr. HALE. Do we not all understand about that? Is it not the understanding, I will say, in another body that whilst it is not desirable this year to have a public-building bill there will be one next year? The truth is, Mr. President, the Senator is wrong about that. These public-building matters go more easily, and have done so heretofore, in a short session than at any other, after the elections are over and after everything is out of the way. When we come in at a long session it is always said we must not have a public-building bill, we must not have a river and harbor bill, but when we get into the short session we always have it. There will be a public-building bill next year. There will be a much better chance of passing it then than there will be this year.

Mr. QUARLES. Mr. President, I do not think this measure would find its way into that bill. There are so many other measures to which Members and Senators are wedded in their own localities that my proposition is that this great measure would be driven out, as it has been for five years. For five years the necessity of this building has been just as apparent as it is to-day. You have had two public-building bills, but this bill could not get in; neither will it get into the next public-building bill.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. QUARLES. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I desire to ask the Senator whether if this session should be prolonged to a date to which the long session usually reaches, would it not furnish the opportunity for securing the information which the Senator from Maine suggests as being important, and still leave time enough in which to pass this bill? So if it is of such crying importance, of such great magnitude, would it not, in the opinion of the Senator, be better that we should give it that direction rather than adjourn and leave it without any action whatever?

Mr. QUARLES. Mr. President, I am in favor of the passage of this bill now.

Mr. BACON. I understand. I was simply asking a question of the Senator which might suggest a way in which the difficulty

which he presented might be obviated and the passage of the bill still secured during the present session of Congress.

Mr. QUARLES. No, Mr. President; I conceive that the information upon which my distinguished friend from Maine lays such great importance is of no avail. As I said, we have that information now, unless the figures have been destroyed. The committee has had them and has considered them.

Mr. HALE. Certainly, there is not in this report the slightest particle of information either way about that.

Mr. QUARLES. Of course not.

Mr. HALE. It is singular that with evidently so many Senators believing offhand that this building ought to be erected on the south side of Pennsylvania avenue, the committee does not give us a particle of information upon that point. I do not blame the committee. I do not suppose they have any exhaustive information such as a commission can get. A commission can get complete information and furnish it to the Senate, but the committee can not do that. They have other things to attend to and I do not find fault with them. It is impossible for the committee to do it.

Mr. QUARLES. Mr. President, my learned friend underestimates the industry of the chairman of the committee. The chairman of the committee has undertaken that labor himself on three several occasions. He has consulted the owners of this property, he has obtained their lowest prices, and has submitted those prices to the committee, and the committee in each instance has determined that the prices were excessive and that the property would have to be condemned.

Mr. HALE. I suppose there are 500 owners south of the Avenue. The chairman could not have seen them all.

Mr. QUARLES. I do not mean that we went all down that line. We did not go down below the power-house site. But we took every piece of property west of the power-house site, clear up to and including the Regent Hotel, and each and every other piece of property—

Mr. HALE. That is only a block; that is only a small portion.

Mr. QUARLES. It is more than a block, because it included the power-house site.

Mr. GALLINGER. But, if the Senator will excuse me, the power-house site is already purchased for the municipal building, and they are commencing the construction of the building now.

Mr. QUARLES. I am well aware of that fact.

Now, Mr. President, just a word as to the immediate necessity of this building. I will say the immediate initiation of the building. No Senator can read the report this committee has made, I think, without coming to the conclusion that it is the duty of the Senate to pass this bill at once.

When we say that the facilities which are given to the State Department, for instance, are inadequate we are not half stating the proposition. They are simply shabby. Our great Secretary of State has only one office. He has no retiring room. If two diplomats call at the same time on different matters of business, one has to wait. If a Senator happens to call he has to wait in the open corridor. I ask Senators to read this report from the several Departments that are to be housed in the new building and see how absolutely imperative it is that the building should be commenced at once.

When we consider that five years will undoubtedly be necessary to complete this building, it requires no great strain of imagination to see what the condition of affairs will be in the city of Washington with reference to our great Departments before the time comes when we can possibly finish this building. It is a shame and a disgrace that a great Government like this should leave these great Departments in the condition in which we find them in the city of Washington at this time.

I ask, without protracting this debate—for the time is running on—that Senators will read the report of the committee and read the appeals which are made by these several Departments for greater facilities. Then, in the light of that suggestion, they will be prepared to vote upon this bill, and I think they will agree with me it ought to pass at this session and be sent over to the other House in time to be considered there.

Mr. HOPKINS. Before the Senator from Wisconsin takes his seat, I should like to ask him a question. I understood the Senator to say, in the course of his remarks, that the land which is described in this bill is held at prices which the committee believed were so exorbitant that the Government would have to resort to condemnation proceedings. What assurance will we have, if that authority is given, that the Government will get the property at any less prices than those fixed by the property owners? What has been the experience of the Government in the past in questions of that kind?

Mr. QUARLES. Does the Senator mean to ask me whether by condemnation we shall be able to economize?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. QUARLES. In regard to that, I am utterly unable to furnish the information desired by the learned Senator. My experience is not sufficient to warrant me entering upon that theme. That, however, is the only recourse, as the Senator well knows, if the price which is fixed by the property owners is exorbitant. There is no alternative.

Mr. HOPKINS. I agree with the Senator that that is correct if we take that particular property. But I think that is a consideration which should be looked into further in determining whether we shall select the specific property which is described in the bill.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If the Senator from Wisconsin will allow me—

Mr. QUARLES. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The discussion has been directed mainly to one of the blocks mentioned in the bill; but there are several sites which the commission is authorized to consider.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator from Indiana think it likely after he gets this bill through that any other block will be selected excepting that great residential block to the west of Jackson Square?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. "That great residential block!" That is a misuse of words.

Mr. HALE. I make that inquiry.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. That square—

Mr. HALE. Is not the Senator himself in favor of acquiring that square?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If I had my way about it, I certainly would acquire that square, and I think it is a serious mistake for the Government not to take it. I think so, and when I have an opportunity to get the floor I shall undertake to demonstrate it. How other members of the proposed commission may view the subject I do not know. I have not consulted with any of them. I do not know what their opinion is upon it. My desire is, Mr. President, to accomplish something and not stand here sticking in the bark upon a great question. Let us deal with a great public question in a great, broad, intelligent way.

Mr. HALE. That is precisely what we want.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If this were a matter of individual or corporate concern, Mr. President, it would have been settled long ago. The history of the efforts to secure buildings in the District of Columbia for the accommodation of the public business is a serious commentary upon the manner in which business is sometimes done. History shows that years are consumed in debate as to the necessity of a public building, and much time is frequently consumed in debating these little questions—the nonessential details which have been debated here. I can characterize them in no other way—

Mr. HALE. I do not wish—

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I say that without any discourtesy to the honorable Senator.

Mr. HALE. No; it is not a matter between the Senator and me here, but I do not agree with the Senator that Congress has been remiss in this business. Long since I came into Congress almost every Department of the Government—

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Will not the good Senator, who has spoken frequently, allow me a few moments for uninterrupted discussion?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If, however, the Senator has arisen for a question I do not wish to interrupt him.

Mr. HALE. No; I see the force of what the Senator says, and will not interrupt him.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I think the Senator has spoken a half dozen times, and I, in order to expedite the passage of the bill, have refrained from saying anything.

Mr. HALE. I shall not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, about fourteen years elapsed from the time the discussion began for the erection of the extension of the Treasury building until it was completed and occupied. It was about eleven years after the discussion of the necessity for a new Congressional Library building began until the building was ready for use. And some seventeen years—mark you—elapsed in the consideration of the necessity for the construction of the State, War, and Navy building and the actual construction.

Twenty-five years, Mr. President, have elapsed since the debate began as to the necessity of a hall of records, and until the present hour all that has been accomplished has been to acquire a site for the building. The question of an appropriation comes later.

Mr. LODGE. And an undesirable site.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. "An undesirable site," the honorable Senator from Massachusetts says. I do not admit it. That has been one of the great stumbling blocks in the consideration of this question—sites. There are differences about the tariff and some constitutional questions which can be easily adjusted, but when it comes to the question of sites for public buildings there the opinions are fixed, rigid, and unchangeable. It seems to me that we

have got to accommodate ourselves to each other's views in a measure in order to accomplish anything in these important matters.

What the people of the United States want in the city of Washington is suitable accommodations for the transaction of the business of the Government. I need not say to Senators here how great is the necessity for additional facilities for the economical conduct and proper transaction of the business of the Government.

The Department of Justice is housed in inadequate quarters, and valuable documents and records of the Government, amounting possibly to more than the comparatively little sum involved in this bill, are in constant danger of destruction and loss.

Go to the Treasury Department and you will find that there are records stored away in insufficient and in inaccessible recesses, liable to be destroyed at any moment, amounting to millions of dollars in value, and yet we debate about the question of architects' fees or whether this or that inconsequential detail should go in the bill.

Ah, my friend, we have got to repose confidence and discretion in some one if we expect to secure the requisite facilities for the proper transaction of the public business.

I know, Mr. President, there is no more ungracious task that rests upon any committee of the Senate than that which rests upon the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. If we propose a measure here deemed by us essential to the public interest, we are beset by property owners and real-estate speculators from the beginning of the discussion of the measure to its final consummation.

No great residential section should be taken for this purpose, says the Senator from Maine. Once it was true that the block in question was a great residential section, but it is not so now—its glory has departed. I believe the Government owes it to the future as well as to the present to acquire block 167. There and in that vicinity is the heart of the Republic, and it must so continue down through the years that lie before us.

This block looks out upon the White House and the White House grounds. It looks out upon Lafayette Square, which will always be an object of great interest to the people of the United States. Block 167 will either be owned by the Government or by private individuals—private speculators—and in time there will be erected upon it either a Government building that will be a matter of admiration and pride with the people and which will enhance the value and desirability of all the surrounding Government property, or there will be built upon it apartment buildings, stores, and shops, which will be a standing disgrace to the Government.

Nobody can tell what the particular site mentioned by the Senator from Maine will cost, as the committee in its report frankly says to the Senate. The men upon the committee are practical men, used to dealing with questions of some magnitude. They believed there was only one way to accomplish the object desired. You can not accomplish the end in view entirely by legislation; you will have to give authority to some commission to go and select within reasonable limits a site adequate for the erection of a great building.

What have we provided in the bill? We have provided that a commission shall be composed of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate, and the chairman of the like committee of the House of Representatives, and to these four we have added three members of the Cabinet—the Secretary of State, the Attorney-General, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. That commission of seven, within the limits prescribed by this proposed act, is authorized to acquire by purchase—and if not able to purchase upon reasonable terms, then by condemnation—the requisite property.

Block 167, says my friend the Senator from Maine, will be the one acquired. I do not know. The commission under this bill, if it shall become a law, will be authorized to purchase not only block 167, but the one immediately opposite to it across Lafayette square—block 169; the block west of the State, War, and Navy Department, upon which the Winder Building is situated, or it may acquire a site south of Pennsylvania avenue and east of Fifteenth street, as proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. The bill has given this much discretion to the commission, and a very broad discretion it is.

Why? Because dealing with the subject through Congress would be a cumbersome, slow, tedious, and uncertain process, and no one knows that better than the able and distinguished Senator from Maine.

The Senator from Maine says he does not want a Department building erected in this "great residential section." Let us see about that. Block 167 is now partly occupied by the Court of Claims; it is partly occupied by the Bureau of American Repub-

lics, and it is partly occupied by one of the bureaus of the Department of Justice.

People, instead of wanting to live there, as a general proposition are obtaining homes and going elsewhere. North, looking down upon this block, is a hotel and, I believe, three residences, one, if I recollect correctly, unoccupied for some time. West, across Seventeenth street, is the Metropolitan Club. I have heard of protests from some of the members of that organization against the erection of a public building in that vicinity. South of the club, reaching down to Pennsylvania avenue, are a few residences and a number of shops. When shops go in, residences go out, as the Senator knows.

South of this block is the great War, State, and Navy Department building, and on the east side is Lafayette Square. Senators must have observed that large apartment houses are crowding down into that locality. It seems to me that we would be recreant in our duty to safeguard the future interests of the city of Washington, in which the people are justly concerned, if we allowed this property to go into the hands of those who would make of this locality an undesirable place.

This seems to me to be the most desirable block for a great building which shall stand as a representative of the dignity and power of the Government. These Department buildings are but few, and when they are built they should be built not only for the present but for the future.

As to the architect's fees, of which the Senator has made complaint, it has not been customary—and I appeal to the Senator from Maine in the statement I am about to make—it has not been customary to impose limitations upon fees to be paid architects.

The Senator is a member of the great Committee on Appropriations, and one of the last bills reported to Congress by that committee contained a provision carrying some three and a half million dollars for the construction of a building for the National Museum. That proposition did not go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as, under the rules, it should have gone, but it went to the Appropriations Committee, of which the honorable Senator is so powerful and distinguished a member. What did that committee do?

Did it put a limitation on the architect's fees? Certainly if there was great peril to the Government the vigilant Senator would not have omitted to say so, but an inspection of the act as it stands upon the permanent statute books of the United States discloses the fact that the Senator did not deem such a limitation there necessary.

Mr. HALE. I will state to the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. With pleasure.

Mr. HALE. I will state to the Senator that I did not think then, and do not think now, that there was any danger in that case; but if the Senator had directed his attention to another case, where a great building was to be erected, and where there would be danger of this, he would find that on my motion the following clause was inserted in the bill providing for the erection of a hall of records:

And no plan shall be adopted unless authorized by legislation hereafter to be enacted, and said plan or any compensation connected therewith shall only be preliminary and shall not in any way run with the construction of the building, and no obligation for such preliminary plans shall be incurred to cost in excess of \$5,000 herein appropriated.

I mean, Mr. President, if I can have my way, upon every public building erected here in the city of Washington, and perhaps outside largely, to have a provision similar to that which I have just read put on the bill. In the case of the hall of records I thought such a provision necessary; but I did not think any architect was needed in the matter to which the Senator has referred, and do not know that one has been employed.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I will ask the Senator if he has not been pressing certain bills for public buildings in Maine, and whether there is any limitation in regard to architects' fees in those bills?

Mr. HALE. I do not know how that will be when we get them. We have not got the buildings yet.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. You have got the bills.

Mr. HALE. We have got the bills for the sites and all that. I am entirely willing and should be very glad to have the provision I have referred to incorporated upon all bills of that kind. Of course it is not so essential upon a small building, but even in such a case I think if any architect at all is employed he ought to be employed under limitations, and he ought to be a local architect.

When it comes to big buildings—and we have got some, as the Senator knows, in contemplation in New York City and other cities—I for one shall not consent to any provision for those great structures unless it is accompanied by such a stipulation as, on my motion and drawn by me, was put on the bill providing for a great building for a hall of records. I want Congress to

know before it embarks on these undertakings and appropriates the money what all this is to cost, and on buildings here in Washington—I do not want to interrupt the Senator from Indiana—

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I am glad to hear the Senator.

Mr. HALE. But on matters here in Washington, I think, as I have said, Congress ought to know where its money is to go and what the land is going to cost. That can be easily done.

I agree with the Senator, and generally we are all agreed, that we want these buildings. But six months' delay is not fatal by any means. We are constructing a great many public buildings in Washington, as the Senator knows. Long since I have come into Congress every Department under the Government has been taken out of crowded, narrow, cramped quarters, and many of them given fine, handsome, commodious rooms. I do not think we are especially at fault. I want to go on from year to year, but I want to know where we stand when we do go on.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. So far as the architects' fees are concerned—and I will take but a moment, as I wish to see action upon the bill to-night—I am willing to leave that subject in the discretion of the Secretary of State, the Attorney-General, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. It is a discretion which they will exercise reasonably. The Senator can have no doubt about that.

There was one thing stated by the honorable Senator from Maine that I did not understand precisely. He said that the bill would not go through. Why?

Mr. HALE. I said that I expected it would not. I do not think the Senate is prepared to pass the Senator's bill. I may be wrong about it, but I judge so from the indications. Of the Senators here to-day, almost every one who has spoken, except the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Wisconsin, has spoken in favor of going south of the Avenue. I may be wrong about that.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senator indicates—the statement was perhaps somewhat unguarded and inaccurate—that there had been undue haste, and that was the sound of alarm when the Senator first began his observations. Mr. President, there has been no subject which has been before the Senate for years which has been more deliberately considered than this. It failed of action in the Senate, first, because an amendment was put upon the bill at the suggestion of the honorable junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. While we were dealing with that amendment the bill was so delayed that it failed of passage at the long session of Congress.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I yield with very great pleasure.

Mr. BAILEY. Has it not heretofore been the idea that the building for the Supreme Court, at least, should be located near this Capitol and opposite to the Library?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Yes; the Senator is right about that.

Mr. BAILEY. Speaking for myself, I dislike very much to see the Supreme Court sent so far from the Capitol.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I agree with the Senator; but this bill does not make provision for the Supreme Court; it is for the Attorney-General; it is for the executive branch of the Department of Justice.

Mr. BAILEY. Then my objection does not apply; but I had been advised that it included the Supreme Court.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Oh, no.

Mr. BAILEY. I was going to say that it often happens that it is necessary for Senators to go to the Supreme Court for the purpose not of attending to their profession, but to hear the discussion of important causes there. Every Senator has probably the experience that I have, of frequent requests to present members of the bar from his own State for admission there. In attending to those matters it would be very inconvenient to us if the court were put at the other end of the Avenue. I think they ought to have better quarters than they have. I think they ought to have more room and better room, and I hope we shall find it for them near the Capitol.

Now, Mr. President, that I am on my feet, I am constrained to ask the Senator from Indiana how long it is going to be before the Senate takes care of the minority members of its own body, and how long must we be set down here in a building that has been condemned as unsafe? I think myself that it would not be very much loss to the country, perhaps, if some of us were not able to perform our service, but for one I should like to be able to perform it with all my faculties, and I have no taste for being housed in a building that, by common consent, is regarded as unsafe.

Those in charge have declined to allow us to carry books into our rooms over in what is known as the "Senate Annex," because they are afraid that if we all carry books up there the building will fall. [Laughter.] Most of the Senators who are located in that building probably are wise enough not to need books to help

them perform their duties; but some of us do need them, and we chafe a little at being told by the janitor in charge of the building that we must not carry books up into our rooms, because, if we do, the building is liable to fall.

That is the condition in which thirty-five or forty members of this body find themselves, and I sincerely hope the Senator from Indiana, who is chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and performs his work well, will relieve those Senators before he takes care of others. In other words, I think it infinitely more important to provide for the safety of the Senators than for the comfort of the Commerce and Labor Department or even of the Attorney-General. I do not believe that any man who works for the Government ought to be exposed to an unnecessary hazard. But when a man comes here, faithfully performing, certainly at what is not more than a moderate salary, what the public service requires of him, if he can not have comfortable quarters, he ought at least to have a safe place in which to do his work.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I fully agree with the honorable Senator from Texas. There are more buildings than he has mentioned needed in the District of Columbia.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator from Indiana permit one suggestion from me in that connection?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I yield for a question.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is a mere suggestion, and that is, that a structure somewhat resembling the Executive office of the President, but composed of better material, unobtrusive, and in harmony with the architecture of the Capitol, could be constructed immediately adjoining this building upon the same ground, and connected with it. That would give ample accommodations to those who now have very inferior accommodations.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. One of the difficulties about securing necessary building legislation in the District of Columbia has been the great divergence of opinion as to which was the most emergent measure.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I was going to say that the Senator and I have discussed the matter he has just mentioned, and I think it is one that should be taken up and considered in a deliberate and intelligent way.

Mr. BAILEY. But is it not the most emergent? I have heard no suggestion that anybody else is occupying quarters that have been condemned. I have heard that some are occupying quarters that do not comport with the dignity of their several offices, and there may be more or less force in that, but I have not yet heard a suggestion that anybody connected with the public service is occupying condemned quarters, except several of the Senators.

I said a moment ago that Senators of the minority were those occupying this building; but I will correct that statement and say the Senators who are sent down to this building, commonly known as the "Maltby Building," I believe, but legally known as the "Senate Annex," are not entirely Democrats, but there are a number of newly elected Republican Senators as well. They are sent down there more as a matter of seniority than they are as a matter of politics; and I take it that in case of accident you would lose about as many able-bodied men as we would.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. It would be a sort of nonpartisan accident.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; but I discover that it is a nonpartisanship that comprehends only the new members. If you reversed it and sent the old members down there, they would have had a new building three years ago.

Mr. HALE and Mr. GALLINGER. That is true.

Mr. BAILEY. But the new Senators hardly know how to proceed with that dispatch and efficiency which their seniors have acquired; and so, being new and without that powerful influence in these affairs, we are put down there with our lives in our hands and told to wait until the comfort of other folk can be provided for.

I am not going to obstruct the Senator's bill; but if the Senate, or at least that part of it that is quartered down there in this condemned building, had my view, there would never be another public-building bill pass this body until the safety of the Senate was provided for.

I do not myself expect to stay down there all the while. I expect to join the seniors up here, if I live long enough. I expect to be provided with quarters here, and probably long before you would have that building finished if you began it now. But I do believe that it is a reflection on the good judgment of the Senate to compel a large number of members to occupy rooms in a building that is unsafe, and has been condemned as unsafe, and is so unsafe that the Senators are not permitted to carry books up there to inform themselves about questions which they ought to discuss. They can carry them up one or two at a time, but the vigilant janitor there, if he finds any Senator with too many, serves notice on him that he must take them out. Twice within the last two or three weeks I have seen books taken from a Senator's room into the hall to be carted down to the basement.

Now, that is an outrage upon the Senators who are compelled to do their work there, and I am sure the Senator from Indiana will give the matter his attention. I hope there will be no division of opinion here that this is the most urgent. The others are simply questions of comfort and of architectural beauty—of adorning the city, as it were. This is a question that may seriously affect the lives of Senators. If there were an explosion anywhere within 200 yards of the Maltby Building, it would crumble to the dust. It is an outrage that Senators are compelled to occupy such a building.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, only a word or two more.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If it is for a question, I will yield.

Mr. CULBERSON. It is for a question on the same matter to which my colleague has alluded. I call the Senator's attention to Senate bill 3687, providing for the purchase of a suitable site for a building for the Supreme Court, and I ask him whether, if that bill should become a law and the Supreme Court should be removed from the Capitol, there would be sufficient space now occupied by the Supreme Court to give the remaining Senators offices in this building?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I do not think so. No; I think it would be entirely inadequate. I believe with the Senator from Texas that we should make ample and adequate provision for the Senators who now have their committee rooms in the Maltby Building. I spent two years there, the first two years of my service in the Senate, and I sympathize fully with the observations the Senator has made.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, I desire to say that the most serious objection I have yet heard suggested to the construction of a building for the use of the Senate is that which has just been found in the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada, that when that building is constructed it should be after the pattern of the new Executive building, about which something has already been said in this debate. I think if it is going to be after that pattern possibly Senators would prefer almost to risk their lives in the present annex building, known as the "Maltby."

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, I must decline—

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will pardon me for saying that I entirely agree with the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire; that it would have been better if the Executive building had been put in the rear of the White House.

Mr. BAILEY. So as to make a stable out of it.

Mr. BACON. I suppose in making that suggestion the Senator from New Hampshire was animated by the same consideration that moved Sydney Smith in some advice he gave to one of his friends, one of the prominent poets of England—I believe it was Rogers—who was not especially distinguished for personal pulchritude. He advised him whenever he had his picture taken to have it taken while he was at prayer, with his face in his hat. [Laughter.]

Mr. NEULANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I must decline to yield further, if the Senator from Nevada will pardon me. I only wish to say a word or two, and must hasten on.

This is a matter which claims our serious attention as trustees of the interests of the public. We pay out yearly on appropriation bills—as the distinguished Senator from Maine, who is an honorable member of the Committee on Appropriations, well knows—\$316,000 for the rent of quarters in the District of Columbia, admitted to be very inadequate.

With the money lying in the Treasury with which to build buildings for the accommodation of our business, the Appropriations Committee does nothing—and I say it without any unkindness whatever—to aid us to secure the construction of proper buildings, and to make unnecessary that immense draft upon the Treasury each year. When the committee charged with the duty of providing buildings for the Government comes to the Senate with a measure which will save the drain to a considerable extent, we find nothing but serious opposition. Shall we continue, Mr. President, to pay out \$316,000 a year indefinitely?

Mr. HALE. The Senator should wait until we get through the session. The Committee on Appropriations put on last year provision for two large buildings. They were put in the appropriation bill.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. What two buildings?

Mr. HALE. The building for the hall of records.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. That was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HALE. But the appropriation had not been put on by the committee. Provision for the Agricultural and Smithsonian buildings were put on the appropriation bill.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Agricultural building measure passed as a separate bill. I introduced the bill, and it was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HALE. I know; but we put it on finally in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Because it was the law. That was the reason for it.

Now, are we going to waste \$316,000 a year indefinitely? I have had the honor of sitting in this Chamber some seven years. I have not gone into the figures accurately, but I am within the reasonable limits of the truth when I say that there has been paid out during that time for rents in the District of Columbia over a million and a half of dollars, when the money for the construction of necessary buildings is piled up and lying idle in the Federal Treasury. What kind of business is that, Mr. President?

I hope the honorable Senator from Maine is not prophetic. I hope his very positive statement that the bill will not pass is founded in error. It is in the interest of the Government that it shall pass. It is in the interest of good administration that it shall pass. Even after it has passed, several years will elapse before the building contemplated can be occupied.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] seems very insistent on gaining further time for the consideration of this subject. When I first became a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I think some five years ago, this matter was then under consideration. It has been considered every session since that time. This is the fifth session that it has been under consideration. How long it had been under consideration before the same committee prior to that time I can not say. But this much is evident. If I have learned anything in that committee it is that there is no hope, by any character of investigation, of finding a single spot in the city of Washington where we can locate a public building and get a reasonable price put upon the property.

Therefore a commission, such as is suggested by the Senator from Maine, might serve for ten years, and they could not secure the setting of a reasonable value upon any property for public purposes. It is necessary, therefore, that we should go beyond what is proper, or that we go to the courts in condemnation proceedings.

We have considered this matter during all these years, and we have come to the conclusion that it is necessary and proper at this time to put up a building of the character described in this bill. And why? The money in the Treasury is lying there rotting, while we are paying out, as has been suggested, \$316,000 a year for rentals in the city of Washington. The money is there to pay for the building. What character of economy can we call it when we have the money on hand and when we can put up the building within a few years and yet at the same time go on with these extra expenditures for rent?

Not only that, but the quarters now occupied by the Department of Justice and by other Departments which are to be benefited by this bill are inadequate and improper for the purpose. Vast records are stored there. There is no adequate place for them, and in case of their destruction they could not possibly be replaced. That is one reason why we should commence now the construction of this building, which can not be completed in less than five years from the present time.

The Senator from Maine says that this building will cost us \$10,000,000, and yet I understand the building just east of us was completed entirely within the limits of the appropriation and the original bill. If that is true, it seems to me a committee consisting of the gentlemen who are mentioned in this bill, assisted by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, both exceedingly conservative, can secure for us as reasonable a place for the building of this structure as we could possibly hope for. Mr. President, I can not see any necessity for further delay. Nothing can be gained. This committee has done everything that possibly could be accomplished by the commission which the Senator from Maine desires.

I wish to address myself, before closing, to just one other proposition, and that is the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. Mr. President, may I ask for the reading of the amendment, so that I may clearly understand it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read. The SECRETARY. On page 6, line 5, after the word "architects," it is proposed to strike out the word "to" and insert:

The successful architect shall receive compensation in full for plans, specifications, and attendance at a rate not exceeding 2½ per cent of the total cost of said building, and shall also.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am in entire sympathy with the object sought to be accomplished by this amendment, but it seems to me the amendment produces exactly what the Senator and I are attempting to guard against, that instead of cutting down the expenses of the architectural work, it makes it the duty of the commission to employ an architect to superintend the construction of this building.

I desire to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the reading of the law itself, and to state to him that

under the bill as it now reads there is no authority on the part of the Commission which is to secure the construction of this building to employ an architect for the purpose of supervising the construction of the building. Under the law which the Senator from New Hampshire has already read in connection with this bill, if it becomes a law, the duty will be imposed upon this Commission simply to employ architects for the purpose of securing plans and to pay them for those plans. Then, following the law which is now upon our statute books, the Commission would turn over to the Supervising Architect the duty to supervise the construction of the building.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Now, let me read this, if the Senator please, before he quotes the law again.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me just here?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Since drawing the amendment I have examined the law and read it, and I am entirely persuaded that it is not necessary for us to provide for supervision. So I have rewritten the amendment which I am going to offer, and will now offer it as a substitute for the one I submitted a while ago. I will send it to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire withdraws his former amendment?

Mr. GALLINGER. I withdraw it and send the proposed amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota desire to have the amendment read before he proceeds?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will consent to its being read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. After the word "architects," in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "to" and insert:

The successful architect shall receive compensation in full for plans and specifications not to exceed two and a half per cent of the total cost of said building, and shall also—

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I can see some objection to this new amendment. Under the law as it now reads the amount to be paid to an architect for the plans is left to the sound discretion of this commission. I have entire confidence in the commission, if this bill becomes a law, and I do not believe that under any circumstances they would allow, on a building that would cost \$5,000,000, more than two and a half per cent, which would amount to \$125,000. I do not believe as a conservative commission they would consider it was worth more than a hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars to secure plans alone. Therefore it seems to me that the amendment is unnecessary and practically makes it incumbent upon them to fix at least the value which they shall pay.

Now, reading this bill—

That the construction of said building shall be in charge of the Secretary of State, the Attorney-General, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, who are hereby authorized and directed to select and adopt plans for the said building, and to make contracts for its construction—

I do not conceive that anyone will claim that the words "contracts for its construction" shall be construed to include fees for superintending—

after proper advertisements and the reception of bids, and, if they shall invite plans by competition among architects, to pay to the person submitting the two sets of plans next in order of merit to those selected such sums as, in their judgment, shall be proper compensation for their preparation.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire why it is not satisfactory to leave it in that way, and if the commission consider that the plans and specifications are not worth more than thirty or forty or fifty thousand dollars, why shall we say to them practically that they shall consider them worth a hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, or 2½ per cent upon the value of the building?

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, as he asks me a question, I will say that the Senator from New Jersey insists that the architects will demand 5 per cent. We have had a recent experience where they demanded and received 8 per cent. I think that is a sufficient answer to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. But the demanding of the 5 per cent, I understand, includes not only the plans, but supervision also; that where there is no supervision by the architect, there is no general rule that he shall have 5 per cent upon the value of the building.

Mr. DRYDEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McCUMBER. With pleasure.

Mr. DRYDEN. The usual charge of 5 per cent by the best architects in the country includes the furnishing of a design, the preparation of detailed drawings, the preparation of specifications, and the supervision of the entire work from start to finish. Now, as I understand, and I will speak only a moment—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DRYDEN. The last amendment proposed as a substitute by the Senator from New Hampshire covers simply the furnishing of a design and the preparation of specifications, and for that the Senator proposes to pay the architect 2½ per cent. I think that is an extravagant price to pay the architect for what the amendment proposes to require of him, according to my understanding. The great expense, the great labor in connection with the preparation or the entire scheme by the architect for a building consists in preparing the detailed plans. That may involve, for such a building as is proposed here, assuming that it is going to cost, as some Senator has said, ten or twelve million dollars, the employment of a force of fifty or perhaps seventy-five clerks for a series of years.

Mr. GALLINGER. Do not the specifications cover that?

Mr. DRYDEN. Not at all; not by any means.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will amend it then by putting in detailed drawings, if it will suit the Senator from New Jersey better.

Mr. DRYDEN. The specifications are a comparatively simple matter.

Mr. LODGE. The percentage paid, when the supervision of the building is not involved, is very much less than 5 per cent. I think if he will look at the rates of charges fixed by the Architects' Society he will find a much lower charge. Supervision is considered very laborious work.

Mr. DRYDEN. It may be somewhat less. But I doubt the wisdom of giving a contract to an architect and relieving him at the very point at which he should be held responsible. If you provide in the contract that the architect shall do nothing more than furnish the design, specifications, and the detailed drawings, and go no further than that, if the building is not properly constructed, and that is ascertained afterwards, you can not hold the architect responsible, because you have specifically eliminated him from that responsibility.

Now, in my judgment, the architect should be held responsible for the entire matter from the time he furnishes his general plan of the building until the building itself is completed.

Mr. CULLOM. And turned over.

Mr. DRYDEN. And turned over.

Mr. McCUMBER. There seems to be considerable divergence of opinion as to what are the duties of an architect, under the general rules of the association, when he receives his 5 per cent. As I understand the Senator from New Jersey, his duties would simply consist of showing a design of the outer structure of the building, without specifications. I understand that it includes not only the general design of the building and specifications, but in addition, supervision of construction.

Mr. DRYDEN. And detailed drawings.

Mr. McCUMBER. And all detailed drawings. But I would understand also that the 2½ per cent basis, or one-half of that, would include the specifications as well as the general design. But whatever that may be, in a case of this kind it would be subject to a special contract.

There are very few five or ten million dollar buildings put up in the United States, and therefore buildings of this character can not be taken ordinarily as a basis for the value of the services of an architect. In other words, the ordinary public building that costs a million dollars would require almost as much of specifications and certainly as great skill on the part of an architect as a \$5,000,000 or a \$10,000,000 or possibly a \$20,000,000 building. There are exceptions, of course, to this rule. I believe charges should be graded somewhat according to the value of the building. Certainly if an architect should receive 5 per cent upon a building that cost only \$100,000, he would not receive nearly as much accordingly for his services as if he were to receive 5 per cent upon one which is to cost \$10,000,000.

But seems to me we can justly leave this matter entirely with the commission to determine what is reasonable and what is just. It seems to me, further, that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire might be construed as requiring the commission to pay a greater compensation than they ought to merely for the work of the architect in furnishing the plans and specifications. It might be worth 2½ per cent and it might not be worth 1 per cent, and it seems to me we should leave that entirely in the hands of the commission.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I appreciate fully the desires and wishes of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds in some effective way to add to the public buildings in the District, and I also appreciate the difficulty they have in making selections as to what particular building shall be first constructed.

We had a considerable debate here the other morning, and it appeared from that discussion, or one side of it at least, that a portion of the office of the Public Printer was in such a condition that the building should be torn down, or that portion of it which has been in occupation for a long time, and a new building constructed in its place.

We to-day have the suggestion from younger Senators in this

body that they are not quite fairly treated in comparison with those who have been here for some years. My friend the Senator from Texas even went so far as to suggest that the Maltby Building should be occupied by the older Senators and that the new Senators, those who have come in more recently, should occupy the space in this building. I sympathize with the Senator in this regard, although I never had the opportunity of occupying any portion of the Maltby Building.

But I want to say to the Senator from Texas and other Senators that I believe one of the first things necessary for us to do as respects appropriations for public buildings is to provide for what we may call an annex to the Senate. The House of Representatives for a long time saw the necessity of such an annex for the House, and they purchased what is known as the Butler Building a good many years ago and used it, and they also rented other buildings in and about the south side.

Now I think we have reached a point where it will be necessary for us at an early day to provide an annex building to this Capitol. It is obvious that we can not—

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me? He stops with the statement that they purchased the Butler Building and rented others outside. The Senator, of course, is aware that two years ago Congress provided for a structure that was to cost something more than \$2,000,000 for an annex to the House.

Mr. ALLISON. I mentioned that fact just before the Senator came in.

Mr. BAILEY. I did not hear it.

Mr. ALLISON. The House structure will cost, I think, more than \$2,000,000; possibly, including the condemnation of the land, two and a half million dollars.

Now, we need a structure, of course not as extensive as the structure proposed on the south side of the Capitol. We need a structure for the use of the Senate, and that structure should be placed as near the Capitol as practicable. It should not be where the Maltby Building is now. We should purchase a corresponding corner northeast of the Capitol, and erect there a suitable building architecturally for the convenience and utility of the Senate. I agree that that is a very important thing to do.

The Senator from Indiana suggested that the Committee on Appropriations had hardly made in the past such provision as they ought to have made for these public buildings. Perhaps that criticism is a very proper one.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. No; I did not intend to be understood as going to the extent which the Senator from Iowa says I did. I was led to observe, if my observation is drawn out, that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds were endeavoring to relieve the Government from this intolerable embarrassment and continual expense, and they were antagonized in that effort by leading influences upon the Committee on Appropriations. Of course the responsibility for enacting the law rests primarily upon the committee of the other House.

Mr. ALLISON. It does as a rule, although I believe the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate has a right to originate appropriations for the necessities of the Departments of the Government and for the necessities of either or both branches of Congress. I do not think that as respects these questions there is any necessity for a law; but I believe the House have decided otherwise, and therefore they will consider no appropriations unless previous provision is made for the buildings by law, except that they inserted in the appropriation act in the House last year a provision for the construction of the building south of the Capitol.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. And I may ask the Senator if the practice of the Senate has not generally been in line with that?

Mr. ALLISON. It has generally been in line with that, and I think too strictly in line with it.

This bill provides for an appropriation to house the Department of Justice. There was an appropriation made some four or five years ago, during the incumbency of Attorney-General Griggs, appropriating, as I remember it, twelve hundred and fifty thousand dollars for a building for the Department of Justice, and I think there was a commission provided. I do not know whether it was a commission similar to this one. The Senator from Indiana will know.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Does the Senator refer to the act of 1890?

Mr. ALLISON. I refer to that act.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. It appropriated \$1,000,000.

Mr. ALLISON. There was another act, was there not?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Not as I recollect it. My understanding is that there was \$1,000,000 appropriated, but the Attorney-General afterwards reported that he could not construct the building within the limit.

Mr. ALLISON. I was about to come to that. During the incumbency of Attorney-General Griggs provision was made for the Department of Justice by a separate statute, I believe, and it

also contained a full and complete appropriation. The Attorney-General was authorized to secure plans and specifications for that building. He did so, and the plans and specifications which he or the commission, if it was a commission, decided ought to be accepted would cost in the neighborhood of sixteen hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Nineteen hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. ALLISON. Nineteen hundred thousand dollars. I think afterwards it was modified so that it could have been constructed for sixteen hundred thousand dollars. That was in 1899. The old building was torn down, and the Department of Justice was compelled to lease buildings around the city until that construction was completed. I am not aware that from that time to this there has been any suggestion of a statute looking to the enlargement of the cost of the building for the Department of Justice. The Senator from Indiana will correct me if I am mistaken in that.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I did not understand the Senator's statement. My attention was diverted at the moment.

Mr. ALLISON. I was about to state that that building failed because of an incomplete limit and because of an incomplete appropriation, and because of the rule which the House has established we could not put upon an appropriation bill any increase of that appropriation without first removing the limit of cost and fixing a new limit. I am not aware that any bill has ever been presented in this body or in the other suggesting an enlargement of the limit of cost in order to provide for a building to house the Department of Justice. If I am mistaken in that, the Senator will correct me.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senator is not absolutely correct about that, because immediately following that failure a bill similar to the one now before the Senate was prepared. It had the entire concurrence and approval of the Attorney-General. He preferred this arrangement to the one to which the Senator refers.

Mr. ALLISON. Then this bill, or an arrangement such as is proposed here, was substituted for that original plan?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Yes; the idea being that it was cheaper for the Government to erect a building that would accommodate the State Department, the Department of Justice, and some third Department, than to spend smaller sums in different independent structures.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well. Whilst that may have been the judgment of the Attorney-General, I have always believed, and I still believe, that the Department of Justice building ought to be built upon the space we now have. It is large enough for the Department of Justice.

Now, I believe another thing; that it is not wise to have three or four Departments in one building. I believe that whatever construction we make for the several Departments ought to be made, as far as practicable, for them independently.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly. I am stating my own opinion now about it.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I agree with the Senator as to that. This provision is, in the nature of things, but temporary. Originally there were three Departments provided for in the State, War, and Navy Department building. One of those Departments will retire on the passage of this bill, and ultimately it will be occupied by one or the other remaining.

Mr. ALLISON. I certainly so understand.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. So, with the building under consideration, while there will be three Departments partially accommodated for the time being, there will be ultimately another building, and this building will be eventually occupied by one Department.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator's suggestion is in exact accord with what I was endeavoring to say, and would have said in a few moments.

In 1876 or in 1877, I have forgotten which—the date is not material; perhaps earlier than that; I believe, in fact, in 1871—we commenced the construction of the State, War, and Navy Department building, and everybody said at that time the building would be ample for thirty or fifty years for those Departments. Before that building was completed and after its completion there was a struggle between those three Secretaries, and particularly between the two Secretaries of War and Navy, about the space to be occupied in that building, which had to be settled finally by the arbitration, if I may say so, of a committee of Congress.

Mr. HALE. By Congress.

Mr. ALLISON. By Congress practically alone. The structure, by the time it was completed, was claimed by the three Secretaries then in service to be insufficient for the accommodation of their several Departments. And now of the immense rent we are paying a large portion of it is for the War Department, I think amounting to \$30,000 or \$40,000. The Senator probably has the details; I speak only from memory. We have entered into a

lease for a building just completed, called the "Mills Building," adjacent to the War Department, for which I believe we are paying \$20,000 or \$24,000 a year.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senator from Iowa is mistaken about the War Department expenditure for rent. It is among the least amounts paid for that purpose.

Mr. ALLISON. The Navy Department has the building.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I will state that the estimate for rent for the War Department this year is \$16,800, but for the Navy Department it is \$24,500.

Mr. ALLISON. It is the Navy Department; I said the War Department. The Navy Department is paying \$24,000 for a new fire-proof building, which I believe has been rented for a long period of years; at least it was understood when the building was constructed that it was constructed at great expense and according to plans and suggestions made by the then Secretary of the Navy. Although the War Department pays only \$16,000 for rent, it is paying, I repeat, a large sum for rent. The State Department I think is not paying anything, although it may be paying some small sum for rent.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Practically nothing—\$720 a year.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, Mr. President, the bill provides that this new structure shall be occupied by the State Department, by the Department of Justice, and by the new Department of Commerce and Labor. I say, with due respect to Senators, I believe there are a great many people housed in this city in the public service who need, more than the State Department, additional room.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If the Senator will bear with me a minute—

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I fear he has not taken that accurate and careful survey of this subject which he usually takes of subjects. The Senator has just stated that we are paying rent for accommodating the War and Navy Departments outside.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If the State Department goes into the new Department building there will be space there to be occupied by either the War or the Navy Department, and to that extent it will reduce the outside rent.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that very well. That is a very excellent statement. The State Department portion of the building will accommodate a few people from the War Department, but it is so arranged that the great body of clerks will find very little space there for their use.

The Department of Justice is not a very large Department, but it is growing as other Departments are growing.

Then comes the Department of Commerce and Labor. Mr. President, that is a new Department, but it has assigned to it certain bureaus and offices that require a large number of clerks. Six hundred, I believe, alone are in the Census Bureau. The Census Bureau is now situated on the corner of Second and B streets, in a building which was rented by the former Director of the Census for three years, with the option of renting it for five years more. The Committee on Appropriations, regarding that rent as exorbitant, brought in an item in the appropriation bill some two years ago, or last year, providing for the purchase of that ground. It received practically no support from the Senate, for the reason that the location did not seem to be exactly suited to the people who were to be housed there. The result is, that of the \$316,000 rent we are paying, \$26,000 a year for three years goes for a building for the Census Office.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If the Senator will permit an interruption, that very situation is strongly illustrative of the statement I made as to the difficulty of accomplishing anything here in a sensible way for the public business. That building, as the Senator will recollect, was offered to the Government of the United States at \$250,000.

Mr. ALLISON. Two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senator urged that we should have authority upon an appropriation bill to purchase it, as I recollect it.

Mr. PERKINS. At \$225,000.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. At \$225,000. But somebody opposed it, and we are continuing to pay \$26,000, or more than 10 per cent upon the reasonable value of the property.

Mr. ALLISON. The amount is \$26,500, and we will be compelled to pay that during the continuance of the lease, whereas, if we had purchased it, we would have had more than half the rental involved in the purchase money.

Mr. GALLINGER. May I ask the Senator from Iowa who made that lease, leasing a building for the Government at 10 per cent of its value?

Mr. ALLISON. It was made, I think, by the Census Office, but they were under pressure at the time.

Mr. GALLINGER. I asked the question for the reason that what little investigation I have made leads me to the conclusion that the Government is paying in rents about twice what it ought to pay or what private individuals would pay; and there ought to be some way of finding relief from that oppression.

Mr. ALLISON. There ought to be. Now, before this building is constructed, I make the prediction that if we should pass this bill to-day, the Department of Commerce and Labor will want the whole of it.

Mr. HALE. Every part of it.

Mr. ALLISON. Every part of it. When we started on the Post-Office building at the corner of Eleventh street and Pennsylvania avenue, which has been so largely condemned to-day by Senators, it was supposed that we could pick out in many bureaus of the Treasury Department and put them in there in addition to providing for the whole postal service. Before the building was completed, or about the time it was completed, the Post-Office Department insisted upon using nearly the whole of it, and they did use all of it except the space set apart for the Sixth Auditor's room, and that will be out in a very few months if it has not been already removed. I think it is still in the building. The Post-Office Department requires every inch of the building for its purposes, and on the 1st of July the Department will have the exclusive use of it.

Mr. HALE. The Senator will bear in mind that the Post-Office Department is not only occupying the whole of this building, but is now paying large sums for rent of buildings outside.

Mr. ALLISON. I know it is.

Mr. HALE. There is only one Department there, occupying that immense building, and they want more room than they have. As the Senator says, you can not get three Departments in one building.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, if the Senator will allow me, I want to make a slight criticism upon the details of this bill in view of what I have already said. The bill, as I understand it, provides for two commissions, one commission composed of members of the House and Senate, the presiding officers of each House, and the chairmen of the Committees on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which are added three Secretaries—the Secretary of State, the Attorney-General, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. There is no place fixed for the construction of this building, as I understand it, but the commissioners are confined to three squares.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me.

Mr. ALLISON. Am I right about that?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. No. I had the bill amended this morning so as to give the commission the right to select a suitable location south of Pennsylvania avenue and east of Fifteenth street.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; in addition.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. In addition to the three sites mentioned by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. Well, that is an improvement, of course. I think myself that we ought to commence the construction of Department buildings, as far as we can do it properly, on the south side of Pennsylvania avenue. But the commission which selects the site, as I understand it, is functus officio when that is done.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The commission to select the site is composed of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Public Buildings and Grounds of the two Houses, and three Cabinet officers. The three Cabinet officers are to continue and construct the building after the site has been selected.

Mr. ALLISON. So I understand. Now, that is a very excellent commission, of course; but the three Cabinet officers are the commission who will report after the building is constructed, and they will have the power of saying who shall go into it, and they also have full direction in the construction as to the character of the building in every respect.

Whilst I have every confidence in every gentleman who occupies the position at this time, and probably will have such confidence in those who will occupy the position when the building shall be completed, which will be five or six years hence, it does seem to me that if we want to economize in the space of buildings and in the construction of buildings, so as not to have too great space, there ought to be somebody somewhere who would have some direction over the people who are to occupy this building. I speak of that because we had precisely this difficulty when the State, War, and Navy Department building was completed.

Mr. President, whilst I do not criticize this bill in any way, and I do not wish in any way to impede its passage, it seems to me that there are other things which are just as important as what is proposed here, and that as respects relief from the great rental we will find at the end of five years that we will be paying as much rent here as we are now paying, notwithstanding this construction.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa if there is not another objection, or at least another consideration, in regard to these three Cabinet officers? For instance, if they are to have a say so and controlling power in apportioning the space, naturally they will have a plan to suit their ideas of the needs and necessities of their respective Departments.

Mr. ALLISON. They should have, in a great measure.

Mr. TILLMAN. But if it were an independent building, where each one of them would have his own house and plan it to suit the necessities of the Department over which he presides, that would be one thing; but the difficulty of getting these three to agree upon any scheme of apportionment of this great structure that will not prove abortive I think is a very strong argument against the idea to have this palace, you might say, and then try to divide it up among three Departments, when by a reasonable expenditure of a couple of million dollars, say, or three million dollars for each Department, we can construct three buildings and improve the south side of the avenue by taking away the unsightly, miserable, measly houses that are along there now and substitute others. The land is cheaper there, and I would much prefer to see three buildings constructed, one for each of these Departments, than to see one building constructed and have the conflict of interests which would naturally arise from the effort to divide it in a reasonable way.

Mr. HALE. I will say that before the time comes to occupy this building, as the Senator from Iowa has intimated, a single one of these heads of Departments will claim that his Department needs the whole of the building, and we will be called upon, after having been led into a scheme which is to house three Departments, to construct two other Department buildings, when we can begin and take up all the property south of the avenue and erect for each Department a suitable, commodious building and let it be independent by itself. The experiment of putting several Departments into one building does not work. It never has and it never will. It has been just the contrary.

This building will cost before we get through with it \$12,000,000, I have no doubt, and for that sum you can build three good handsome structures south of the avenue, one for each of the Departments, and house every one of those Departments by itself.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Maine think a proposition to construct three Department buildings would get the sanction of Congress?

Mr. HALE. Well, I think we would do very much better and get on very much better, if the Senator would report from his committee in favor of one Department building at a time, and put one on each year.

Nobody raises issue with the Senator from Indiana about the desirability—it is not the necessity, as he says, but the desirability—of having these buildings for the Departments erected; but the Senator must bear in mind that we shall have to pay rent longer than he or I or any of us will live. The Departments grow all the time; and long before we had got the three Departments of the State, War, and Navy fairly housed in their present building, they were renting buildings outside; so that somebody, in rather a waggish way, when some one asked: "Why are you appropriating so much money for rents," some Senatorial wag, I do not remember who, said: "We are renting buildings outside, because we have just built one for these Departments. That is the reason."

The Senator will never see the day, we all agree, when that will not be the case, but we have got a chance now to develop what is a great plan. We can provide that that property, with all those buildings south of Pennsylvania avenue, shall be taken by the Government. Then we can from year to year erect everything except the building for the Supreme Court of the United States, which ought to be provided for early and ought to be in a building near here corresponding to the Congressional Library building; and all the courts, all tribunals, and all arbitration boards, etc., ought to be put into a building over there, corresponding in external architecture with the Congressional Library, so that we might get the Supreme Court out of the Capitol building and yet leave it near by, so that Senators and lawyers who come here can visit it, as the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] has said.

We have now got a chance to do these things. This scheme which has been proposed here does not in any way help either of those schemes. I should have been very much better content if the Senator had been willing to wait and report back a bill placing all the courts in a building near the Congressional Library building. I think that is more needed than is this. The Senator, however, did not do that; and it is not for me to say that he should. He is a good legislator, and has done what he thinks is the right thing. But the trouble with this scheme is that it commits us to

what puts off all these other things. I am sorry to have taken up so much time.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President—

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. With pleasure.

Mr. BAILEY. My attention was diverted for the moment, but I am told that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] understood me to say that Senators of longer service ought to be transferred down to the Senate Annex, and those of us of shorter service ought to be brought up here. Probably I was unfortunate in expressing myself. I did not say that ought to be the case. What I did say was that if that were done, we should soon have ample accommodations.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator from Indiana yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. With pleasure.

Mr. ALLISON. I may have been careless in my observations. I did not suppose for a moment that the Senator from Texas wished to reverse the custom of the Senate in that regard.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine assumes continually that the site for this building will be upon block 167 and not south of Pennsylvania avenue. He is unwarranted in that assumption. The commission is left free to select a site along the south side of Pennsylvania avenue in accordance with his wishes. It is perfectly obvious that we can not legislate upon this subject readily, and we have got to permit some discretion to a commission.

If one building is erected, the Senator says, for the three Departments, those Departments would soon outgrow it. That is true. Ultimately this building will be occupied entirely by one Department; ultimately the War, State, and Navy Department building will be occupied by either the War or the Navy Department. There is no doubt about that.

Now, specifying the purposes to which this proposed building is to be devoted is but a temporary expedient. We can not—I think I am confirmed by the good judgment of Senators here—we can not now enter upon the scheme of erecting a separate building for each Department. This proposed building will be larger than is necessary for the present requirements of the State Department and larger than will be necessary for accommodating the Department of Justice—I refer to the Executive Department—four years to come. There will be surplus of space after those two Departments are accommodated. That will not be lost. That will be turned over to the Department of Commerce and Labor. It will not be sufficient to provide entirely for the wants of that Department. Soon after this building is authorized, if it shall be authorized, the work of constructing other buildings should be entered upon.

Mr. President, if we were to provide for buildings in the District of Columbia, calling ultimately for the expenditure of \$15,000,000, it would be good business policy. Why? Because we are paying out in the District of Columbia now, in the way of rent, more than the interest upon \$15,000,000. It is simply a business proposition. Shall we divide over the question of whether there shall be one Department or two Departments? Shall we divide over the mere question of location? It seems to me we should not be in any wise unaccommodating. The committee reported in favor of three sites. There are Senators who say, "We wish this option enlarged and the commission given authority to select a site below Pennsylvania avenue." The committee said instantly, "Very well; we are willing to clothe this commission with that authority; we have no fixed immovable policy. What we want first and foremost is a building, and we want to enter upon the construction of it at the earliest possible day."

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question there?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. With pleasure.

Mr. BACON. The Senator says the paramount object is to secure a building. Would the Senator be willing to concede to those of us who are very much opposed to a building being located on block 167 that the building shall be located upon the south side of Pennsylvania avenue, east of Fifteenth street? If the Senator will do that, I myself will vote for the bill promptly, and I do not think there will be the slightest difficulty in getting it through.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. There are others who have a different view. I do not speak for them.

Mr. BACON. I simply asked the Senator if he would be willing to concede that much.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I would not at the present time. No; I would not.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator not believe that the purchase of a site or sites may be made to much better advantage

and the Government secure a much lower price if the commission on selection was not tied to any particular block or locality?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senator is perfectly right about that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. In case of going south of Pennsylvania avenue you will have the entire stretch from Fifteenth street to the Botanic Garden, not one site, but half a mile of territory.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I had not intended to advert to it, but there is very serious opposition to that part of the scheme. I had not intended to bring that into this debate, as it seemed irrelevant.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no disposition to do that; but the Senator will remember that the parking commission has suggested the very site that he has in his bill, and likewise made the suggestion concerning the south side of Pennsylvania avenue.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senator is perfectly right about that. I was not criticizing him in any degree. We go into that subject in the report, and the situation we contemplate is within the plans of the parking commission. We report that that is not to be adopted to further those plans, but its adoption does not stand in the way of their plans being adopted and carried out.

There is, I may suggest to the Senator in all frankness and candor, elsewhere, in very powerful quarters, a very strong opposition to carrying out the parking commission's plans south of Pennsylvania avenue, and when this bill goes elsewhere it will be antagonized more sharply because we vest in the commission the discretion to go south of Pennsylvania avenue than for anything else it contains. I am not opposed to the scheme of the parking commission—

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me just there—I know there is a prejudice against the park system, so called, but I have never seen in debate anywhere opposition manifested to utilizing the south side of Pennsylvania avenue for public purposes. Possibly the Senator has seen some debate that has escaped my attention, but I have been very diligent in reference to this matter. While I agree with him that there is very strong opposition to the adoption of the park system, so called, which, after all, was a mere suggestion to Congress—it amounts to nothing more than that—I have failed to see any opposition manifested to utilizing the south side of Pennsylvania avenue for public purposes.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I do not know whether there has been any public manifestation of opposition to this matter, but there is a common understanding that influential legislators in another branch are very much opposed to it. When Senator McMillan was here and occupied the chair at the head of the District of Columbia Committee, so well occupied now by my friend from New Hampshire, he proposed that the hall of records should be located in that quarter, and I was in entire sympathy with him; but opposition developed so that we found it inadvisable to limit the officers who were to select the site to that locality. But I do not know that opposition was manifested in public debate.

Mr. President, I do not care to prolong this matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. When I offered my amendment to the pending bill, I used the words "plans and specifications." I presumed "specifications" covered all the detailed drawings. That was understood by those of us who have not had the experience the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN] has had. I went to the Standard Dictionary and found "specifications" defined to be "a definite, particularized, and complete statement." That was my notion about the matter, but as a question has arisen I want to modify the amendment by having it read, "for plans, specifications, and detailed drawings."

I will allow the amendment to remain in that shape to be voted on. If the Senate wishes to adopt it, all right; if they wish to reject it, all right. I shall make no further modification.

I should like to have the Secretary state the amendment from the desk, so that I may see that he has it correctly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, line 5, after the word "architects," it is proposed to strike out the word "to" and insert the following:

The successful architect shall receive compensation in full for plans, specifications, and detailed drawings not to exceed 2½ per cent of the total cost of said building, and shall also.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. As the report of the committee is a substitute for the original bill, I ask that the amendment may be considered as if it were the original bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana asks that, as the bill reported by the committee is a substitute, it may be treated as the original bill for the purpose of amendment. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

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

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If the Senator from Illinois will allow me—his motion, of course, if it prevails, will render it impossible

to vote upon this bill to-night—I want to ask if it is not possible to agree to vote upon the bill Wednesday, say before the close of Wednesday's session?

Mr. HALE. Wednesday has been assigned.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Wednesday has been assigned?

Mr. LODGE. It has been assigned to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], with a bill about the regulation of milk.

Mr. GALLINGER. That measure will be discussed.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Then, if Wednesday is occupied, and if Thursday is also occupied, I ask unanimous consent that we vote on the bill on Friday.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know whether other Senators wish to speak on this bill, but I think before we go any further we ought to have a print of the bill, so that we may know what it is. Nobody knows what it is now.

I do not believe you can fix any time for voting on this bill. I do not believe the bill is so important that it is necessary to fix a time.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. It is not any more important than hundreds of other bills, but the Senate has already spent a great deal of time in its consideration, and that should not be wasted.

Mr. TELLER. I do not think the Senate has spent as much time on this bill as it ought to spend on it before it commits itself to the system to which it is proposed to commit the Senate by this bill. I think the bill ought to be discussed. I think the beauty of this city depends somewhat upon the passage or nonpassage of this bill. I confess that I am not a friend of the bill.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I did not charge the Senator with being its friend.

Mr. TELLER. If it means what I think it means, it ought not to pass, not simply because of the cost, but because it will not do for the city what we might do for it in expending this amount of money. So I do not think it is worth while to try to-night to get an agreement to vote. That can be done when the bill has been more thoroughly discussed.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Then I shall move to take up the bill on next Friday after the routine morning business, if there is no earlier opportunity to do so.

Mr. CULLOM. I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to ask to have an amendment to the bill printed, so that it may be before the Senate. I will send this print to the desk in a moment. I will suggest it so that it may be taken down correctly. In line 8, page 4, after the word "otherwise," I move to strike out all down to and including the word "Columbia," in line 12, and to insert:

A suitable site on the south side of Pennsylvania avenue between the Capitol and the Treasury.

I will send the bill up, so that the clerks can get it correctly and have it properly printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed.

HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO SENATE PENSION BILLS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the following Senate pension bills:

A bill (S. 3274) granting an increase of pension to Jane I. Long; and

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

Mr. PATTERSON. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the respective bills and ask for a conference with the House on the bills and amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. PATTERSON were appointed.

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE PENSION BILLS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the following House pension bills, and asking for a conference with the Senate thereon:

A bill (H. R. 3032) granting an increase of pension to William Pittenger;

A bill (H. R. 2923) granting an increase of pension to John G. Fairchild;

A bill (H. R. 2920) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Huffman;

A bill (H. R. 2809) granting an increase of pension to John Watt;

A bill (H. R. 2477) granting an increase of pension to Frank J. McLaughlin;

A bill (H. R. 4136) granting an increase of pension to Caleb Arnett;

A bill (H. R. 4351) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hinkle;

A bill (H. R. 4526) granting an increase of pension to William J. Shepard;

A bill (H. R. 5367) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Moore;

A bill (H. R. 5555) granting an increase of pension to James R. Hauptly;

A bill (H. R. 5865) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Harlan;

A bill (H. R. 6025) granting an increase of pension to John Herzog;

A bill (H. R. 6426) granting an increase of pension to David Z. Beidler;

A bill (H. R. 6705) granting an increase of pension to Edwin A. Forman;

A bill (H. R. 8376) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan J. Smith;

A bill (H. R. 8058) granting an increase of pension to William M. Underhill; and

A bill (H. R. 9583) granting an increase of pension to James H. Hargis.

Mr. PATTERSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments to each of those bills disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agree to the conferences asked for by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. PATTERSON were appointed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 1, 1904, at 12 o'clock meridian.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn Monday, February 29, 1904.

John F. Jewell, of Illinois, and William Ross Davis, of Ohio, to be consuls of the United States, respectively, at Alexandretta, Turkey, and Martinique, West Indies.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 29, 1904.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be captains.

First Lieut. George J. Holden, Tenth Infantry, December 10, 1903, vice Taggart, Sixth Infantry, detailed as quartermaster.

First Lieut. Charles F. Bates, Twenty-fifth Infantry, December 17, 1903, vice Benjamin, Twenty-seventh Infantry, deceased.

First Lieut. Arthur Cranston, Seventeenth Infantry, December 26, 1903, vice Schoeffel, Sixteenth Infantry, appointed judge-advocate.

First Lieut. John J. Toffey, jr., Fourth Infantry, January 2, 1904, vice Grisard, Seventh Infantry, appointed judge-advocate.

Ordnance Department.

Capt. William W. Gibson, Ordnance Department, to be major, January 21, 1904, vice Lyle, promoted.

First Lieut. Edwin D. Bricker, Ordnance Department, to be captain, January 21, 1904, vice Gibson, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander James R. Selfridge to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of February, 1904, vice Capt. Frederic Singer, an additional number in grade.

Lieut. Commander Charles Laird to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of February, 1904, vice Commander Alexander Sharp, an additional number in grade.

Ensign Charles H. Fisher to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 28th day of January, 1904, upon the completion of three years' service in his present grade.

Lieut. Commander William G. Cutler to be a commander in the Navy, from the 31st day of December, 1903, vice Commander James D. Adams, promoted.

Capt. Caspar F. Goodrich to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 17th day of February, 1904, vice Rear-Admiral Charles S. Cotton, retired.

APPOINTMENT IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Lauren S. Willis, a citizen of Vermont, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 23d day of February, 1904, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

CHAIRMAN OF ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION.

Rear-Admiral John G. Walker, United States Navy, retired, of the District of Columbia, to be chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission, to fill an original vacancy.

MEMBERS OF THE ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION.

Maj. Gen. George W. Davis, United States Army, retired, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, to fill an original vacancy.

William Barclay Parsons, of New York, to be a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, to fill an original vacancy.

William H. Burr, of New York, to be a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, to fill an original vacancy.

Benjamin M. Harrod, of Louisiana, to be a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, to fill an original vacancy.

Carl Ewald Grunsky, of California, to be a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, to fill an original vacancy.

Frank J. Hecker, of Michigan, to be a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, to fill an original vacancy.

INDIAN AGENT.

Rush J. Taylor, of Castlewood, S. Dak., to be agent for the Indians of the Yankton Agency, in South Dakota.

J. Blair Shoefeld, of Wyoming, to be agent for the Indians of the Union Agency, in the Indian Territory, his term having expired January 18, 1904. (Reappointment.)

Lieut. Col. James F. Randlett, United States Army, retired, of California, to be agent for the Indians of the Kiowa Agency, in Oklahoma, his term having expired February 2, 1904. (Reappointment.)

MARSHAL.

Victor Loisel, of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice Charles Fontelieu, deceased.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Joseph T. Bridges, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at Roseburg, Oreg., his term having expired June 2, 1903. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

James H. Booth, of Oregon, to be receiver of public moneys at Roseburg, Oreg., his term having expired June 2, 1903. (Reappointment.)

Frank M. Foote, of Wyoming, to be receiver of public moneys at Evanston, Wyo., his term having expired December 19, 1903. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

William M. Newell to be postmaster at Mesa, in the county of Maricopa and Territory of Arizona, in place of William M. Newell. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1904.

ARKANSAS.

Omar N. Hawkins to be postmaster at Morrilton, in the county of Conway and State of Arkansas, in place of Thomas D. Hawkins, deceased.

Charles L. Jones to be postmaster at Junction, in the county of Union and State of Arkansas, in place of Edward S. Parnell, resigned.

COLORADO.

Preston Holbrook to be postmaster at Blackhawk, in the county of Gilpin and State of Colorado, in place of Preston Holbrook. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1904.

ILLINOIS.

Robert B. Thomas to be postmaster at Lacon, in the county of Marshall and State of Illinois, in place of Robert B. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

IOWA.

William A. Grummon to be postmaster at Rockwell, in the county of Cerro Gordo and State of Iowa, in place of William A. Grummon. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1904.

A. M. Loomis to be postmaster at Wyoming, in the county of Jones and State of Iowa. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

KENTUCKY.

Thomas B. Kirkpatrick to be postmaster at Hodgenville, late Hodgenville, in the county of Larue and State of Kentucky. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John F. Mitchell to be postmaster at North Grafton, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in place of John F. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1904.

Lyman D. Thurston to be postmaster at Leicester, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in place of Lyman D. Thurston. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1904.

MICHIGAN.

Zebedee G. Culver to be postmaster at Reading, in the county of Hillsdale and State of Michigan, in place of Zebedee G. Culver. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1904.

Charles Quick to be postmaster at Lowell, in the county of Kent and State of Michigan, in the place of Charles Quick. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

MINNESOTA.

William Cordiner to be postmaster at Princeton, in the county of Millelacs and State of Minnesota, in place of William Cordiner. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1904.

MISSOURI.

Milton J. Hudson to be postmaster at Hale, in the county of Carroll and State of Missouri. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

William G. Kitchen to be postmaster at Bloomfield, in the county of Stoddard and State of Missouri, in place of William G. Kitchen. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1904.

NEBRASKA.

Theodore A. Gierens to be postmaster at Arlington, in the county of Washington and State of Nebraska. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

NEW YORK.

Charles T. Jackson to be postmaster at Goshen, in the county of Orange and State of New York, in place of Charles T. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expires March 6, 1904.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Richard M. Norment to be postmaster at Lumberton, in the county of Robeson and State of North Carolina, in place of Richard M. Norment. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1904.

OHIO.

Charles H. Clark to be postmaster at Mount Sterling, in the county of Madison and State of Ohio, in place of Edgar C. Hornbeck. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1903.

OKLAHOMA.

G. A. Hall to be postmaster at Okarche, in the county of Canadian and Territory of Oklahoma, in place of Ellery A. Humphrey, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John W. Chamberlain to be postmaster at Wyalusing, in the county of Bradford and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Lotta J. Kintner. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1904.

Cyrus E. Hipple to be postmaster at Conshohocken, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Cyrus E. Hipple. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1904.

Sylvester C. Stout to be postmaster at Glenside, in county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential July 1, 1903.

TEXAS.

William Reese to be postmaster at Floresville, in the county of Wilson and State of Texas, in place of Paul Neubauer. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1903.

WASHINGTON.

James Lane to be postmaster at Roslyn, in the county of Kittitas and State of Washington, in place of James Lane. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1904.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 29, 1904.

POSTMASTERS.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

William Noble to be postmaster at South McAlester, in the Choctaw Nation, Indian Territory.

MISSOURI.

Benjamin C. Klusmeier to be postmaster at La Grange, in the county of Lewis and State of Missouri.

Lauriston H. Condit to be postmaster at Canton, in the county of Lewis and State of Missouri.

NEBRASKA.

David S. Beynon to be postmaster at Burwell, in the county of Garfield and State of Nebraska.

NORTH CAROLINA.

J. Sanford Patterson to be postmaster at Spray, in the county of Rockingham and State of North Carolina.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Albert Albrecht to be postmaster at Anamoose, in the county of McHenry and State of North Dakota.

OHIO.

Charles E. Frame to be postmaster at West Union, in the county of Adams and State of Ohio.

William M. Evans to be postmaster at Hubbard, in the county of Trumbull and State of Ohio.

PENNSYLVANIA.

James H. Morrison to be postmaster at Marienville, in the county of Forest and State of Pennsylvania.

W. H. Longwell to be postmaster at Oil City, in the county of Venango and State of Pennsylvania.

WASHINGTON.

George W. Edgerton to be postmaster at Puyallup, in the county of Pierce and State of Washington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, February 29, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 27, 1904, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

By direction of the Speaker, the credentials of Hon. George A. Castor, Member-elect from the Third Congressional district of Pennsylvania, were read by the Clerk.

Mr. Castor appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office prescribed by law.

THOMAS JOYCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 8850) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Joyce, with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

HARRY HALLER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 6582) granting an increase of pension to Harry Haller, with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendment and request a conference.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed the following as conferees on the part of the House: Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama.

EMPLOYMENT OF DOCKET CLERK.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I present the following privileged resolution and report, which I will send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution No. 79.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to employ an additional clerk as calendar and docket clerk, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided for, at the rate of \$2,500 per year.

Amended so as to read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to employ a docket clerk for the purpose of tracing legislation, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided for, at the rate of \$2,000 per year, from and after January 4, 1904.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken; and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The question was taken; and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

RELIEF OF BATH IRON WORKS AND OTHERS.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Claims has had before it, among other bills, the bill (H. R. 10346) for the relief of the Bath Iron Works and others. The parties for whom this bill is sought to be a relief are some dozen different contractors and manufacturers who contracted to build a number of torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers. The bill seeks to give to these manufacturers the difference between the contract price and the actual cost of these boats. The contention of the claimants is that they lost money on the contracts.

The House committee has not reached any conclusion upon the

merits of the bill, but has had a hearing occupying two full days. The bill involves a large sum of money, something a little less than \$2,000,000. Under these circumstances I have come into the House on behalf of the Committee on Claims for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to have the report of this hearing printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to have the hearings before this committee on the bill (H. R. 10346) for the relief of the Bath Iron Works and others printed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9480) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CULLOM, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. TELLER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 623. An act for the relief of Henry O. Bassett, heir of Henry Opeman Bassett, deceased.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 12833) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes.

Mr. MUDD. I desire to reserve points of order on this bill.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. They have been reserved.

The SPEAKER. Points of order have already been reserved.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Pending my motion, I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PIERCE] whether he has any suggestion to make as to the duration of the general debate on this bill?

Mr. PIERCE. I suggest that the matter be permitted to run along; and when the debate has proceeded somewhat, we can then, if necessary, agree upon a time for closing it.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. That suggestion is satisfactory to me.

The motion of Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union (Mr. LAWRENCE in the chair), and proceeded to the consideration of the bill H. R. 12833, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The Clerk was proceeding to read the bill, when

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota said: I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

There was no objection; and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been constructed with two ideas in view: First, the recognition of the fact that the District of Columbia contains the capital of the United States, in which all of the people of the United States are interested and in which they take a natural and proper pride; and, second, the recognition of the necessity for reasonable care and prudence in the expenditure of public money.

The appropriations carried in this bill, exclusive of the appropriations for the water department, which are payable out of the income of that department, are based upon estimates of \$12,884,825. This bill carries appropriations amounting to \$10,059,071, being \$2,825,754 less than the estimates.

The amount appropriated for expenses of the District of Columbia for the current year is \$8,753,691. Hence this bill carries \$1,305,380 more than the appropriations for the current year. But this sum is made up almost entirely by two items—namely, \$968,155 of an increase for the completion of the filtration plant and \$300,000 to carry on the work connected with the building of the new terminal railway station.

Of the \$10,059,071 appropriated in this bill, exclusive of the appropriation for the water department, the amount payable from the Treasury of the United States is \$5,038,285.50; the amount payable from the revenues of the District of Columbia is \$5,030,785.50. This covers \$2,500 which, under the highway act, is payable wholly out of the revenues of the District.

In addition to the amount just named, there is carried in the legislative bill, chargeable to the District of Columbia, the sum of \$90,043. Provision is also made for the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River, at an expense of \$996,000, for which about \$250,000 will be required from the District funds the coming year.

The total revenues of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1905 are estimated at \$4,730,935.10.

It will thus be seen that the amount appropriated in this bill payable out of the District revenues exceeds those revenues by about \$830,000. To meet this excess of expenditure provision is made in section 3 of the bill for advances from the Treasury corresponding with those heretofore made.

There have been a few additional offices provided, all of them being deemed necessary. In the first place, the school system has called for an addition of forty-five teachers. There has also been an addition to the fire department. The aggregate of additional employees numbers seventy-six.

There have been some increases of salaries, notably among those enjoying the smaller salaries. The minimum salary of teachers in the public schools of Washington has been \$450 per year. That minimum has been raised in this bill to \$500 per year. There has been in the police department a minimum salary of \$720. That is now raised to \$900. There has also been an increase in the salaries of those men connected with the fire department who are receiving the smallest pay. In brief, this statement accounts for practically all the increased salaries and additional offices.

There are in this bill several provisions which might be construed as being legislation and therefore perhaps subject to a point of order. But every one of them has a purpose relevant to this bill; and I trust that if a point of order is raised by anyone, it will be reserved in order that explanation may be made, because I think with explanation the point of order will be withheld.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman a question. I should like to ask if any provision is made for sewers in that region of the city about Woodley Inn?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in general answer to the gentleman from New York, I would say that our plan in connection with the extension of sewers has been to extend now the trunk lines for the general sewage-disposal system. As perhaps most of the members of the committee know, the sewage of Washington now finds its outlet in front of the city. That has not been regarded as healthful. The purpose is to collect it all into a great trunk sewer, carry it under the Eastern Branch, and then by a siphon to dispose of it 2 miles below the mouth of the Eastern Branch, so that none of this foulness shall enter the Potomac in front of the city. The carrying on of the enterprise referred to—that is, the general sewage-disposal system and the trunk sewers connected with it—is taking so much money that there is no sewer construction being done in the section of the city referred to by the gentleman. Later on, when this general sewer system has been worked out, we hope to reach that part of the city to which he refers.

Mr. PAYNE. When will that hope probably be realized?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but I should say it will be when we are thoroughly convinced that it is a wise expenditure of public money to take up that particular part of the sewerage system.

Mr. PAYNE. And in the meantime those people up there will have to get along without sewers?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. In the meantime they will have to do as other people have to do who go out to the suburbs. They get the benefit of cheap land on which to build their homes and have low taxation, and must be satisfied to do without some of the things enjoyed by those who live on higher priced land and pay higher taxes.

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

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to inquire what has been done and what is now being done upon the filtration plant and how soon that is expected to be completed?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Kansas, I would say that the amount appropriated for the filtration plant for the current year was \$600,000. Colonel Miller, the officer of the War Department in charge of this water system, assured us that if we would give him for the coming year the full amount estimated to be necessary to complete the filtration plant—in round numbers, \$1,600,000—he would have that filtration plant completed on the 1st day of December of this year, so that when we return next fall we can both drink and wash in clean water.

Mr. PAYNE. Did you make the appropriation asked for?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. We have made the appropriation, and that accounts, in large part, for the size of this bill. There is an additional million dollars in that one item, and that accounts for a large part of the increase that the bill carries.

Mr. SCOTT. Is the filtration plant to be located up near the source of the supply?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. It is located out near the Catholic University and the Soldiers' Home.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] such time as he desires.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time, when we are considering the annual District of Columbia appropriation bill, to submit a few remarks, generally, upon our national capital, her government and development. I believe that in connection with the many plans for the beautifying of Washington that have been urged upon the attention of Congress and the press and the people within the past few years, some of which are provided for in this bill, it may be interesting and profitable to know something more than the facts and figures which this bill carries.

For a very few moments that I shall occupy your attention I desire to give something of the original plan for the completed Washington, together with some of the difficulties that have stood in the way of its consummation. I want, incidentally, to submit something in a very general way of the government of the District and how and whence it comes about. It is an unique government, nothing like it anywhere, and yet every citizen of the Republic is proud to believe that his capital is the best-governed city in the world.

It was a risky statement by some one that "more people have ears to be tickled than understandings to judge." But to this he might have added that there were more eyes to be feasted than dispositions to know.

The thought suggests itself that of the many Americans who tour Europe and the world how few do know how their own capital is governed. Then, too, of the many thousands of people who annually visit Washington and feast upon the scenes of art and industry, from the great galleries to the magnificent panorama of her streets and avenues, and the great public and private institutions, how few ever inquire into the machinery that makes Washington the beautiful city it is. How few ever stop to think that in all the world besides there is not another city governed just like Washington. Here is food for much reflection; here is reason for much speculation upon the power to abandon "inherent rights" with the "consent of the governed."

Admiring multitudes have stood in awe before the statues of marble and bronze to the heroes of the Republic; they climb the shaft towering over them all, erected to the memory of the Father of his Country; they explore the city to its farthest corners, for every step is filled with historic recollections; they are whirled through miles of streets paved with asphaltum and admire their width, and their length, and their ingenious figure; they applaud the parks and the pleasure resorts; yet, with it all, few ever stop to ask, How is this all brought about—what is it that makes it possible? Whence comes the treasure to care for this enormous expense? And, if some one were to tell them that they had helped to elect a member of the common council of this beautiful capital city there would be an air of incredulity approaching disbelief. Nevertheless, such is the case. Their vote may have been cast in Maine or in California, in Texas or in Florida, yet every vote for a Member of Congress was a vote for a member of the common council of Washington. Congress is the lawmaking power of the national capital in exactly the same capacity as the board of aldermen is for New York City, but with unlimited prerogatives and unlimited power. That is, there is no law of superior importance above Congress that would compare with the State statutes that control the council of an ordinary city.

Perhaps this may seem new to somebody, but it is only the refreshing of a treacherous memory, for everybody has read in that article of the United States Constitution in which is enumerated the powers of Congress—

Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation on all questions whatsoever over such district, not exceeding 10 miles square, as may by the cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States.

Everybody who has ever read the Constitution has once known this fact, and it only needs to be suggested for him to call it vividly to mind. Perhaps, however, he has never thought, and probably has never asked himself how that clause in the Constitution is executed. Or perhaps he may think it has fallen by the wayside in its literality, supplanted by some substituted form under our "elastic Constitution," by man's ingenuity in making the "old document" adjustable to modern ideas.

It is safe to say that comparatively few people know how this clause is carried out, or whether it is even pretended to be carried out, and if so, to what extent. Thus, I say, few people understand that within our own confines, at the very heart of the nation, at our own capital, there is a district of 70 square miles, inhabited by over 800,000 of God's creatures, intelligent, educated, civilized, Christianized, who not only have no voice in the affairs of the nation, but indeed exercise no control whatsoever over their own local government. This is the condition in Washington. Congress does the legislating for the District of Columbia. It not only provides the form of government for the District, but directs the execution of that form of government. It also makes its laws, both civil and criminal, it makes the rules

of evidence for the courts, names the punishment for criminals, and provides laws regulating juries.

In short, Congress, without let or hindrance, with no other restraint than the one clause in the Constitution just quoted, is the source of all government in the District of Columbia. Congress passes upon and allows every dollar of money expended in the District, directs and limits improvements, scrutinizes and fixes the salary of every clerk in the city offices. It provides a water system, a police force, and a fire department. It orders the streets paved and repaired, cares for the parks, and carries away the garbage. In short, the Congress of the United States, constituted at present of 386 members in the House of Representatives and 90 in the Senate, representing forty-five States, is the common council of Washington, with supreme power and authority to legislate for it. Thus it may be said that this particular clause in the Constitution is interpreted literally and is executed as it is interpreted.

It should also be said that under the control of Congress Washington has developed from a neighborhood of suburban fringes of near-by villages, surrounded by the most inauspicious conditions, to that of a beautiful city. Swamps have been drained, forests have been removed, rivers have been bridged, canyons have been filled, and rocks have been blasted out in making way for the beautifully paved and parked capital city that Washington has grown to be. And let me say that during all of that time the symmetrical plan which the Father of his Country prided himself so much in and spent so much time in perfecting has been carried out. To many its consummation has seemed slow. There have always been those who chafed under the apparent lethargy in the building up of Washington, and at times the enormous cost has almost persuaded those in control of affairs that the plan was too big and that the design of the draftsman was too expensive of execution. But, to the credit of all of them, better judgment has always prevailed, charity and patience on the one hand has met apprehension and conservatism on the other, and the symmetry of the plans of Washington have never been interfered with.

To George Washington belongs the credit of most of the beauties of plan of the capital city, for it was his farseeing eye that looked clear in advance of anything then dreamed of by most people and to where we have scarcely yet reached.

To George Washington, the Father of his Country, the designer of her machinery of government, the savior of her liberties, it was appropriate likewise that the plan for her capital should be entrusted when she was ready to have one. In him then was reposed the trust of selecting the exact location of the capital city. For several years the headquarters of the nation had been migratory. It had been going from one city to another, according to the patriotic manipulations of the "logrollers" in Congress, or other more or less worthy motives, until most men came to believe that if the nation was to endure and perpetuate its blessings and beauties, it must have a permanent, fixed seat of government; that if it was to convince the skeptical of its future stability, it must at least be settled and determined within itself.

Some time was taken up in controversy as to just where the capital was to be located. The South very naturally wanted it in the Southern States, and the North wanted it in the Northern States, and every State wanted it in that particular State. The compromise, so well known to all men, was finally made that the Southern States were to be permitted to have the capital located on the Potomac River, and the Northern States, in consideration of permitting them to have it without further trouble, were to have assumed certain of their State obligations incurred in Revolutionary war times. Thus the location of the capital, which threatened at times the disruption of the Union, was finally adjusted as the result of a barter of the "location" for the "assumption of State debts." This only shows that those old philosophers were no less alive to home interests than men of more modern times, and that "Pro bono publico" is sometimes a local question.

Washington was then given authority to select the site for the Federal city. In this he was limited to 100 miles along the Potomac River, running from somewhere about Cumberland, Md., to Jones Point, down just below Alexandria. His experience as a surveyor preeminently qualified him for the undertaking, while his proverbial justness to all men and to all things and under all conditions made him the unanimous choice for this important yet laborious undertaking.

How fitting that George Washington should select the site of the permanent abiding place of the nation's capital, and that the city should bear his name, to stand throughout the life of the nation a growing monument to the grandeur of the achievements of his life. He selected, in accordance with the law, a place 10 miles square, located on the Potomac River, about two-thirds of it north of the river, in Maryland, and the rest of it south of the river, in Virginia. The lateral lines of the square do not extend due east, west, north, and south, but in a northeasterly, north-

westerly, etc., direction, giving it such a shape that one corner is at the farthest northern point and its opposite diagonal corner is the farthest southern point. This makes it somewhat of a diamond shape as it appears on the map with its corners toward the four points of the compass.

In 1846 that part selected west of the Potomac River and in the State of Virginia was ceded to that State, and the District of Columbia now constitutes about 70 square miles east of the west bank of the Potomac River.

Washington, then, with the assistance of L'Enfant, proceeded to lay out the city of Washington. He made the streets to run north, south, east, and west, but across them, diagonally northeast and southwest, and northwest and southeast, he ran avenues. All of these thoroughfares he made of extraordinary width. All the city was to be reckoned from the Capitol. The streets are numbered from the Capitol east and west and lettered from north to south. From the Capitol these streets and avenues radiate as the spokes from the hub of a great wheel. Between the Capitol on one hill and the White House on another hill, about a mile and a half away, he ran Pennsylvania avenue, familiar, of course, to everyone who has ever visited Washington. It was down this thoroughfare, then little more than a cow path through a jungle of smartweeds, that the British went when they destroyed the Capitol in 1812. It was down this historic old street that the "Boys of '61" rushed to the defense of the nation, and where they again marched through the mud at the close of four years of fighting in their last "Grand Review." Down this thoroughfare went Thomas Jefferson on horseback unattended to take the oath of office, and down it also the inaugural parade of every President has led.

The plan which George Washington laid out was, until the close of the civil war, looked upon by many as visionary. It contemplated an enormous expense and a great city to sustain it or need it. The city was unpromising, although perhaps for this she was not to blame. The uncertainty of the permanency of the capital until after the civil war gave little heart to the residents to improve Washington. But after Appomattox all uncertainty was removed. Washington was to continue forever the seat of government of the American Republic. To be sure, there was no public edict to this effect, as indeed there could be none, but the verdict was rendered in two millions of hearts and minds in the last "Grand Review." Four years of warfare had more intimately acquainted the people with the historic significance of Washington. Its defense and preservation by the heroes in blue had endeared it to every Northern soldier, and the verdict was sealed, silently but effectually, and from that time all effort to remove it has ceased.

In 1871 Congress established a government for the District, giving it a governor and Delegates in Congress and providing for popular elections. At this time and under the impetus of this first real attention that Congress had given to the development of the District the first move of any consequence for the improvement of the city was made. Several millions of dollars (probably about thirty millions) were expended by the administration of affairs in opening up the streets and in extending the city. But popular government soon demonstrated itself to be a failure, at least the people of the District evidently thought so, for they united in a request to Congress in 1874 to establish a government other than one dependent upon elective franchise of the people of the District.

This may be the first time that people have asked that their consent be taken away from them in governmental affairs. Accordingly the commissioner system was established in 1874, similar in many respects to what pertains now, and in 1878 the present government of the District was given by Congress. Under this government, known as "the commissioner system," exemplified and perfected from that of 1874 by the act of 1878, the beautiful Washington of to-day has grown. By this arrangement the people of the District gave up their right of representation in Congress and their right of franchise. Congress, on the other hand, agreed to assume one-half of the expense of operating the city in the future. By the provisions of that government the President appoints two Commissioners, residents of the District, who, together with a member of the Engineer Corps of the United States Army, detailed by the President, constitute the Board of Commissioners, with executive powers in administering the affairs of the District in accordance with the laws that Congress provides.

This government has existed since 1878 and is the most satisfactory to the people of the District of Columbia and to Congress of any that has been tried. The Commissioners, through offices created and provided for by Congress in their general laws, levy and collect taxes of the people of the District. The taxes are paid into the Treasury of the United States and are there kept in a separate fund for the District of Columbia. They are then all paid out under the appropriation bills passed by Congress. By the terms of the act of 1878 of every public expense Congress ap-

propriates 50 per cent from the District fund and the other half from the United States fund. In short, it may be stated as practically correct that the United States pays one-half of the cost of the maintenance and running of the District of Columbia, Washington, and Georgetown, and the people of the District pay the other half.

There are two reasons perhaps most potent for this arrangement. First, the United States is a very large property owner in the District and city, and of course Government property is not taxable. The amount of this property is constantly increasing. Every year additional land is being purchased and new buildings are being erected. When property is changed from private to public ownership, and consequently withdrawn from the available taxable property, the share of the burden as borne by this property is then shifted to the remaining property of the District under private ownership. But a second reason for the United States bearing one-half of the whole burden which might not appear to the casual observer, and which perhaps is the most potent, is that unusual demands are made for the improvement and beautifying and control of Washington. It is the capital city of 80,000,000 people and of the most prosperous nation on earth. Every individual feels a proprietary pride in his capital and wants it in keeping with the mighty, progressive nation that we are. The Constitution placed control where it is so that the whole people, through Congress, could have their capital just as they wanted it. It is not thought proper that the taxpayers of a single city should be called upon to pay for the ideals of the people in this particular. They could not do it. It would confiscate property to enforce it; hence the amicable arrangement and the "half-and-half" plan.

Congress exercises the full power reposed in it by the Constitution in the legislation for and the control of the District of Columbia. In both the Senate and House of Representatives there are committees on the District of Columbia, to which all matters of legislation are referred. The appropriations of funds, of course, go to the Committee on Appropriations.

This appropriation bill that we now present is the annual budget of the District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905. It is made in accordance with the laws that I have heretofore mentioned. The committee have given it very careful consideration, and we believe it is as nearly perfect as could be made. As it shall be read item by item and paragraph by paragraph opportunity will be given for every Member of the House to understand every detail and to criticize it and to amend it if they so choose. [Loud applause.]

Mr. PIERCE. I yield one hour, or so much thereof as he may desire, to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, four or five days ago the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] consumed about an hour of the time of this House in undertaking to tell us what the Democratic party stands for. I should be glad to have the gentleman from Connecticut present.

Mr. BENTON. He is here.

Mr. GILBERT. I propose to take so much of the hour now following as may be necessary to point out what the Republican party is and what it stands for, and, like the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], I shall decline to be interrupted until I shall have concluded what I have prepared to say, and then I shall be very glad to attempt to answer any reasonable questions that may be propounded.

The Republican party was at the outset not a political organization at all. It was a party of wild-eyed religious fanatics, who despised the Constitution and evaded the laws. They emphasized certain glittering generalities in the Declaration of Independence and denounced the express provisions of the Constitution of the United States. They were almost as frenzied and unreasoning in their determination to free the negroes and give them political and social equality as were the Crusaders in their determination to rescue the Holy Sepulcher from the hands of the Moslem.

The first Republican platform, adopted in 1856, upon which Frémont was nominated for the Presidency, demanded the immediate admission of Kansas as a State of the Union. Kansas then had a sparse population of only a few thousand, spreading over a vast wilderness. Now, when three great Territories with a half million of people each demand admission as States, this party continues in its platforms to promise admission and continues to violate the promise. For example, the platform you adopted in 1892 contained, among other things, this promise to the American people:

We favor the admission of the remaining Territories at the earliest practicable day, having due regard to the interest of the people of the Territories and of the United States.

You repeated this promise in 1896, and then again in the platform of 1900 you proclaimed:

We favor home rule for and the early admission to statehood of the Territories of New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma.

How many more times are you going to write these falsehoods in your platforms and how many more years will these people in the Territories be denied the right of local self-government? Has your fondness for holding crown colonies in the Orient tempted you to hold these neighbors and kindred of our own country in subjection also? Do the people who inhabit the poor hillsides of New England dread to see the seat of political empire drift away to the South and West?

You wanted Kansas to come in immediately because she would have strengthened your political power. You oppose the admission of these three great Territories because you fear six more Democratic Senators and quite an additional number of Democratic Congressmen. This is the state of the Union upon that matter. And speaking of promises in the Republican national platforms which have never been redeemed, it would afford amusement, if the matter were not so serious and important, to review this highway leading to your political perdition next November, paved with good resolutions, and see how it is strewn with wrecks and betrayals of the people's confidence. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In the platform of 1868 this Republican party announced that suffrage in all the loyal States properly belonged to the people of those States, but that in the disloyal States it was a matter under the control of Congress. This absurd doctrine was carried out with all its hideous enormity in the reconstruction of the South. No civilized people in modern times, though subjugated by war, were ever subjected to more outrage and cruelty by a conquering enemy than were the people of the Southern States at the close of the war. Not content with disfranchising the white people, they placed the ballot into the hands of the ignorant and illiterate negroes, who were fresh from the cornfields and cotton plantations, and these negroes were guided and controlled by unscrupulous carpetbaggers from the North.

These illiterate negroes mounted the bench as judges of the courts. They filled the halls of the State legislatures and inaugurated such a carnival of crime and corruption as were hideous to contemplate. Such pollution of society ensued, such misery followed, as no other people endured. Yes, these issues are dead; but these historical facts are not, and should not be forgotten. If, when England conquered the Republic of South Africa, she had disfranchised the white population of those countries and had placed the right to vote exclusively in the hands of the negro slaves, the case would still not have been as great an outrage as was heaped upon the southern people of our own land. The outrage would not have been so great, because negro slaves of South Africa were as intelligent as the negro slaves of the Southern States, whereas the Boers of South Africa were a different race of people from the English conquerors. They were strangers, separated by wide oceans, speaking a different tongue, with different manners and customs; while the southern white people were of the same blood, descended from the same sires, speaking the same language, and inheriting the same laws, literature, and traditions as the people of the North.

The day is long in the life of a people, but time will hardly efface from our memories the needless cruelties and frightful devastations that were visited even upon the smoking ruins of the fairest of all the lands of the world.

Coming now to the platform of 1872—I want to try and hasten on to get down to some of these modern issues [applause], so that I can entertain the young gentleman from Minnesota, who hopes to laugh and giggle the doctrines of Jefferson and Jackson out of the country, and I want to get down to the days that are in the recollection of my distinguished friend from Connecticut.

In the platform of 1872 this party declared this astounding statement:

It suppressed a gigantic rebellion, emancipating four million of slaves, decreeing the equal citizenship of all, and established universal suffrage, exhibiting unparalleled magnanimity; it criminally punished no man for political offenses.

There is not a single truthful statement in that whole paragraph. The Republican party did not suppress any rebellion. The Democrats North and South who voted for Douglas and the Whigs and Union men North and South who voted for John Bell were as much opposed to secession as were the Republicans who voted for Lincoln. More votes were cast for Douglas and Bell than were cast for Lincoln. They were as patriotic, as devoted to the Union, and made as good soldiers and did as much in every way to suppress the rebellion as did those Republicans who claimed the sole credit.

The Republican party never saved the Union at all and never freed a negro slave. Missouri voted for Douglas, and she put more than 100,000 soldiers in the Union Army. Tennessee voted for Bell, and that State furnished 31,092 Union soldiers. Kentucky voted for John Bell, and yet she furnished 85,860 soldiers to the Union Army. Maryland furnished 46,638 soldiers to the Union

Army. West Virginia furnished 32,068 Union soldiers. I have heard no less an authority than Judge Harlan, of the Supreme Court, say that the Union was saved in a great measure by the southern men who refused to join the secession, but who, with equal heroism and greater love for the Union, stood out against their brethren of the South and fought to maintain and perpetuate the Government of their fathers. Think of this declaration in the platform, "exhibiting unparalleled magnanimity; it criminally punished no man for political offenses." When the German army conquered the Turks at Poltava, the Turks were permitted to return home and to maintain their local laws and institutions.

When the French army was destroyed at Sedan, the Frenchmen were allowed to return to their own country and exercise all the rights of citizenship. So when the army of the Sultan conquered the Greeks, these people retained their local laws and institutions and were allowed to rule their own country as if no war had been waged. Even when Russia, Germany, and Austria despoiled Poland, her citizens were still left permission to control their local affairs, forced only to acknowledge the paramount allegiance to the conqueror. In this South land of ours, alone of all the conquered countries of modern times, the white citizens, the property owners, the intelligent part of the population, were disfranchised and the local government placed in the hands of former slaves.

Coming now to the platform of 1876, let us read this paragraph: We rejoice in the quickening conscience of the people concerning political affairs.

Think of this! When Tilden received 4,284,757 votes, while Hayes received only 4,033,950 votes; and yet by the utter lack of any political conscience whatever the returning boards and the Electoral Commission found a devious way by fraud to either go behind the returns or to refuse to go behind them or do whatever else was necessary to vote into the high office of President a man who had been defeated at the polls, and to count out a man whom all honest men now admit was duly elected. So, having perpetrated the greatest election fraud in our history, and having forcibly canceled the certificate of the people at the polls, this party in the next platform of 1880 with great impudence declared, "The honest voter must be protected against terrorism, violence, and fraud."

But let us hasten on to 1884, when that party began its series of promises to reduce the tariff—promises which it never intended to fulfill. Instead of redeeming this pledge that party has constantly pursued the opposite plan, and the surplus has grown to such proportions that certain favorite national banks are made depositories of this surplus and are collecting millions of dollars annually in the way of interest by lending this surplus back to the people. The net profits made every year by these national banks in this way would furnish many millions for campaign funds, to be expended to perpetuate the outrage and still leave the bankers time and leisure to praise the glories of the Republican party in newspapers and magazines of the country. [Applause and laughter.] Then look at this siren song which was sung in that same platform:

The Republican party has gained its strength by quick and faithful response to the demands of the people for the freedom and equality of all men.

The freedom and equality of the ten millions in the Philippines, in Porto Rico, in Alaska, and in the Sandwich Islands are meant, of course. The only freedom and equality furnished since this platform was written was such as was shown to a colored woman, Mrs. Cox, at Indianola, when the Administration undertook to force her services as postmaster upon the white people of that city. Another instance of freedom and equality is to be found when the President disregarded the recommendations of both white Republicans and Democrats in South Carolina and forced upon the people a black, odoriferous geranium by the name of Doctor Crum as collector of the port of Charleston. Still another instance of freedom and equality to all men was perhaps shown when a certain other ducky by the name of Booker Washington came to lunch at the White House and the President expressed his regrets that his family were away and insisted that Mr. Washington return to dinner. So this negro did come back to dinner, with the President of the United States at one end of the table, Mrs. Roosevelt at the other, Miss Alice and Theodore, jr., on either side, and Booker Washington seated at the seat of honor at the right hand of the President, eating out of the same dish and "sopping" out of the same bowl.

"Freedom and equality to all men!" What rot and nonsense in the light of recent history. Have you read the address delivered the other day by ex-Secretary of War Root at the law school banquet? Here is what he says, in part:

It has been my province during the last four and a half years to deal with arbitrary government. It has been necessary for me to not only make laws and pronounce judgment without any occasion for discussion, except in so far as I would choose to weigh the question involved in my own mind, affecting 10,000,000 of people; and not only to make laws and pronounce judgment, but to execute judgment with overwhelming force and great swiftness.

Think of this for one moment and think how rapidly we have degenerated from the institutions founded by the fathers of this Republic. Think of one arbitrary despot holding the destinies of 10,000,000 of human beings in the hollow of his hand without any restraint of constitution or law. "Execute judgment with overwhelming force and great swiftness!" The time was when such an utterance would have demanded and received universal condemnation. But now it is the strenuousness of a popular administration. A military satrap burning cities, devastating provinces, torturing prisoners and noncombatants has become the hero and idol of a Republican party that has the unspeakable impudence to talk about "liberty and equality."

But hastening on to the platform of 1888, we find this ebullition of patriotism from the swelling bosom of the Republican party:

The Republican party would accept all needed reductions in the national revenues by repealing the tax upon tobacco, which is an annoyance and a burden to agriculture.

Then, why don't you repeal the tax on tobacco and relieve the farmers of this annoyance and burden to agriculture? You elected your candidate to the Presidency in 1888. You have controlled Congress ever since. Time and again the Democrats have urged you to redeem this promise to repeal this tobacco tax. There are four or five bills now pending in this House, one introduced by my distinguished friend who sits in front of me, Mr. STANLEY, one by my colleague from Kentucky, Mr. TRIMBLE, still another by my distinguished friend from Tennessee, Mr. GAINES, and another by, I think, Mr. HOPKINS—all of them Democrats.

They have all been referred to that magnificent Committee on Ways and Means, and there they will be permitted to sleep. I hate to discourage you, gentlemen, but those tobacco bills are as dead to-day as the seven sleepers of Ephesus, and no resurrecting angel will ever roll away the stone from their sepulcher as long as the Republican party remains in power.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. I am listening with great delight to the gentleman's able and magnificent address, but I have too much faith in that thing we call the human heart and its sympathies with the pain and suffering with fellow-men, as it is found on both sides of this Chamber, to believe that those just bills can die.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, it is easily to be seen that my colleague is serving his first term in Congress. [Laughter.] He will learn more after he stays here. If tobacco was grown chiefly up yonder on the barren hillsides of New England, this war tax would have been abolished years and years ago. It is about the only relic that is left upon the statute books of that régime under which the Government taxed anything and everything in order to carry on the war.

Here is another sweet exhalation from the swelling bosoms and perfumed breath of the Republican party:

We declare our opposition to all combinations of capital, organized in trusts or otherwise, to control arbitrarily the condition of trade among our citizens.

Opposed to trusts, are you? In every Congress your leading Members put out three standard arguments, and standing arguments, too. The first is that there are no trusts. The second, that there are trusts and that there have been trusts time out of mind, and that they are good things to have. The third is that the Republican party is pledged and is using every reasonable effort to destroy the trusts.

The Sherman antitrust law was enacted in July, 1890, more than thirteen years ago. It provides that "every contract, combination in the form of trusts or otherwise, or conspiracies in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations are declared to be illegal," etc., and persons found guilty are to be punished by fines of not exceeding \$5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both fine and imprisonment. Hundreds of thousands of poor people in this country have suffered with cold on account of the soulless rapacity of the coal barons. Hundreds of thousands of ragged children have cried themselves to sleep with hunger on account of the soulless rapacity of the beef trusts and the milling trusts, while these scoundrels were increasing their dividends upon watered stock; and yet no man has ever been made to wear a felon's stripes for violating this law—no man has ever been convicted of violating this law.

Indeed, a distinguished Senator has introduced a bill at the other end of the Capitol to virtually repeal the Sherman antitrust law. Lawyers who have been for years making their fortunes out of the trusts, with the trusts for their clients, are brought here from New Jersey and Pittsburg to fill the office of Attorney-General of the United States, and of course they are not able to fine any of the trusts. In the last Congress we appropriated a

special fund to track the trust and hunt down these modern brigands. Five hundred thousand dollars still remains unexpended in the Treasury, and no prosecutions are inaugurated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to suggest to the gentleman's memory the fact that on last Saturday only the Republican side of this Chamber voted unanimously, or perhaps with three exceptions, against a proposition to prevent the Secretary of the Navy from making Government contracts with combinations convicted of being trusts and of living in violation of the Sherman law.

Mr. GILBERT. Certainly, I remember that, and it is a very apt illustration and a forcible addition to the argument I was attempting to make, and I am obliged to the gentleman from Mississippi for that contribution. The money, as I said, remains unexpended in the Treasury, and these freebooters, instead of being put upon trial, are lauded as philanthropists when they donate to some church, or to some school, or some other charitable or eleemosynary institution a very small part of their booty. They are the idols of fashionable drawing-rooms. They are the chief drawing card of the swellest clubs in the country. When they come to the city of Washington they are wined and dined with unusual eclat.

Why, the average Republican smiles and fawns and seems to be flattered by the society and the association of these great modern nabobs. There was a triumvirate—I turn aside from the regular course of my remarks to make a historical allusion. There was a triumvirate in the old days—Crassus representing the newly rich, Pompey representing the old democracy, and Julius Cæsar representing the "rag-tag" and the rabble of the day. The next step was a combination between Crassus and Cæsar—a combination, in other words, between the newly rich and the rabble. This combination soon disposed of Pompey, and they also soon disposed of the liberties of their country. The next step was an imperial despotism. It is this combination of the wealth of a country with the rabble that is to be dreaded now in this country, and it is to be dreaded always and everywhere.

But we must return to our mutton, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] would say.

"We favor the extension of our foreign commerce, etc.," taken from the platform of 1896. Everybody knows that in order for ships to engage in foreign commerce they must be permitted to bring a return cargo. And yet this party has built a tariff wall around the country so high as to almost entirely exclude foreign manufactured goods. They have not been totally excluded thus far, but the high tariff wall has forced the commercial nations of Europe to retaliate by putting up tariff walls themselves, and it is inevitable that this policy will in a very few years naturally destroy our international trade. You put the Dingley tariff rate at 20 per cent higher than was thought to be proper even by the avowed friends of protection, and you did so under the promise that this extra per cent should be traded off in consideration of concessions to be obtained from foreign countries in the way of reducing the duties upon farm products and manufactured articles exported from this country and imported into those countries. Under this Dingley law provisions were made for the negotiation of reciprocity treaties, and quite a number of them were negotiated by Mr. Kasson.

Indeed, treaties were made calculated to build up our foreign trade with all of the leading countries of Europe. Not a single one of these treaties has ever been ratified by the Senate. The two years provided by that law in which these treaties could be made have waxed and waned and the treaties have been abandoned. Although you procured this unprecedented protective rate under the promise of reducing it by reciprocity agreements, the doctrine is now "stand pat" and "keep on letting well enough alone." There was a barefooted Nazarene who came preaching a new doctrine to the world, but the money changers and magnates of that day cried out, "Stand pat," and "Keep on letting well enough alone." So when Washington and the ragged, hungry soldiers at Trenton and Valley Forge were fighting for our liberty the plutocrat of that day and the money changers were as a class "stand patters," and their watchword was, "Keep on letting well enough alone."

That is always the war cry and the campaign cry of the privileged classes in all the ages of the world. The revolutions in the world's history that have come for the betterment and the upbuilding and the promotion of the welfare of mankind have always come from the undercrust, who were oppressed and who were opposed to the doctrine of "stand pat" and "keeping on letting well enough alone." [Applause on the Democratic side].

But take this fine declaration from the platform of 1896:

The Republican party has always been the champion of the oppressed and recognizes the dignity of manhood, irrespective of faith, color, or nationality.

I suppose this was written exclusively for the benefit of the negro, because, strange as it may seem, while the Caucasian race and the African race stand at opposite ends of the line with regard to the different races that make up the human family, the Republican party has all along manifested a strange solicitude for the negro race alone. They have never shown any especial anxiety for the welfare of the Chinese, or the Indians, or the Boers, or the Armenians, or for the Circassian slaves, or for any other race except the beautiful and sweet-smelling sons of Ham.

But I am glad to be able to say that distance lent enchantment to the objects of their devotion and that with closer proximity and better knowledge their original enthusiasm is softening down in some degree to a condition of reason and common sense.

In the platform of 1900 the party made this declaration:

We renew our allegiance to the principle of the gold standard and declare our confidence in the wisdom of the legislation of the Fifty-sixth Congress, by which the parity of all our money and the stability of our currency upon a gold basis has been secured.

At last, after a century of support given to wildcat banks, free-silver coinage, and fiat money, this Republican party, by strange political fortune, has come to pose as the champion of sound money. In the old days of Jefferson and Jackson the Democratic party was the advocate of sound money, contending that gold and silver were the only legal-tender money authorized by the Constitution, whereas the Federalists, headed by Nicholas Biddle, were clamoring that the issues of the national bank should be made a legal tender, and they were also the advocates and defenders of a general system of wildcat banks.

The Democratic party, on down to the days of Tilden and Hendricks, of Justices Field and Lamar, were still the friends and defenders of sound money and were still contending that gold and silver were the only legal-tender money authorized by the Constitution. In those days the Republican party was the creator and defender of fiat money. That party created the greenback money and made it a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, except duties upon imports and interest upon the national debt. The Supreme Court, in an opinion written by a Democrat, Mr. Justice Field, decided that gold and silver alone could be made a legal tender and that the legal-tender feature of the greenback legislation was unconstitutional and void. The Republican party, to avoid this decision, proceeded to reorganize that court, created new judges, and these places were filled by a Republican President with judges known to support the contention of that party.

What a howl they made down in my State in 1896 about the claim that the long-haired 16 to 1 Populists and anarchists were going to reorganize the Supreme Court, that it was going to be a revolution.

Thus a new decision of that court was obtained, upholding the constitutionality of the legal-tender function of the greenbacks. This was the beginning of that long series of Republican legislation in the interest of the money classes which has proved a very Pandora's box of evils. The Republican party opened the silver agitation in 1873 and continued it in their platforms down to the meeting of their convention of 1884. They inserted in their platform of 1884 a demand for an international agreement to fix the standard of value between gold and silver. Then, in their platform of 1888, they denounced the Democratic party for its efforts to demonetize silver. Continuing their soft-money crusade and love for unsound money, this party, in its platform of 1892, announced this doctrine:

The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetalism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money.

Still on down to 1896, and in the platform of that year, the Republican party pledged itself to promote bimetalism by international agreement, so that never until the platform of 1900 did the Republican party become the open advocate of the gold standard or become the friend or supporter of what it pleases to call "sound money," and this attitude it assumed by a strange reversal of the positions of both of the two great political parties. On the other hand, the Democratic party, reading the Constitution, finds this language: "No State shall make anything but gold and silver a legal tender in the payment of debts," and by this constitutional provision the Democratic party has consistently stood during all the years of our national life.

Now, let us come to 1900 again and notice the last effusions of the "Grand Old Party." This was the convention in which the chairman insisted that ex-Governor Taylor, of Kentucky, should come upon the platform so that all could see and honor him. This was the platform written at the cottage of E. A. Griscom, the president of the International Transportation Company and the head and front of the ship-subsidy steal. This platform an-

nounces: "We have conducted, and in victory concluded, a war for liberty and human rights. No thought of national aggrandizement tarnished the high purpose with which American standards were unfurled." That sounds fine, doesn't it? What are the facts? Democratic votes forced your party into the war, and Democrats took the leading part in its prosecution until Cuba was liberated; and then the Republican party came in for the spoils and for the subjugation of the Philippines.

The commander in chief of the Army was Gen. Nelson A. Miles, a Democrat; the man who had charge of the navy at Cavite and Manila and who destroyed the Spanish fleet was Admiral Dewey, a Democrat; the man who had command of the fleet at Santiago and who knocked the Spanish fleet into "smithereens" was Admiral Schley, a Democrat; the man who was put in charge of the civil government of Cuba was Gen. Fitzhugh Lee, a Democrat; the man who had charge of the land forces in Cuba and who sent no grumbling complaints home, was Gen. Joe Wheeler, a Democrat; the man who had command of the land forces in the field in the Philippines, did the main fighting, and was never guilty of torturing anybody, was Gen. J. Franklin Bell, of my own city, and a Democrat. The Republicans were not idle. They were busy, too. A distinguished Republican was accused of furnishing the soldiers embalmed beef, and how many of the soldier boys were made sick and how many died from this cause will perhaps never be known. Then there was a Republican horse doctor sent to Cuba who was accused of befriending the gamblers and other lawbreakers.

There were two Republicans, Rathbone and Neely, that had charge of the post-office affairs in Cuba, and who were found guilty by a jury of peculations and fraud. There was little General Funston, a good Republican, who violated the rules of civilized warfare, dressed in the uniform of the enemy, forged letters, scouted all the laws of hospitality, and captured Aguinaldo. Then there was General Davis, a good Republican, who had charge of the commissary, and who sold rice and other provisions to the starving natives at enormous profits, and last of all, the Republican Congress refused to limit the friar lands for the benefit of home seekers, but placed in the bill provision permitting corporations and syndicates to purchase and exploit these lands in large tracts.

What does the Republican party now stand for? It stands for the open door in China, while busily pursuing a policy that would close the doors of Europe and Canada. It stands for ship subsidies to build up our foreign trade, while it drafts bills giving most of the subsidy to fast passenger steamers, the floating palaces of the seas, that carry those trust magnates and millionaires back and forth across the ocean, instead of giving it to the vessels that carry the freight. It stands for the Monroe doctrine and fomenting an insurrection in Panama. It stands and preaches that to put articles on the free list increases the price to the consumer, while it is forced to take off a tariff from quinine and coal in order to relieve the distresses of the people. It stands for high protection in order to build up the farming interests of this country and helps Cuba to remove her protection in order to benefit the farmers of Cuba. This party stands for extraditing criminals from across the sea and refuses to bring criminals from across the Ohio River.

It promises in platforms to destroy the trusts, but gathers its chief campaign funds from them; refuses to prosecute them, and now has a bill in the Senate making lawful all reasonable trust criminals and repealing the imprisonment clause of the Sherman law as to these criminals who are unreasonable. It stands in favor of the Nicaragua Canal in all its platforms, and gives to a defunct French corporation \$40,000,000 in order to get a chance to build a canal at another place. It stands posing as the friend of the laboring man, and votes down the Clark amendment by which the Chinese would be effectually excluded and refuses to pass the eight-hour law. It stands as the pretended friend of reciprocity, and refuses to ratify every reciprocity treaty that is presented to the Senate. There is no heresy and no delusion in finance, economics, international law, or politics which this party has not at some time or other embraced or practiced and at other times denounced. A medley of contradictions and inconsistencies, it stands for anything and for everything and for nothing at all.

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

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes granted me by somebody who has charge of the time.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. GILBERT. Can such a medley of contradictions and inconsistencies continue to win the elections? I am sure I do not know. This combination has usually won in the world's history. Only few exceptions can be found here and there as oases in the great desert of human wretchedness. Partial and vicious laws enacted and enforced in the interest of certain occupations or localities in course of time always result in building up a large, wealthy, aristocratic class, and this class, by power and prestige,

terrify the timid, corral the poor and ignorant, purchase and control the venal and purchasable vote, and thus have usually succeeded in outvoting the great intelligent middle class that constitutes the Democratic party of this country and the liberal parties of the Old World.

This combination of wealth and aristocracy and the baser elements has succeeded in all the dark blood-stained centuries of history. Tribunes of the people and governors of provinces have returned loaded down with the wealth collected from the people by fraud and extortion. Thus prepared he becomes ready to give entertainments to please the ragged and hungry populace and to buy their votes. Crowds thronged the Colosseum and the Circus Maximus to enjoy and applaud. Young damsels of the patrician class sat with smelling bottles, themselves beautifully gowned, and clapped their white bejeweled hands at the sight of wild beasts tearing peasants to pieces, limb by limb, by the thousands. When the hero of the entertainment appeared in sight, "the rabblement hooted and clapped their chapped hands and threw up their sweaty nightcaps, and uttered such a deal of stinking breath that he swooned and refused the crown that was offered him by the foolish populace."

Are we traveling away from our moorings and going in the same direction? Some day, perhaps when it is too late, we will learn that no free government can long endure unless builded upon the doctrines of Jefferson and Jackson. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BEDE] can not laugh nor giggle this party out of existence. I am not a prophet, but when the old doctrine of the Democratic party of "equal rights and opportunities for all and exclusive privileges to none" shall have perished, then the liberty of the people will have perished also.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman—

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman, when he began his address, stated that he desired not to be interrupted, and I therefore deferred until this time a question which I wish to propound.

Mr. GILBERT. Come this way a little.

Mr. SCOTT. In the beginning of the gentleman's remarks he alluded to what will probably go down into history as the Booker Washington incident. I should like to inquire whether he would criticize as severely a Democratic President who would receive at his table at the White House a negro as he has criticised a Republican President?

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, that is an impossible assumption.

Mr. SCOTT. By no means impossible, Mr. Chairman, for the reason that it has already happened.

Mr. GILBERT. There is a vast difference between the equality which a Democrat and a Republican regards the colored man. Will you let me give you an illustration?

Mr. SCOTT. Let me ask you this question—

Mr. GILBERT. Wait a minute; I want to answer the first question. A few days ago a colored man from my own country was in Boston hunting for employment; he knocked at the front door of a house and asked for something to eat, I believe it was, instead of work. The master of the house came out and said, "My dear sir, I am very sorry, but we have nothing to eat." He went to the second house and knocked and asked for something to eat, and the white master of the mansion came out and said, "I am very sorry, sir, but I have nothing to eat for you in the house." He went to the third house and he knocked at the door, and the white man came out to the front door and said, "You black scoundrel, what do you mean by coming to my front door for something to eat? Walk around to the kitchen and get your breakfast." That third man was a Democrat; the other two were Republicans. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given two minutes more to answer one more question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky be given two minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GILBERT. Go ahead; I would be delighted to try to answer the question.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to ask if the gentleman knows during President Cleveland's first Administration he entertained at his table at the White House a negro?

Mr. GILBERT. No; but, mind you, we are not particularly claiming Mr. Cleveland. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. As matter of fact, that never happened.

Mr. GILBERT. I never heard of it before, and if it did happen it may be barely possible that Mr. Cleveland was not a first-class Democrat. [Laughter.]

Mr. COCHRAN. That is cumulative proof that there is no better Republican in this country than Grover Cleveland. [Laughter.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries, who informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On February 20, 1904:

H. R. 2427. An act granting a pension to Cynthia Thomas.

On February 26, 1904:

H. R. 3584. An act to authorize the resubdivision of lots or blocks in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9640. An act to amend an act granting to the Keokuk and Hamilton Power Company right to construct and maintain a dam, and so forth, approved February 8, 1901;

H. R. 134. An act granting a pension to Wilhelmina Miller;

H. R. 195. An act granting a pension to Michael Landy;

H. R. 219. An act granting a pension to Minerva J. Burton;

H. R. 529. An act granting a pension to Emma H. Higley;

H. R. 754. An act granting a pension to John M. Lawton;

H. R. 1855. An act granting a pension to Harriett B. Riley;

H. R. 2040. An act granting a pension to James Anderson;

H. R. 2932. An act granting a pension to Dudley R. W. Williams;

H. R. 3298. An act granting a pension to Mary E. Pennock;

H. R. 3299. An act granting a pension to Medie M. Flanders;

H. R. 4365. An act granting a pension to Barney L. Brookins;

H. R. 4378. An act granting a pension to Catharine M. McClanahan;

H. R. 4625. An act granting a pension to Theresa B. Nash;

H. R. 4946. An act granting a pension to James F. Wheeler;

H. R. 5372. An act granting a pension to Mariah Kuechler;

H. R. 5528. An act granting a pension to Maria Lindhorst;

H. R. 5538. An act granting a pension to Jane Elizabeth Bullock;

H. R. 6085. An act granting a pension to Anna M. Maier;

H. R. 6547. An act granting a pension to John Holzer;

H. R. 7072. An act granting a pension to Mary McCall;

H. R. 7515. An act granting a pension to Rebecca A. Mathias;

H. R. 8123. An act granting a pension to Eliza S. Smith;

H. R. 8728. An act granting a pension to Matilda Lafferty;

H. R. 8920. An act granting a pension to Harriet A. Tucker;

H. R. 9029. An act granting a pension to Georgie S. Barbour;

H. R. 138. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Hale;

H. R. 165. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Adelsperger;

H. R. 198. An act granting an increase of pension to Emmett Cole;

H. R. 249. An act granting an increase of pension to Mollie J. Mitchell;

H. R. 561. An act granting an increase of pension to Eri Summy;

H. R. 610. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Alexander;

H. R. 660. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Sines;

H. R. 681. An act granting an increase of pension to Ella P. Kersteter;

H. R. 689. An act granting an increase of pension to Edgar Chapman;

H. R. 703. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert P. Baker;

H. R. 727. An act granting an increase of pension to James K. Blye;

H. R. 734. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry S. McAlister;

H. R. 812. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Emery;

H. R. 937. An act granting an increase of pension to Mark A. Shelton;

H. R. 1156. An act granting an increase of pension to John Pan-gratz;

H. R. 1294. An act granting an increase of pension to William McBrien;

H. R. 1483. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Black;

H. R. 1487. An act granting an increase of pension to Dexter T. Drake;

H. R. 1497. An act granting an increase of pension to Dana Cook;

H. R. 1859. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick Cannon;

- H. R. 1906. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Blanchard;
 H. R. 2016. An act granting an increase of pension to George Gardner;
 H. R. 2111. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Towsley;
 H. R. 2201. An act granting an increase of pension to George McDonald;
 H. R. 2553. An act granting an increase of pension to George Wintz;
 H. R. 2822. An act granting an increase of pension to Louisa Phillips;
 H. R. 2912. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Jones;
 H. R. 2916. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis S. Howard;
 H. R. 3172. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Pogue;
 H. R. 3272. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hardy;
 H. R. 3337. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Craigue;
 H. R. 3345. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Clarke;
 H. R. 3367. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Kerby;
 H. R. 3407. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank Lewis;
 H. R. 3411. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Hart;
 H. R. 3435. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Pratt;
 H. R. 3521. An act granting an increase of pension to John Hawker;
 H. R. 3616. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Davis;
 H. R. 3617. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Everett;
 H. R. 3665. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Jones;
 H. R. 3815. An act granting an increase of pension to Hester E. Mooney;
 H. R. 4031. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Wasson;
 H. R. 4276. An act granting an increase of pension to Hamilton E. Burritt;
 H. R. 4323. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Wurtz;
 H. R. 4325. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Sills;
 H. R. 4457. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Meldram;
 H. R. 4629. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Pond;
 H. R. 4759. An act granting an increase of pension to David P. McDonald;
 H. R. 4837. An act granting an increase of pension to George N. Thorpe;
 H. R. 4915. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Hibbert;
 H. R. 4937. An act granting an increase of pension to Emily Conklin;
 H. R. 5199. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Johnson;
 H. R. 5299. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Wheeler;
 H. R. 5471. An act granting an increase of pension to A. Marion Gamble;
 H. R. 5531. An act granting an increase of pension to Marvin Nash;
 H. R. 5534. An act granting an increase of pension to Adaline Shaw Lovejoy;
 H. R. 5609. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Grigsby;
 H. R. 5617. An act granting an increase of pension to William P. Hereford;
 H. R. 5634. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Miles;
 H. R. 5699. An act granting an increase of pension to James P. Johnson;
 H. R. 5718. An act granting an increase of pension to Adolph Heiser;
 H. R. 5720. An act granting an increase of pension to William T. Filler;
 H. R. 5818. An act granting an increase of pension to Philip Snow;
 H. R. 5883. An act granting an increase of pension to David Warentz;
 H. R. 5972. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Wilbur;
 H. R. 6005. An act granting an increase of pension to George B. Davis;
 H. R. 6020. An act granting an increase of pension to William P. Conner;
 H. R. 6023. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Wigert;
 H. R. 6028. An act granting an increase of pension to Anson Heffron;
 H. R. 6032. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Bellows;
 H. R. 6036. An act granting an increase of pension to John Shafer;
 H. R. 6061. An act granting an increase of pension to Alpheus D. Brown;
 H. R. 6071. An act granting an increase of pension to Abraham C. Null;
 H. R. 6091. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Brown;
 H. R. 6342. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Springer;
 H. R. 6442. An act granting an increase of pension to James P. Wallace;
 H. R. 6562. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Thompson;
 H. R. 6588. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Cummings;
 H. R. 6701. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Reeds;
 H. R. 6947. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Cooper;
 H. R. 6994. An act granting an increase of pension to Theresa Nebrich;
 H. R. 7095. An act granting an increase of pension to Harrison H. Hakes;
 H. R. 7355. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Barrett;
 H. R. 7374. An act granting an increase of pension to Jabez Perkins;
 H. R. 7439. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Bates;
 H. R. 7447. An act granting an increase of pension to William Bailey;
 H. R. 7594. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Miller;
 H. R. 7682. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Howard;
 H. R. 7732. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Chenowith;
 H. R. 7756. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Schroder;
 H. R. 7757. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Davidheiser;
 H. R. 7798. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Black;
 H. R. 7799. An act granting an increase of pension to John O. Rice;
 H. R. 8187. An act granting an increase of pension to George Jeffrey;
 H. R. 8207. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Johnson;
 H. R. 8342. An act granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Davis;
 H. R. 8717. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Edwards; and
 H. R. 8729. An act granting an increase of pension to Gustus S. Renick.
 On February 27, 1904:
 H. R. 7287. An act 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. Stephen's meridian.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman from Minnesota will kindly yield me five minutes, I shall be very much obliged.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas five minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. The reply of the gentleman from Kentucky to the last question which I asked him was a good illustration of what I think the lawyers call "confession by avoidance."

Mr. GILBERT. That is a good plea in any court.

Mr. SCOTT. It happens to be fresh in my memory, however, and I have asked this time in order to give some information to gentlemen on the other side of the House who will no doubt be interested in it. During the first Administration of Mr. Cleveland a negro from Kansas was brought to Washington, taken to the White House, introduced to the President, and by him invited to remain and sit at the table at luncheon, an invitation which I need not say was promptly accepted.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman state who it was that introduced the negro, and upon whose authority the gentleman is making this statement?

Mr. SCOTT. I make the statement on my own authority.

Mr. COCHRAN. Were you present?

Mr. SCOTT. I was not present, but one of my colleagues will corroborate me as to the fact.

Mr. COCHRAN. Who was this negro?

Mr. SCOTT. It was C. H. J. Taylor, afterwards appointed register of deeds for this District by President Cleveland. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I wish to call the attention of the House one moment to the difference in the character of these two men. Concerning Booker Washington, the least that can be said of him is that he is a good man. But I think it might also be said that if he had a white skin it would be considered an honor by any gentleman to know him; that he is a gentleman and a scholar. So much of a scholar that he has been given an honorary degree of master of arts by Harvard University; so much of a gentleman that he was invited by the president of Harvard University to sit at his table to lunch with Gen. Nelson A. Miles, who received the same honorary degree from the same university at the same time; so much of a gentleman that he has been entertained by Queen Victoria at Windsor Castle; so much of a scholar that a member of a college faculty of one of the southern colleges recently denominated him the foremost living American, for which utterance he was promptly called to tab by his associates; but, I am glad to say, that it was declared by the authorities of the college that they held free speech—

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I have only five minutes, and I decline to yield. I have alluded to the character of Booker Washington not because he needs any praise from me, but because I want to call attention—

Mr. MADDOX. I want to say to the gentleman from Kansas that the declaration was that he was second to Robert E. Lee.

Mr. SCOTT. I can not quote the language exactly for I do not remember it. Probably the gentleman is correct. But from his standpoint I should suppose it would be considered quite a compliment to be named as second to Robert E. Lee.

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

Mr. BREAZEALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana asks that the time of the gentleman from Kansas be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I will yield the gentleman five minutes' time.

Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman, in justice to that college, that the faculty did rebuke this professor for making that utterance, but did say that he had a right to it as enjoying the liberty of free speech.

Mr. SCOTT. They rebuked him for making the utterance, but they did not attempt to say that the utterance was not true. They rebuked him because they were forced to do so by the public sentiment of their community.

Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN. The gentleman who uttered it afterwards explained and said he did not mean it. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SCOTT. That is a question for the gentleman and his friends on that side to decide between themselves.

Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN. He said he did not mean to say that he was the greatest man the South ever produced except Lee, but the greatest negro.

Mr. SCOTT. All that aside, it will be admitted by every Member on the floor of this House that if Booker Washington had a white skin, any one of us would receive him on terms of equality.

Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN. Why does not the gentleman receive him, having a black skin?

Mr. SCOTT. We do receive him in every proper way.

Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN. Does the gentleman mean to say that he receives him as his equal?

Mr. SCOTT. Not as my social equal—

Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN. The black skin is the cause of it, is it not?

Mr. SCOTT. The black skin, and the prejudice, and all that.

I recognize that as fully as the gentleman does. I am not standing here, if the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN. We are alike, then. The gentleman has the same prejudice that we have—on account of the skin. There is no difference between us on that.

Mr. SCOTT. I am not standing here to make a plea for social equality. We all know that is impossible. I do not stand for that any more than Theodore Roosevelt did when he invited Booker T. Washington to his luncheon, any more than President Eliot did when he invited Booker T. Washington to his luncheon, any more than Grover Cleveland did when he invited C. H. J. Taylor to his luncheon. I have alluded to the character of Mr. Washington, which everybody in the country recognizes, because I wanted to point a contrast between the man whom the Republican President of the United States received at his table and the man whom the Democratic President of the United States received at his table. Who was C. H. J. Taylor? He was a black negro, as black as you ever saw. He had been a ward heeler, and nothing more, in the city of Kansas City, Kans. He had no great accomplishment to his credit; he had no education to speak of; he had nothing to commend him to any man's consideration, particularly nothing to commend him to the consideration of any Democrat, except the presumption that he carried some negro votes in his vest pocket and could deliver them to the Democratic party.

For that reason, and for that reason only—for the reason that he had promised that if he were given this position here in Washington he could turn the negro vote in Kansas from the Republican party to the Democratic party—he was brought here to Washington by some Democratic leaders of Kansas, taken to the White House, introduced to the President, seated at his table, and afterwards paid the price by receiving the appointment of register of deeds of this District.

Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN. Does the gentleman approve of Grover Cleveland asking that negro to dine with him and dining with him? Does the gentleman approve of that?

Mr. SCOTT. I do not approve of it, because I know the character of the man. I would not invite him to my house if he were a white man.

Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN. Because he is a Democratic negro—is not that it?

Mr. SCOTT. That is not the reason. It is because the man is utterly without character, without education, without culture, or anything to commend him to the consideration of a gentleman.

Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN. Who introduced that negro to the President? The gentleman said his colleague was present when it was done.

Mr. SCOTT. I did not say that. I simply said my colleague was cognizant of the fact.

Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN. Did not a Republican from Kansas introduce him to the President?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, no; by no means. I have already said he was introduced by a Democrat.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have alluded to this matter, not to apologize for President Roosevelt, who needs no apologist, but merely to call attention to the glaring inconsistency which goes into hysterics over a courtesy paid to a man of admitted high character and who has done and is doing a splendid and noble work, while utterly ignoring a similar attention paid to a man without standing or character or accomplishment, and whose only claim to consideration was the presumption that he could swing a certain number of votes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, much has been said of late, both in this Chamber and elsewhere, upon the hustings and in the public press, upon the subject of reciprocity. The question has been discussed as to whether, as an economic policy, it is Democratic or Republican. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND], who addressed the committee some days ago, assured us that it found its first expression from the lips of Thomas Jefferson, and yet I find in the last Democratic campaign text-book this assertion:

Reciprocity looks like free trade, but tastes like protection. In practice reciprocity is worse than protection. Free trade would open our markets to benefit our own country. Reciprocity cares nothing for the consumer and hunts the foreign market with a club. Reciprocity is based on the same false theories as protection, and, like protection, is a sham and a humbug, and to most people has been and will ever continue to be a delusion and a snare.

And then, again, I find in a magazine article written by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the leader of the minority, this declaration:

There is also a tariff revision by piecemeal, which is the handmaiden of the other system. This is tariff revision by reciprocal trade agreements with other nations. Much can be done along this piecemeal line of tariff revision under a Democratic or approximately a Democratic law.

*What democracy means
Everybody's May Feb 1904*

In other words, there is a reciprocity approved of by the Democratic party for the purposes of tariff revision, and as leading to free trade. In view of that fact, and in view of the further fact that at least two Republican national conventions have declared in favor of reciprocity, I am forced to the conclusion that there are two kinds of reciprocity—one Democratic and the other Republican, and that they differ in toto coelo.

The reciprocity in trade relations advocated by the Democratic party embraces reciprocity in competing articles, and is therefore free trade in whole or in part, dependent upon the terms of the particular agreement. It is of value to the Democratic party only to the extent that it is an effective force toward the overthrow, partial or complete, of the protective system, with which it is absolutely inconsistent.

Now, it is too manifest to be the subject of argument that to impose a duty upon a foreign article for the purpose of preserving the home market for a like home article and then to lower or remove that duty so as to admit the foreign article into competition in the home market is to abandon in that case the principle of protection and to adopt that of free trade.

Republican reciprocity is reciprocity in noncompeting articles and in nothing else. [Applause on the Republican side.] I know of no better definition of it than that given by ex-Postmaster-General Charles Emory Smith. He says:

When rightly understood the principle is axiomatic. Brazil grows coffee, but makes no machinery. We make machinery, but grow no coffee. She needs the fabrics of our factories and forges, and we need the fruits of her tropical soil. We agree to concessions for her coffee; she agrees to concessions for our machinery. That is reciprocity.

And I know of no better definition of its purpose than that given by President McKinley in his inaugural address:

The end in view—

He says—

always to be the opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and can not produce ourselves and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people, but tend to increase their employment.

In other words, Republican reciprocity, like protection, keeps always in view the preservation of the home market, the primacy of our manufacturers, and the well-being of the wage-earner.

My purpose at this time in undertaking to make some observations on this subject is to enforce and emphasize the difference between Democratic and Republican reciprocity and to demonstrate that Republican reciprocity admits of reciprocity only in noncompeting articles.

And I aver that there is nothing in the history of the Republican party, in its traditions, or in any of its platforms that justifies the claim that reciprocity in competing products is consistent with Republican principles. On the contrary, everything in its history, its traditions, and its platforms proclaims such reciprocity to be inconsistent with the protective system, and therefore inconsistent with Republicanism.

If the committee will bear with me, I propose very hastily and as briefly as possible to review some of our national experiences with respect to this subject. They may be dealt with under three heads: First, reciprocity with Canada; second, reciprocity with Hawaii, and third, tropical reciprocity, as illustrated under the Dingley and McKinley tariff laws. And I deal with reciprocity with Canada, because arguments have been made upon the Democratic side of this Chamber looking toward a renewal of reciprocal trade arrangements with Canada, and because arguments have been made elsewhere with like purpose of a sensational character by men whom we can not regard otherwise than as covert enemies of protection, although they appeal to Republican hearers.

Our reciprocity treaty with Canada was made in 1854 and abrogated in 1866. Various causes have been assigned for the making of that treaty, amongst others that Great Britain was fearful that in the absence of new trade arrangements Canada might become annexed to the United States. There is nothing in connection with the negotiation of that treaty or with its operation of which we have any reason to be proud. The truth is that we were compelled to its discussion by the unjust and indefensible attitude of Great Britain with respect to our rights in the fisheries, and that it was consummated by the shrewdness of the Canadian Governor-General, Lord Elgin, and his staff, who, according to a British writer, "approached the representatives of the American nation with all the legitimate wiles of astute and accomplished diplomats." "They threw themselves," said he, "into the society of Washington with the abandon and enjoyment of a group of visitors solely intent on pleasure." The American opponents of the treaty did not hesitate to say that "it was floated through on champagne."

In view of the present agitation of the subject, the history of this treaty and its results become matters of present practical importance. I think it will be more interesting, instead of using my

own words, to let Mr. Blaine tell the story, as he does, in his Twenty Years in Congress. He says:

When the independence of the colonies was recognized in the preliminary treaty of 1782, the provisions agreed upon in regard to two subjects were held by both Governments to be final and perpetual. One was the territory embraced within the boundaries conceded to the United States; the other was the right to the fisheries. The people of the colonies, especially the people of the New England colonies, had as British subjects used all the British fisheries in what is now known as the Dominion of Canada and the island of Newfoundland, and in the preliminary treaty to which George III gave his assent in 1782, as well as in the final and more definite treaty of 1783, it was provided that the privilege should continue to be enjoyed by citizens of the new Republic.

No doubt of the intent and proper construction of this clause in both treaties had even been suggested until the English and American negotiators were engaged in framing the treaty of peace at Ghent in 1814, at the close of the second war with Great Britain. The British negotiators claimed that the war of 1812 had put an end to all existing treaties, and that the fishery clause in the treaty of 1782 being no longer in force our fishery rights had expired, and if revived at all must be revived under new treaty stipulations.

The position thus taken by the British Government was plainly untenable. The treaty of 1782 was only the formal declaration of certain facts consequent upon the termination of the Revolutionary war. That treaty recognized three conclusions as fully established: First, the independence of the thirteen colonies; second, the territorial limits of the United States; third, the rights and methods of the common fisheries in colonial waters the citizens had exercised as British subjects. The history of the negotiation and the explicit language of the treaty prove that the clause touching the fisheries was the recognition of an existing right and not the grant of a new right. The British Government in 1814 might with equal force and justice have claimed that under this theory of the abrogation of the treaty of 1782 by war the recognition of our independence and the establishment of our boundaries had also become void.

I quote from Mr. Blaine only so much as is necessary to make clear the circumstances under which this reciprocity treaty of 1854 was brought about. He goes on to say:

On the 20th of October, 1818, a treaty was concluded at London containing as its first and most important provision an absolute surrender of some of our most valuable rights in the fisheries.

From the execution of this treaty—as might have been seen—the misunderstanding between the two countries in relation to the fisheries became more complicated.

The right in the fisheries conceded by the treaty of 1854—originally ours under the treaty of 1782, and unnecessarily and unwisely renounced in the treaty of 1818—was not given freely, but in consideration of a great price. That price was reciprocity of trade (so called) between the United States and the British North American provinces in certain commodities named in the treaty. The selection, as shown by the schedule, was made almost wholly to favor Canadian interests. There was scarcely a product in the list which could be exported from the United States to Canada without loss, while the great market of the United States was thrown open to Canada without tax or charge for nearly everything which she could produce and export. All her raw materials were admitted free, while all our manufactures were charged with heavy duty, the market being reserved for English merchants. The fishery question had been adroitly used to secure from the United States an agreement which was one-sided, vexatious, and unprofitable. It had served its purpose admirably as a makeweight for Canada in acquiring the most generous and profitable market she ever enjoyed for her products.

That Mr. Blaine's declaration that the treaty was one-sided, vexatious, and unprofitable was correct appears from the fact that in the last year and three-quarters of its life we remitted to Canada duties amounting to \$70,152,163, and the balance of trade was against us in the sum of \$28,134,749.

Now, this is a general statement, but to go into detail a little more as to the effect of the treaty, let me quote Senator Morrill, of Vermont, who was thoroughly familiar with the subject. He says:

Our exports to Canada in 1855 were \$20,828,676, but under the operation of reciprocity, then commenced, they dwindled in twelve years down to \$15,243,834, while the exports of Canada to the United States increased from \$12,000,000 and odd to \$46,000,000 and odd. When the treaty began the balance of trade had been \$8,000,000 annually in our favor and that paid in specie, but at the end the balance against us to be paid in specie in a single year was \$30,000,000. Here was a positive yearly loss of over \$5,000,000 of our export trade and a loss of \$38,000,000 specie, all going to enrich the Canadians at our expense.

Now, I want to show you the difference in the conditions that existed under this reciprocity treaty and as they exist to-day, and I propose to show you those conditions not by any mere uncorroborated statement of my own, but out of the mouth of a Canadian witness. If you will turn to the North American Review for the present month of February, you will find an article on Canadian reciprocity, written by the Hon. John Charlton, a member of the Canadian Parliament. He says:

The nonprogressive character of the Canadian export trade to the United States is shown by the fact that, while the export in 1866 amounted to \$44,000,000, the export in 1903, less precious metals and articles not the produce of Canada, was no more than \$48,950,000. On the other hand, a comparison of Canadian import returns from the United States will show remarkable increase, as the subjoined table will demonstrate:

Canadian imports from the United States for consumption.

1866	\$28,794,000	1901	\$110,485,000
1890	52,291,000	1902	120,814,000
1896	54,574,000	1903	137,600,000
1900	103,844,000		

These are imports from the United States into Canada for consumption, the goods which we sold her, and for which we got pay. Here is another branch of the same subject. I am still quoting from Mr. Charlton's magazine article:

The subjoined table, showing the Canadian importation of manufactures from Great Britain and from the United States since 1898, will be of interest,

especially when taken in connection with the fact that Canada has given a tariff preference to Great Britain, first of 12½ per cent, 1897 to 1898, then of 25 per cent to 1900, and of 33½ per cent since that time.

Canadian imports of manufactures.

Year.	From Great Britain.	From United States.
1898	\$26,243,000	\$41,510,000
1899	31,187,000	49,362,000
1900	37,328,000	60,473,000
1901	36,469,000	62,643,000
1902	41,675,000	69,536,000
1903	50,473,000	76,231,000

This great increase in the sale of manufactures by the United States to Canada between 1898 and 1903, in the face of the Canadian preference in favor of British imports, gives evidence of the strong hold that the American manufacturer has upon the Canadian market, and of his ability to meet all competitors in the market upon equal terms.

These two tables, with their authors' comments, are eloquent witnesses as to existing conditions.

Let me add that the balance of trade in our favor last year was \$73,554,000.

I have here a copy of a speech delivered by this same gentleman, Hon. John Charlton, member of the Canadian Parliament, at Ottawa, on the 24th of February, 1903. The subject of this discussion is reciprocity with the United States. And after going on to show how favorable the conditions are under existing circumstances to the United States, and unfavorable to Canada, he pays us this tribute:

The American policy has been applied not only to us but to all the world. The object of the United States has been to sell all that it possibly could of the products of its soil and its mills and its workshops, and to buy just as little as it could from other countries, and thus having as much of the balance of trade in its own favor as possible. The result has been that the balance of trade in favor of the United States last year amounted to \$600,000,000 against the whole world—\$71,000,000 against Canada. That is a good thing for the United States, and will be her policy as long as the rest of the whole world will permit her to do it, but it is not a good thing for us.

Now, what does this gentleman who speaks for his people offer us by way of temptation to change this condition of things which is so highly advantageous to the United States and which is not so advantageous to Canada?

He says:

Something must be done to change the trade conditions that exist between the United States and Canada. Free trade in natural products would afford a reasonable adjustment. Nothing short of this will do it, and this condition of free trade of natural products must be granted by the United States without a solitary concession from Canada further than it has already made. We can not afford any more.

What is the proposition? Why, that while everything is going our way, we are to make a trade arrangement upon the same basis as the arrangement in 1854, which proved so disastrous to us. An astounding proposition, indeed! Now, I want to show you—

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. LIND. Is it not a fact that with the exception of the last year of that treaty, after notice of abrogation had been served, the excess of our exports over Canadian imports was substantially as great as has been the relation of exports and imports since?

Mr. DALZELL. Well, I do not have the figures here. I did not go into detail any further than Senator Morrill. But I should answer the question, speaking generally, by saying "No," because the figures that are given by Mr. Charlton in the North American Review article show such a tremendous variance.

Mr. LIND. I will state, however, for the benefit of the gentleman, that with exception of the last year, after notice of the abrogation of the treaty had been given, our excess of exports to Canada was relatively as much as it has been in any years since or any period of years.

Mr. DALZELL. I have been unable to find anywhere, and I have given considerable attention to the subject, a single solitary reason from the United States standpoint that would justify a treaty with Canada in natural products.

Mr. LACEY. If my friend will allow an interruption here—

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. The four years' time to which the gentleman from Minnesota alludes was during our civil war, when it was very difficult to get at what would be a fair basis to figure upon.

Mr. LIND. Yes; but the facts are as I state, are they not, Mr. LACEY?

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Minnesota aware that during the life of that treaty we gained 11 per cent in our export trade and Canada gained 500 per cent in her trade with us? That is the fact.

Mr. LIND. No; I think that is a mistake.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I propose to show that every distinguished statesman in our history who has dealt with this subject at all occupies the same position with respect to this Canadian question that I am now endeavoring to sustain.

The first of the Republican leaders who is recorded as having expressed an opinion on the subject of reciprocity seems to have been Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, who, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on the 11th of January, 1865, reported favorably the joint resolution for denouncing the Canadian treaty.

On this occasion Senator Sumner argued that the event had shown that the treaty was much more advantageous to Canada than to the United States—that, in short, it was "unilateral, and hence not reciprocal." The Senator went on to say:

The reciprocity treaty has a beautiful name. It suggests at once exchange, equality, equity; and it is because it was supposed to advance these ideas practically that this treaty was originally accepted by the people of the United States.

Mr. Sumner proceeded to show by figures that the revenue gained to Canada under the treaty had been very great and the revenue lost to the United States still greater, and that therefore the advantages of the treaty "are not shared equally by the two countries," so that "it loses title to its name." The opinion expressed by Senator Sumner was expressed also by the following prominent Republican Senators: Sherman, of Ohio; Collamer and Foot, of Vermont; Morrill, of Maine; Chandler, of Michigan; Doolittle, of Wisconsin; Wilson, of Massachusetts, and others.

In his first annual message to Congress, under date of December 6, 1869, President Grant alluded to the Canada treaty in terms of disapproval on account of its lack of true reciprocity. I quote this extract from his message:

The question of renewing a treaty for reciprocal trade between the United States and the British provinces on this continent has not been favorably considered by the Administration. The advantages of such a treaty would be wholly in favor of the British producer. Except possibly a few engaged in the trade between the two sections no citizen of the United States would be benefited by reciprocity. Our internal taxation would prove a protection to the British producer almost equal to the protection which our manufacturers now receive from the tariff. Some arrangement, however, for the regulation of commercial intercourse between the United States and the Dominion of Canada may be desirable.

President Grant, in his second Administration, assisted by his Secretary of State, Hamilton Fish, made an effort to perfect a new reciprocity treaty with Canada, embracing among other items the admission into Canada of a large number of our manufactured articles free of duty. The treaty miscarried, as did all other subsequent tentative treaties with Canada, the prevailing idea in opposition thereto apparently having always been that the productions of Canada were practically identical with our own productions, and hence any general admission of Canadian products into this country free of duty or at reduced rates of duty would necessarily compete injuriously with our own industries.

I have already quoted Senator Morrill, but I will quote him again:

It is said we must do something to build up and extend our foreign commerce—to which I agree—and to do this it is strangely proposed at once to surrender much more of our markets at home than is offered to us abroad—to which I do not agree. We are asked, so to say, to throw into the sea a greater amount of bait than will be returned in the catch of fish. Eleven years of this over-baited traffic, giving up superior markets in exchange for inferior markets, did not win the commercial or political friendship of the Canadians.

I quote now from another distinguished President—President Harrison—from his message of June 20, 1892:

A reciprocity treaty limited to the exchange of natural products (referring to the case of Canada) would have been such only in form. The benefits of such a treaty would have inured almost wholly to Canada. Previous experiments on this line had been unsatisfactory to this Government. A treaty that should be reciprocal in fact and of mutual advantages must necessarily have embraced an important list of manufactured articles and have secured to the United States a free or favored introduction of these articles into Canada as against the world.

And again, in his fourth annual message, Mr. Harrison said:

During the past year a suggestion was received through the British minister that the Canadian government would like to confer as to the possibility of enlarging, upon terms of mutual advantage, the commercial exchanges of Canada and of the United States; and a conference was held at Washington, with Mr. Blaine acting for this Government and the British minister at this capital and three members of the Dominion cabinet acting as commissioners on the part of Great Britain. The conference developed the fact that the Canadian government was only prepared to offer to the United States, in exchange for the concessions asked, the admission of natural products. The statement was frankly made that favored rates could not be given to the United States as against the mother country. This admission, which was foreseen, necessarily terminated the conference upon this question. The benefits of an exchange of natural products would be almost wholly with the people of Canada.

The objections to the Canadian treaty have never been better stated than they were by Mr. Roberts, Treasurer of the United States, who said:

The commerce of Canada and of the United States covers substantially the same classes of articles. The question of reciprocity or commercial union between Canada and the United States is a very different one from that which would arise over the proposition for reciprocity with Mexico or with the South American republics, for the reason that Canada produces almost identically, so far as its production goes, the same articles as the United States produces. Therefore there can be very little of exchange in the sense of our

getting back for our products what we do not ourselves produce. The trade with Canada would be inviting competition, so far as there is a production in Canada, as against our own producers.

Now, I submit that every utterance of this long line of distinguished statesmen on this subject is just as applicable to-day, just as pertinent, as it was when uttered first. I submit that there would not only be no reason in it, but that it would be folly to throw open the splendid markets of 80,000,000 people in exchange for the markets of less than 6,000,000 people and to bring into competition the products of high-priced farm lands in the West, cultivated with a high wage rate, with those of Canada, with its low-priced lands and low wage rates. Every dictate of reason, every impulse of patriotism, every sense of loyalty to our own people and their interests demands that we should let well enough alone. [Applause.]

Now, I will not stop to talk about Hawaii, because it has no special bearing upon the proposition now in hand. We all recall that the treaty was made in 1875, and that it was made not for economical reasons, but for reasons purely political, because of the anticipated annexation of Hawaii to the United States. It cost us in the end the loss of nearly \$13,000,000 of revenue.

Now, you will observe that in the declaration of the statesmen from whom I have read the principal point made is that natural products are not the proper subjects of reciprocity. During the Arthur Administration the idea of tropical reciprocity seems to have originated.

The fact that we admitted the products of tropical countries into our ports without the payment of any duty and that a duty was imposed upon nearly all of our products in their ports gave rise to the idea that we might very well make some arrangement whereby we could, for the concession of our free list, obtain like concessions from our neighbors. In 1883 a treaty with Mexico was attempted and failed. In 1884 a treaty with Cuba, Porto Rico, and Santo Domingo was attempted and failed. Both Mr. Arthur and his Secretary of State are upon record as to what they believed to be the true principles of reciprocity. A letter of Secretary Frelinghuysen, sent to the Senate and subsequently embodied in a report dated March 20, 1884, contains the following important announcement as to the true principles of reciprocity between nations:

The true plan, it seems to me, is to make a series of reciprocity treaties with the states of Central and South America, taking care that those manufactures and, as far as is practicable, those products which would come into competition with our own manufactures and products should not be admitted to the free list.

Mr. Arthur, in his messages, announced the same principle:

The need has long been recognized of some arrangement by which the natural market of the large communities lying at our doors should be secured under beneficent terms for the principal productions of the United States. In return for this we grant certain reserved favors, whereby the articles, mainly raw materials or food products, which this country does not produce or produces in inadequate quantity shall reach their natural market of consumption in this country. * * *

And again, on another occasion, he recommended:

A series of reciprocal commercial treaties with the countries of America, which shall foster between us and them an unhampered movement of trade. The conditions of these treaties should be the free admission of such merchandise as this country does not produce in return for the admission free, or under a favored scheme of duties, of our own products.

You will recollect that in 1889 the Pan-American Congress concluded its sittings and recommended a series of reciprocity treaties between the several states constituting that conference and the United States. Mr. Blaine, who was then Secretary of State, made his report, the conference having been called at his suggestion in the first instance, and Mr. Harrison sent that report to Congress with a message.

And that was the beginning of practical Republican reciprocity. The Blaine plan was that instead of placing our noncompetitive articles on the free list they should receive duties and that those duties should be remitted by the President in exchange for concessions to be made by the nations who sent to us noncompetitive products. It would be tedious to go through the legislative history of the McKinley law, that finally embodied the Blaine reciprocity. It is sufficient to say that certain articles, noncompetitive, were placed upon the free list—sugar, molasses, tea, coffee, hides—and the President was authorized to remove them from the free list and impose on them certain duties in cases where unreasonable duties were imposed on our products.

There is considerable of history connected with the making of this reciprocity provision, because, you recollect, it was not in the McKinley bill as it went from the House, but was put in it in the Senate. But I shall not stop to go over that, because it is familiar to a great many gentlemen who are here, and I am more anxious about results than I am as to how they were brought about. It will be observed that the reciprocity provided for by the McKinley law was reciprocity in purely noncompetitive articles. That was a time when our sugar industry had not as yet assumed such proportions as to be called a "home industry," requiring protection, and it was put upon the free list, and constituted

one of the articles on the free list to be used in making these negotiations.

The domestic consumer was protected by way of bounty. It will be observed that the reciprocity of the McKinley law was in aid of our foreign trade, without the possibility of harm to any domestic industry or any domestic producer. Under the McKinley law, as you recollect, a great many treaties were made, quite a number. They were all of them swept by the board when the Democratic Administration came into power, without either rhyme or reason.

But I must hasten on. I want to call attention particularly to the provisions of the Dingley law, because there never was a law put upon the statute books that is so little understood and so much misrepresented. The reciprocity provisions of the Dingley law are to be found in sections 3 and 4.

Section 3 deals with two classes of articles. The first class contains argols or crude tartar or wine lees, brandy, champagne, still wines, vermouth, paintings, and statuary. These articles are substantially noncompetitive articles. Under the preceding paragraphs of the law they have each been charged with a duty. For this duty the President is authorized to substitute a certain lower duty for the purposes of barter. In other words, if he can obtain an agreement with a foreign country whereby our products can obtain favorable entrance into foreign markets by lowering the duties on these articles, he is authorized to do so. The second class contains tea, coffee, tonka, tonka beans, and vanilla beans, which were on the free list. On these the President is authorized to impose a certain duty, unless the countries exporting them should grant us fair entry into their markets.

So far as this section is concerned, it will be observed that the principles of Republican reciprocity are preserved.

The articles to be the subject of barter do not come into competition with any home industry.

The discussion of this section gives me the opportunity to say that no law that ever went upon our statute book has been so grossly misrepresented as has the Dingley law. It has been heralded all over this country—it is heralded all over the country today—that the schedules of the law are intentionally placed above the protective point, and that therefore the people are suffering from excessive taxation.

It is not said that some schedules were so treated, but the schedules, meaning all of them. That is not true. The only duties that were raised were those upon argols, or crude tartar, or wine lees, brandy, champagne, still wines, vermouth, etc., and this for trading purposes. It has been asserted that Mr. Dingley admitted the raising of duties. On the other hand, men have rushed to deny that he did. There was no reason for any controversy on the subject, for either assertion or denial. The bill itself shows the articles that bore the extra rates of duty. There was no concealment of the matter. The articles were those that I have mentioned, and no others. I have no doubt that Mr. Dingley admitted the claim as to them, but more than that he never did admit, never could have admitted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DALZELL. Let me say to my friend from Mississippi that I think I know what he is going to say. I have read his magazine article, and I propose to address myself to it in the course of a few minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I wanted to ask the gentleman this question, and then perhaps what I ask the gentleman will be what he knows I am going to say and perhaps it will not be. Upon what articles is the President given authority under the Dingley bill to negotiate reciprocity treaties with a reduction of 20 per cent?

Mr. DALZELL. I knew that was what the gentleman was going to ask me. I will answer it in a moment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is what I would like to know in that connection.

Mr. DALZELL. I repeat—

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. The Hon. John A. Kasson—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If the gentleman from Missouri will permit, I would like to have my question answered first.

Mr. CLARK. That is all right. I thought the gentleman was going to answer it directly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No. In this connection, as I understand the gentleman, when he has said that articles were put 20 per cent too high in only certain cases which he mentioned, I ask this question: What articles are put within the power of the President as a basis to negotiate reciprocity treaties upon where he is granted the power to negotiate upon the basis of a reduction of 20 per cent?

Mr. DALZELL. I will answer the gentleman in a moment or two. I am coming to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Right now?

Mr. DALZELL. In the course of perhaps thirty seconds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Are not those all the articles?

Mr. DALZELL. Not at all. There is a limitation that the gentleman has not paid any attention to. I will satisfy the gentleman, if he will only wait a moment.

I repeat that there is no undue duty placed upon any article in the Dingley bill, whether for the purposes of barter or otherwise, except upon those to which I have referred—argols or crude tartar, wine lees, etc.—and I would like some gentleman now to stand up and tell me who they are that are tax ridden and suffering because of the duty on argols or crude tartar and wine lees, or any other article named in that section. And yet out of "such stuff as dreams are made of" a hostile press and the enemies of protection are continuing to vex the souls of a credulous public.

Mr. LIND. You have reduced the duty on argols and such, have you not, since the passage of the Dingley bill?

Mr. DALZELL. I do not know whether that is true or not.

Mr. LIND. Well, they have been reduced.

Mr. DALZELL. Now, then, section 4 is the section that worries my friend from Mississippi and which he seems to think justifies him in the assertion that we are providing for 20 per cent overtaxation all along the line.

Section 4 provided, first, that the President might, within a period of two years, enter into treaties with foreign nations to secure favorable entry of our goods into their ports in consideration of a reduction upon their duties of not more than 20 per cent, such agreement not to last over five years; and, second, he might agree to place on our free list such of their products as we did not produce, or retain such if already on the free list. But his authority to act could only be by treaty to be ratified by the Senate and approved by Congress.

This section was not in the bill when it went from the House. It was a Senate provision. It is not now in effect more than two years since the passage of the bill having expired. When the bill went from the House to the Senate, the House had a reciprocity section, viz, section 3, and the Senate had a reciprocity provision, viz, section 4. A compromise was made by adopting both House provision and Senate provision with certain amendments.

I see that the gentleman from Mississippi in his magazine article contends that the 20 per cent rebate allowed by the fourth section measures the extra duties of the Dingley bill. But his position is not tenable for the reason that the schedules of the bill had been fixed before this section was suggested by the Senate, and without any reference thereto, and without any knowledge by the House that fixed the schedules that any such suggestion would be made on the part of the Senate.

But the section was not agreed to without a material limitation by way of amendment, which retained power in the Republican House. That was contained in the provision that no agreement could be consummated save by the consent of Congress.

The men who insisted on that modification did so in order that they might retain in their own hands such power as would protect home interests against possible reciprocity in competitive products. They did so for the further reason that they did not believe it to be within the constitutional power of the Executive and Senate, in the first instance, to deal with the revenues of the country, either by treaty or otherwise, but that the power to originate legislation taxing the people belongs to the representatives of the people.

An analysis of section 4 thus discloses that it contained a provision for reciprocity in noncompetitive articles similar to the House provision—viz, that of section 3—and also a provision which might result in reciprocity in competitive articles, but the latter was so guarded and restricted as to keep the veto power in Congress.

Certain treaties have been negotiated under the provisions of section 4, but they have never been ratified by the Senate and I trust they never will be, because they propose to sacrifice certain American industries in the interest of certain other American industries on the assumption that in the long run the net gain will be greater than the loss. The Republican party, however, does not believe in bookkeeping reciprocity, and I trust it never will. It believes that every American industry, whether large or small, is equally entitled with every other American industry to protection for its labor and its capital. [Applause on the Republican side.] Protection for all is its motto and its practice.

It has been claimed that the Cuban reciprocity treaty was a reversal of the Republican policy.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman my question now.

Mr. DALZELL. All right.

Mr. CLARK. I want to ask the gentleman three questions.

Mr. DALZELL. Does the gentleman expect me to answer all of them at once?

Mr. CLARK. No; you may answer them all at once or may

answer them seriatim. Is not Hon. John A. Kasson, of Iowa, a Republican in good standing and an officer in a Republican Administration?

Mr. DALZELL. Well, he is known as a Republican. I do not know anything about his standing. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK. All Iowa Republicans are in good standing.

Mr. DALZELL. I would not like to certify to that.

Mr. CLARK. In the second place, did not Mr. Kasson, as the appointee of President McKinley, negotiate quite a number of reciprocity treaties which have been pigeonholed with great unanimity by the Senate?

Mr. DALZELL. I have already said so.

Mr. CLARK. Now, my third question is this: If the gentleman's statement here to-day properly expounds the present Republican position on the subject of reciprocity, then does not the transaction touching the Kasson treaties show that the Republican party has changed its base on reciprocity in the last seven years?

Mr. DALZELL. Not at all. The Republican party has been consistent from the beginning; it never agreed to any reciprocity treaty that involved anything except noncompeting articles. [Applause on the Republican side.] And it is because it has been consistent to its principles that those treaties have never been ratified, and, in my judgment, they never will be ratified by Republicans.

Mr. CLARK. The real reason those treaties have never been ratified is because McKinley died, is it not?

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, not at all. They were—

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. They were negotiated a year before McKinley's death.

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. LIND. Can the gentleman think of any noncompetitive product in the world now on the dutiable list that could be made the subject of reciprocity under his definition?

Mr. DALZELL. Why, they all could. Yes, by putting them on the free list.

Mr. LIND. But is there anything now not on the free list that could be made the subject of reciprocity under your definition?

Mr. DALZELL. I don't know; the tariff schedule is a long document. I do not recall any just now.

Mr. PAYNE. Statuary, for instance.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, I mentioned that—statuary and painting.

Mr. PAYNE. He is asking you again; he has forgotten.

Mr. DALZELL. I gave the gentleman a list a while ago—argols, crude tartar, the wine list, champagne—

Mr. LIND. We make all those things in the United States.

Mr. DALZELL. And brandy—oh, no; we do not make any champagne that comes into competition with French champagne. We do not have any competition in argols; we do not have any competition in any of these articles—paintings—

Mr. LIND. One more question. Under the gentleman's definition of reciprocity we could not possibly have reciprocity with Canada in any one product that either nation produces, could we?

Mr. DALZELL. I do not think we could have any reciprocity with Canada that would be of any advantage to the United States in any shape or form. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now let me go on; my time is almost exhausted. I was about to say that it has been claimed that the Cuban reciprocity agreement was a reversal of Republican policy. On the other hand, it was an exception. It was justifiable only on the ground of the exceptional circumstances under which it was made. It necessarily resulted from the peculiar relations that the United States bore to Cuba, a Republic made free by the expenditure of our treasure and the blood of our sons. It is not definitive of Republican policy. It is not a precedent for anything, and no one has any right to so consider it.

So that the reciprocity of Arthur and Harrison and Blaine and Dingley and McKinley is still the reciprocity of the Republican party.

I know that certain gentlemen, enemies of protection, have contended that President McKinley in his last speech at Buffalo, on the eve of his tragic end, abandoned the doctrine whose advocacy throughout his long life had made him famous. I think they do him an injustice. There are detached sentences in that speech that, taken by themselves, may be construed to mean almost anything; but taken as a whole the speech was a McKinley speech. It was a speech, I grant you, in advocacy of foreign trade, but at the same time its keynote sounded the supreme and commanding importance of the home market and was a protest against any curtailment thereof or of any industry therein or of any harm to its wage-earners. Note what he says:

By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt home production we shall extend the outlets of our increasing surplus.

And then again:

We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

And all through that speech, in which he glorifies our prosperity, he attributes its existence to the policy of protection. Whether that be so or not, the faith of the Republican party to-day on this subject remains as declared in 1900 at Philadelphia:

We favor the associate policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in exchange for free foreign markets.

Now, why change this policy at all? Why not cling to the policy of reciprocal relations with respect simply to noncompeting articles, and so preserve our home interests? Oh, they say, because we want to get foreign trade. Well, what is the matter with our foreign trade? There certainly is nothing of criticism to be said about its present status, and I do not indulge in the fears that some gentlemen express as to its future. I apprehend that in the adjustment of world conditions it will take care of itself in the future, as it has in the past. Why, during the last thirty years our foreign trade has grown more than that of Great Britain; it has grown more than that of Germany; it has grown more than that of France; it has grown more than that of Russia; it has grown more than that of any nation in the world.

I have here some figures that I will not stop to read at length, but I will give you the results of them. I have first a table showing the exports of domestic products from the United States, Great Britain, Germany, and France, and I find that between 1872 and 1901 the increase of the United States foreign trade was 168.39 per cent. I find that the increase of trade of Great Britain in the same period was 8.49 per cent. I find that the increase of trade of Germany was 91.19 per cent and of France 6.68 per cent—that is to say, while Germany, which next to the United States grew the most, increased 91 per cent, the United States increased 168.39 per cent.

I have here a table showing the imports entered for consumption in the United States, Great Britain, Germany, and France which I will not stop to read, and I have a table showing the total imports for consumption and exports of domestic products of the United States, Great Britain, Germany, and France, and I will read you the result as to that. The United States between 1872 and 1901 increased 73.06 per cent, Great Britain increased 28.10 per cent, Germany increased 76.74 per cent, France increased 14.32 per cent.

The tables are as follows:

Exports of domestic products from United States, Great Britain, Germany, and France.

Country.	1872.	1901.	Per cent of increase.
United States.....	\$505,033,439	\$1,355,481,861	168.39
Great Britain.....	1,241,760,000	1,347,182,617	8.49
Germany.....	551,618,000	1,054,685,000	91.19
France.....	726,000,000	774,497,600	6.68

Imports entered for consumption into United States, Great Britain, Germany, and France.

Country.	1872.	1901.	Per cent of increase.
United States.....	\$663,146,657	\$899,793,754	35.68
Great Britain.....	1,535,123,000	2,210,111,000	43.97
Germany.....	775,128,000	1,290,254,000	66.45
France.....	689,100,000	843,254,000	22.37

Total imports entered for consumption and exports of domestic products, United States, Great Britain, Germany, and France.

Country.	1872.	1901.	Per cent of increase.
United States.....	\$1,168,180,096	\$2,255,275,615	93.06
Great Britain.....	2,776,883,000	3,557,243,617	28.10
Germany.....	1,326,746,000	2,344,939,000	76.74
France.....	1,415,100,000	1,617,751,600	14.32

I am justified, I think, in the claim that I have made that in the last thirty years our foreign trade has increased more than that of any other nation. And that magnificent showing, let me suggest, was not due to our agricultural trade alone. In 1892 our exports of manufactures amounted to only \$158,500,917, or 15.7 per cent of our exports. In 1902 our exports of manufactures amounted to \$403,641,401, or 29.77 of our exports, an increase since 1892 of 154.7 per cent. Why, the growth of our foreign trade has been the wonder of the world. We have heard time and again on the floor of this House threats made that on account of its increase foreign countries would seek to bar us out of their markets, and we have heard the plea made for tariff revision and reciprocity on that ground.

It is furthermore said that "we must buy or we can not sell."

Why, we are among the greatest buyers in the world. Great Britain buys more than we do; Germany buys more than we do; France buys only a little more, and Russia not near so much. I have here figures covering two periods of time—a period of depression and a period of prosperity—showing what sort of buyers we are in the world's market. Without stopping to give the figures at length, in 1892 we bought at the rate of \$12.73 per capita; in 1894, \$9.41; 1895, \$10.61; in 1896, \$12.29. Then coming to a later period, 1900, 1901, and 1902. In 1900 we bought at the rate of \$17.96; in 1901, \$10.58; in 1902, \$11.43. The tables in full are as follows:

Year.	Amount.	Per capita.
1893.....	\$866,400,922	\$12.73
1894.....	654,894,622	9.41
1895.....	731,969,965	10.61
1896.....	779,724,674	12.29
1900.....	849,941,184	17.96
1901.....	823,172,165	10.58
1902.....	903,320,948	11.43

There are reasons why we should not be as great buyers as some other nations. Those reasons are to be found in our native wealth of wheat and corn and cotton, tobacco, petroleum, coal, and ores—indeed, all the necessities of life in a great superabundance. Taking these into consideration we are, relatively speaking, amongst the world's greatest buyers, and will ever continue to be so long as our industries flourish and our wage-earners are in receipt of such wages as enable them to be large consumers.

Yes; but gentlemen say, "Oh, well, we will be shut out of the markets of the world. They will raise their tariffs on us." My friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] indulged in a sad foreboding here not very long ago, entertaining that fear. For how long a time, for how many years have you heard on the floor of this House that foreign tariffs were going to bar us out of the markets of Europe. Why, Mr. Chairman, men in the aggregate are just like individuals. They buy where they can buy best and cheapest, and buy from the party who has what they want to sell.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be extended until he completes his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if it is not a fact that there has been a large reduction in the exports of manufactures of iron and steel of the United States into the markets of the world?

Mr. DALZELL. Undoubtedly there are periods of depression and periods of prosperity, changes in the market extending from time to time over long periods; and there always have been. I will remind the gentleman that "two swallows do not make a summer."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Ever since the enactment of the Dingley tariff bill have not the European countries that furnished us markets for our goods heretofore almost all of them discriminated against our iron and steel manufactures?

Mr. DALZELL. They do not seem to have affected our prosperity in that direction.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if it is not a fact that our exports last year were less than they were five years ago?

Mr. DALZELL. I do not have before me the figures, but I will say that there are periods of depression, and sometimes there are long times of depression; but there is always a reason for it, and generally temporary.

Now, with respect to this claim that we are going to be shut out of the world's markets. The United States produces one-fifth of the world's wheat.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him just one question?

Mr. DALZELL. I will.

Mr. STANLEY. Does the gentleman not concede that a high protective rate on the part of Great Britain would be a great calamity to this country?

Mr. DALZELL. No, I will not concede it; I prefer to say that

that is a very large question, with which I am not now familiar. It is one that I do not feel myself now prepared or able to answer. I have not given it any study. But I will say for the benefit of the gentleman—

Mr. STANLEY. I am speaking of a tariff on all kinds of American industry.

Mr. DALZELL. I will prefer to say that I am not competent to answer the gentleman's question. If the gentleman wants something to read on the subject, I will refer him to the last Book Lovers' Magazine, to an article written by Mr. Talcott Williams, of Philadelphia, one of our best writers. He can give him more light than anyone who has written on the subject, so far as I have seen up to this time.

Now, as to being driven out of the world's markets, the United States, I say, produces one-fifth of the world's wheat, one-half of the world's meat, four-fifths of the world's corn, and three-fourths of the world's cotton. Europe's importations from the United States last year were three-fifths of its wheat, almost all of its corn, half of its meat, and three-fourths of its cotton. In 1901 Europe took over 50 per cent of our exports of manufactures, 90 per cent of our exports of agricultural products, and 60 per cent of all other exports. Suppose it possible that Europe could be furnished with these necessities from other places outside the United States, what effect do you suppose it would have upon their markets as to price to shut out the American products? To do so, I venture to say, would be an economic impossibility.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have proven anything at all I have proven, first, that Republican reciprocity means only reciprocity in noncompeting products, and I have proven, secondly, that no reason exists, growing out of our relation with the world's trade, for changing or abandoning that policy.

So then, I say, let us abide by the ancient landmarks, the party faith, and I repeat, "we favor the associated policy of reciprocity so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we can not ourselves produce in exchange for free foreign markets." That is all we are willing to give for free foreign markets. We will not agree that a single home industry shall be crippled; we will not agree that a single American wage-earner shall lose his job or part with a penny of his wages. The game is not worth the candle.

In the long run we shall have our full share of the world's markets. We shall have it because we shall deserve it. We shall have it because, in the great international contest for the world's trade, we shall have behind us the inexhaustible wealth of a continent, the energy and enterprise and inventive genius of the most intelligent and energetic people on the face of the earth, and all of it backed by such wise policies as shall most advantageously develop their great resources. [Prolonged applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LOVERING 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 without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 19. An act establishing a United States court at Marietta, Ind. T.;

H. R. 11021. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Weems;

H. R. 8227. An act granting a pension to Lucius E. Polk; and

H. R. 10145. An act to provide for appeals, writs of error, and other appellate proceedings from the circuit and district courts of Beaumont, in the eastern district of Texas.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the action of the President pro tempore in signing the bill (S. 167) "granting an increase of pension to J. Hudson Kibbe" be rescinded, and that the bill be returned to the House of Representatives with the request that similar action be taken by the House with respect to the signature of the Speaker, and that the passage of the bill be reconsidered, and that it be postponed indefinitely, the beneficiary of the same being dead.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, it is an old adage that the application of principles can always be confused by a prolixity of figures. It is true, for the same reason, that the sea has no fixed level and that the running waters have no regular level. People lose sight of the general principle that there is a mean level of the sea, because the sea is never at rest; and people lose sight of the general principle that waters flow downward, because sometimes downstream the waters are higher than above, backed by some inflow of other waters.

Thus, when you come to the consideration of the application of the general principle, you may run over a lot of figures dealing with the great complexities of the trade of a great country and take out some special figures here and there, seemingly contradicting any principle, no matter how well grounded and fixed that principle may be.

So gentlemen every now and then attempt to show that protection, a policy which is inaugurated for the purpose of raising prices for the benefit of the man or industry protected, does really lower prices and thereby destroys its own purpose, and so gentlemen now and then, as in this debate, attempt to show that people grow rich by the "balance of trade" in their favor, or grow poor by the "balance of trade" the other way.

Facts staring all men in the face yet prove that neither assertion is true. Adam Smith long years ago, Ricardo afterwards, John Stuart Mill after him, and Henry George after him have so reasoned and absolutely ridiculed the old mercantile theory of the "balance of trade" out of existence that no man in his sound senses, if he stops to think, would believe for one moment that the relative prosperity or depression of two countries, considering each by itself compared with the other, could be accounted for by the fact that there was in one case a balance of trade in favor of exports or in the other in favor of imports. There is indeed no such thing as a balance of trade, except when you come to consider simply two traders and no more, and even then not for a great time, as history counts time.

It is very true that there was a very large balance of trade in favor of a Kentucky mule dealer, for example, as against myself when I was planting, because every year I bought from six to twelve mules from Kentucky mule dealers, and the mule dealer never bought anything from me, and therefore these old mercantile-theory people would tell you the Kentucky mule dealer grew immensely rich and I was being necessarily impoverished by the trade between myself and the Kentucky mule raiser.

True, if somebody did not come along and buy my cotton it would not be long before the Kentucky mule raiser would have to sell his mules to somebody else. Again, the man who paid me money for my cotton sold me nothing. Thus, according to this balance of trade theory, I impoverished him. Now, there is no sense in all that. The sense in it, if there ever was any logic in it at all, grew out of the old mercantile theory that a country had to get the gold and silver of the world in order to prosper, and that it grew rich only by getting gold and silver.

The truth is the mule raiser, the cotton buyer and I, and the cotton spinner, who bought from the cotton buyer, all made money, and there was, as between all of us and everybody else of whom we bought and to whom we sold, no "balance of trade" at all. We each parted with what we wanted to part with and got what we wanted to get. Neither grew rich by buying; neither by selling.

We each and all grew rich, if we grew rich at all, by both buying and selling.

If either of any two of us had sold always and never bought, and between the two of us had controlled all the trade of the world, the one who exclusively sold would have wound up with all the gold and silver of the world and nothing else, and must have starved for his pains, or begun to buy; the other would have had everything in the world except its gold and silver.

John Stuart Mill says (Principles of Political Economy, vol. 2, p. 117, Little & Brown edition of 1848):

From this exposition we perceive in what consists the benefit of international exchange, or, in other words, foreign commerce. Setting aside its enabling countries to obtain commodities which they could not themselves produce at all, its advantage consists in a more efficient employment of the productive forces of the world.

If two countries which trade together attempted, as far as was physically possible, to produce for themselves what they now import from one another, the labor and capital of the two countries would not be so productive, the two together would not obtain from their industry so great a quantity of commodities, as when each employs itself in producing, both for itself and for the other, the things in which its labor is relatively most efficient. The addition thus made to the produce of the two combined constitutes the advantage of the trade.

It is possible that one of the two countries may be altogether inferior to the other in productive capacities, and that its labor and capital could be employed to greatest advantage by being removed bodily to the other. The labor and capital which have been sunk in rendering Holland habitable would have produced a much greater return if transported to America or Ireland. The produce of the whole world would be greater than it is if everything were produced where there is the greatest absolute facility for its production.

But nations do not, at least in modern times, emigrate en masse; and while the labor and capital of a country remain in the country, they are most beneficially employed in producing for foreign markets as well as for its own the things in which it lies under the least disadvantage, if there be none in which it possesses an advantage.

Before proceeding further let us contrast this view of the benefits of international commerce with other theories which have prevailed and which to a certain extent still prevail on the same subject.

According to the doctrine now stated, the only direct advantage of foreign commerce consists in the imports. A country obtains things which it either could not have produced at all, or which it must have produced at a greater expense of capital and labor than the cost of the things which it exports to pay for them. It thus obtains a more ample supply of the commodities it wants for the same labor and capital, or the same supply for less labor and capital, leaving the surplus disposable to produce other things.

The vulgar theory disregards this benefit and deems the advantage of commerce to reside in the exports; as if not what a country obtains, but what it parts with by its foreign trade, was supposed to constitute the gain to it. An extended market for its produce; an abundant consumption for its goods; a vent for its surplus; are the phrases by which it has been customary to designate the uses and recommendations of commerce with foreign countries.

This notion is intelligible when we consider that the authors and leaders of opinion on mercantile questions have hitherto been the selling class. It is in truth a surviving relic of the mercantile theory, according to which, money being the only wealth, selling or, in other words, exchanging goods for money was, to countries without mines of their own, the only way of growing rich; and importation of goods—that is to say, parting with money—was so much subtracted from the benefit.

Adam Smith says, in his celebrated first chapter of book four, sapping and annihilating the mercantile theory, a chapter which, by the way, every young and old student of this subject ought to read carefully, amongst other things these:

We say of a rich man that he is worth a great deal and of a poor man that he is worth a very little money. * * * Wealth and money, in short, are, in common language, considered as in every respect synonymous.

A rich country, in the same manner, * * * is supposed to be a country abounding in money; and to heap up gold and silver in any country is supposed to be the readiest way to enrich it. For some time after the discovery of America the first inquiry of the Spaniards, when they arrived upon any unknown coast, used to be, if there was any gold or silver to be found in the neighborhood. By the information which they received they judged whether it was worth while to make a settlement there or if the country was worth the conquering.

Piano Carpino, a monk sent ambassador from the King of France to one of the sons of the famous Ghengis Khan, says that the Tartars used frequently to ask him if there was plenty of sheep and oxen in the Kingdom of France. Their inquiry had the same object with that of the Spaniards. They wanted to know if the country was rich enough to be worth conquering. Amongst the Tartars, as among all other nations of shepherds, who are generally ignorant of the use of money, cattle are the instruments of commerce and the measures of value.

Wealth, therefore, according to them, consisted in cattle, as according to the Spaniards it consisted in gold and silver. Of the two the Tartar notion, perhaps, was the nearest to the truth.

In consequence of these popular notions all the different nations of Europe have studied, though to little purpose, every possible means of accumulating gold and silver in their respective countries. Spain and Portugal, the proprietors of the principal mines which supply Europe with those metals, have either prohibited their exportation under the severest penalties or subjected it to a considerable duty.

The like prohibition seems anciently to have made a part of the policy of most other European nations. It is even to be found, where we should least of all expect to find it, in some old Scotch acts of Parliament, which forbid, under heavy penalties, the carrying of gold or silver forth of the kingdom. The like policy anciently took place both in France and England.

When those countries became commercial, the merchants found this prohibition extremely inconvenient. They could frequently buy more advantageously with gold and silver than with any other commodity the foreign goods which they wanted, either to import into their own or to carry to some other foreign country. They remonstrated, therefore, against this prohibition as hurtful to trade.

That this exportation (of money) could only be prevented by a proper attention to what they called the balance of trade. That when the country exported to a greater value than it imported a balance became due to it from foreign nations, which was necessarily paid to it in gold and silver and thereby increased the quantity of those metals in the Kingdom. But that when it imported to a greater value than it exported a contrary balance became due to foreign nations, which was necessarily paid to them in the same manner and thereby diminished the quantity.

Those arguments were partly solid and partly sophistical. They were solid so far as they asserted that the exportation of gold and silver in trade might frequently be advantageous to the country. They were solid, too, in asserting that no prohibition could prevent their exportation when private people found any advantage in exporting them. But they were sophistical in supposing that either to preserve or to augment the quantity of those metals required more the attention of government, than to preserve or to augment the quantity of any other useful commodities, which the freedom of trade, without any such attention, never fails to supply in the proper quantity.

Such as they were, however, those arguments convinced the people to whom they were addressed. They were addressed by merchants to parliaments and to the councils of princes, to nobles and to country gentlemen; by those who were supposed to understand trade to those who were conscious to themselves that they knew nothing about the matter. That foreign trade enriched the country, experience demonstrated to the nobles and country gentlemen, as well as to the merchants; but how or in what manner none of them well knew.

The merchants knew perfectly in what manner it enriched themselves. It was their business to know it. But to know in what manner it enriched the country was no part of their business. This subject never came into their consideration, but when they had occasion to apply to their country for some change in the laws relating to foreign trade it then became necessary to say something about the beneficial effects of foreign trade and the manner in which those effects were obstructed by the laws as they then stood.

To the judges who were to decide the business it appeared a most satisfactory account of the matter when they were told that foreign trade brought money into the country, but that the laws in question hindered it from bringing so much as it otherwise would do. Those arguments therefore produced the wished-for effect. The prohibition of exporting gold and silver was in France and England confined to the coin of those respective countries. The exportation of foreign coin and bullion was made free. In Holland and in some other places this liberty was extended even to the coin of the country.

The attention of government was turned away from guarding against the exportation of gold and silver to watch over the balance of trade as the only cause which could occasion any augmentation or diminution of those metals. From one fruitless care it was turned away to another care much more intricate, much more embarrassing, and just equally fruitless. The title of Mun's book, England's Treasure in Foreign Trade, became a fundamental maxim in the political economy, not of England only but of all other commercial countries.

The inland or home trade, the most important of all, the trade in which an equal capital affords the greatest revenue and creates the greatest employment to the people of the country, was considered as subsidiary only to foreign trade. It neither brought money into the country, it was said, nor carried any out of it. The country therefore could never become either richer or poorer by means of it, except so far as its prosperity or decay might indirectly influence the state of foreign trade.

A country that has no mines of its own must undoubtedly draw its gold and silver from foreign countries, in the same manner as one that has no vineyards of its own must draw its wines. It does not seem necessary, how-

ever, that the attention of government should be more turned toward the one than toward the other object. A country that has wherewithal to buy wine will always get the wine which it has occasion for; and a country that has wherewithal to buy gold and silver will never be in want of those metals.

We trust with perfect security that the freedom of trade, without any attention of government, will always supply us with the wine which we have occasion for; and we may trust with equal security that it will always supply us with all the gold and silver which we can afford to purchase or to employ, either in circulating our commodities or in other uses.

The quantity of every commodity which human industry can either purchase or produce naturally regulates itself in every country according to the effectual demand, or according to the demand of those who are willing to pay the whole rent, labor, and profits which must be paid in order to prepare and bring it to market. But no commodities regulate themselves more easily or more exactly according to this effectual demand than gold and silver; because on account of the small bulk and great value of those metals no commodities can be more easily transported from one place to another, from the places where they are cheap to those where they are dear, from the places where they exceed to those where they fall short of this effectual demand.

If there was in England, for example, an effectual demand for an additional quantity of gold, a packet boat could bring from Lisbon, or from wherever else it was to be had, 50 tons of gold, which could be coined into more than 5,000,000 guineas; but if there was an effectual demand for grain to the same value, to import it would require, at 5 guineas a ton, a million of tons shipping, or a thousand ships of a thousand tons each. The navy of England would not be sufficient.

When the quantity of gold and silver imported into any country exceeds the effectual demand, no vigilance of government can prevent their exportation. All the sanguinary laws of Spain and Portugal are not able to keep their gold and silver at home. The continual importations from Peru and Brazil exceed the effectual demand of those countries and sink the price of those metals there below that in the neighboring countries.

If, on the contrary, in any particular country their quantity fell short of the effectual demand, so far as to raise the price above that of the neighboring countries, the government would have no occasion to take any pains to import them. If it was even to take pains to prevent their importation, it would not be able to effectuate it. Those metals, when the Spartans had got wherewithal to purchase them, broke through all the barriers which the laws of Lyncurgus opposed to their entrance into Lacedaemon.

It would be too ridiculous to go about seriously to prove that wealth does not consist in money, or in gold and silver, but in what money purchases, and is valuable only for purchasing. Money, no doubt, makes always a part of the national capital, but it has already been shown that it generally makes but a small part, and always the most unprofitable part of it * * * and though goods do not always draw money so readily as money draws goods, in the long run they draw it more necessarily than even it draws them.

Goods can serve many other purposes besides purchasing money, but money can serve no other purpose besides purchasing goods. Money, therefore, necessarily runs after goods, but goods do not always or necessarily run after money. The man who buys does not always mean to sell again, but frequently to use or to consume, whereas he who sells always means to buy again. The one may frequently have done the whole, but the other can never have done more than the one-half of his business.

It is not for its own sake that men desire money, but for the sake of what they can purchase with it. * * * That to attempt to increase the wealth of any country, either by introducing or by detaining in it an unnecessary quantity of gold and silver, is as absurd as it would be to attempt to increase the good cheer of private families by obliging them to keep an unnecessary number of kitchen utensils.

As the expense of purchasing those unnecessary utensils would diminish instead of increasing either the quantity or goodness of the family provisions, so the expense of purchasing an unnecessary quantity of gold and silver must, in every country, as necessarily diminish the wealth which feeds, clothes, and lodges, which maintains and employs the people.

The importation of gold and silver is not the principal, much less the sole, benefit which a nation derives from its foreign trade. Between whatever places foreign trade is carried on they all of them derive two distinct benefits from it. It carries out that surplus part of the produce of their land and labor for which there is no demand among them and brings back in return for it something else, which may satisfy their wants and increase their enjoyments.

By means of it the narrowness of the home market does not hinder the division of labor in any particular branch of art or manufacture from being carried to the highest perfection. By opening a more extensive market for whatever part of the produce of their labor may exceed the home consumption, it encourages them to improve its productive powers and to augment its annual produce to the utmost, and thereby to increase the real revenue and wealth of the society.

These great and important services foreign trade is continually occupied in performing to all the different countries between which it is carried on. They all derive great benefit from it, though that in which the merchant resides generally derives the greatest, as he is generally more employed in supplying the wants and carrying out the superfluities of his own than of any other particular country. To import the gold and silver which may be wanted into the countries which have no mines is, no doubt, a part of the business of foreign commerce. It is, however, a most insignificant part of it. A country which carried on foreign trade merely on this account could scarce have occasion to freight a ship in a century.

By opening a new and inexhaustible market to all the commodities of Europe it gave occasion to new divisions of labor and improvements of art, which, in the narrow circle of the ancient commerce, could never have taken place for want of a market to take off the greater part of their produce. The productive powers of labor were improved and its produce increased in all the different countries of Europe, and, together with it, the real revenue and wealth of the inhabitants.

The commodities of Europe were almost all new to America, and many of those of America were new to Europe. A new set of exchanges, therefore, began to take place which had never been thought of before, and which should naturally have proved as advantageous to the new as it certainly did to the old continent. The savage injustice of the Europeans rendered an event which ought to have been beneficial to all ruinous and destructive to several of those unfortunate countries.

I thought it necessary, though at the hazard of being tedious, to examine at full length this popular notion that wealth consists in money or in gold and silver. Money in common language, as I have already observed, frequently signifies wealth; and this ambiguity of expression has rendered this popular notion so familiar to us that even they who are convinced of its absurdity are very apt to forget their own principles and in the course of their reasonings to take it for granted as a certain and undeniable truth.

Some of the best English writers upon commerce set out with observing that the wealth of a country consists, not in its gold and silver only, but in its lands, houses, and consumable goods of all different kinds. In the course of their reasonings, however, the lands, houses, and consumable goods seem to slip out of their memory, and the strain of their argument frequently supposes that all wealth consists in gold and silver, and that to multiply those metals is the great object of national industry and commerce.

The two principles being established, however, that wealth consisted in gold and silver, and that those metals could be brought into a country which had no mines only by the balance of trade, or by exporting to a greater value than it imported; it necessarily became the great object of political economy to diminish as much as possible the importation of foreign goods for home consumption and to increase as much as possible the exportation of the produce of domestic industry.

The restraints upon importation were of two kinds: First, restraints upon the importation of such foreign goods for home consumption as could be produced at home, from whatever country they were imported.

Second, restraints upon the importation of goods of almost all kinds from those particular countries with which the balance of trade was supposed to be disadvantageous.

Those different restraints consisted sometimes in high duties and sometimes in absolute prohibitions.

The two sorts of restraints upon importation above mentioned, together with these four encouragements to exportation, constitute the six principal means by which the commercial system proposes to increase the quantity of gold and silver in any country by turning the balance of trade in its favor.

I shall consider each of them in a particular chapter, and without taking any further notice of their supposed tendency to bring money into the country I shall examine chiefly what are likely to be the effects of each of them upon the annual produce of its industry. According as they tend either to increase or diminish the value of this annual produce, they must evidently tend either to increase or diminish the real wealth and revenue of the country.

Ricardo says:

Gold and silver having been chosen for the general medium of circulation, they are, by the competition of commerce, distributed in such proportions amongst the different countries of the world as to accommodate themselves to the natural traffic which would take place if no such metals existed and the trade between countries were purely a trade or barter.

I quote also on the balance-of-trade subject from Mr. Baker of N. Y. in the *Johnstown Daily Democrat* of February 14. It is not bad reading.

THAT BALANCE-OF-TRADE FALLACY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 13.

When we consider how widespread is the belief (or, rather, acceptance of the statement) that not only does protection "enable" the protected manufacturers to pay high wages, but that in some occult way, which even its advocates do not explain, "compels" their payment by protected manufacturers, it ought not, I assume, to be an occasion for surprise to find how prevalent is the idea that that country whose exports exceeds its imports is thereby made prosperous.

Certainly no fallacy is so widely accepted, has so many devotees, is so infrequently challenged. And yet, even the most cursory thought, the most simple examination of the subject, should be sufficient to expose its fallaciousness.

The policies of nations, the fates of empires, aye, the very existence of civilization itself, seem to most people to be involved in the contest for commercial supremacy which the great nations of the world are engaged in.

So common and so prevalent is the idea of "war" associated with commerce that it has come to be the usual term of expression that this or that nation must "fight" for commercial supremacy, and the reason advanced by people to-day why nations must fight is not, as in the past, ostensibly for territorial aggrandizement, for the extension of the geographical boundaries of nations, but that they must "fight for markets," fight for the right to push the sale of their products among the people of other nations.

Is it not singular that these devotees of war and warlike methods, these people who advocate the necessity of a big navy in order to secure the "open door," who would force our goods upon the heathen Chinese, should not as yet have advocated the creation and establishment of gigantic State militia in order that the goods produced in New York may be forced upon the people of Ohio and Pennsylvania; that the manufacturers in Illinois require a large standing army in that State to force the sale of their goods upon Wisconsin, Iowa, and Indiana?

And yet to those who are not inoculated with this virus for immense armies or big navies it should appear no more fantastic and unreasonable for the people of these and other States to insist that the goods created within their territories shall be forced upon the people of adjoining States than that we should, as a nation, force our goods upon the Chinaman, the Jap, the Russian, or the Hindoo.

As I have said, the prevalence of this idea that markets must be fought for is largely responsible indirectly, if not directly, for the thought that those nations which export the most and import the least are thereby made the most prosperous.

And yet if one will but think on this subject in a simple way, will apply the same powers of logical analysis which he gives to his own affairs, will ask himself the question why the doing of something by a large number of people in their collective capacity has a different effect upon them as a whole than what would follow the same act of an individual, he must at once see the utter absurdity and falsity of the contention that an excess of exports proves that the nation is thereby becoming rich. Nations are great aggregations of individuals. It is just as true that a hundred thousand individuals can not send out a million dollars' worth of wealth, receiving back \$900,000 worth, and thereby become rich, as if it were the transaction of one individual.

Perhaps the most surprising thing in connection with this delusion is the fact admitted even by the most ardent advocates of the "profitableness" of excess exports, that Great Britain, admittedly next to the United States the most prosperous nation in the world, has for a long period of years been importing hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of wealth in excess of her exports.

For the year ending June 30, 1903, her excess of imports over exports amounted to the enormous sum of \$900,000,000. During the same year the excess exports over imports of the United States amounted to \$400,000,000. If the contention that that nation is most prosperous which has an excess of exports is sound, then it follows that England by this time must have been almost entirely denuded of all wealth, for her excess of imports has been going on for decades and must now aggregate many billions of dollars.

If this contention is the correct one, then the year ending June 30, 1903, made England relatively thirteen hundred millions of dollars poorer than the United States, four hundred millions of this being the United States excess of exports and nine hundred millions Great Britain's excess of imports.

The explanation usually given this so-called "favorable" balance of trade is that, to quote President McKinley, we get it back in "pure gold." This in face of the fact that our total excess exports of gold and silver during the last hundred years amounts to over a billion dollars. It would be interesting to know how these "balance-of-trade" theorists account for England having an enormous stock of gold and silver. She has, however, accumulations running into the hundreds of millions of these precious metals, while the United States is one of the largest producers of gold and silver.

So that we have the anomaly, if this balance-of-trade theory is correct, of the nation whose imports (income) habitually exceed her exports (outgo) by several hundred millions annually and produces none of the metals—therefore must import them—accumulating large amounts, while the United States, a large producer of gold and silver, exports several hundred millions in excess of her imports, and yet does not accumulate gold and silver to the extent that Great Britain does.

The old mercantile theory being put into execution, Spain fell from being the richest to about the poorest and least powerful country upon the surface of the earth.

Money must be kept in and products must go out, you say. Why, if you will consider the history of trade between the United States and Great Britain for a few years, nobody with ordinary reasoning powers would talk about the balance of trade one way or the other.

The "balance of trade" has been "against" Great Britain for I don't know how many decades; I believe it has been more than three-quarters of a century, although I am not sure, but anyhow for a long time. Great Britain produces no gold and silver. We produce a great deal of gold and silver. Great Britain buys from us very much more than she sells to us.

The natural result you would think would be that we got her gold and silver. Not a bit of it, for it happens that she imported more gold and silver from us upon the whole than we from her. There is no such thing as a "balance of trade," around the world, except a true balance, and a true balance is nothing on either side. Any country that goes along trading with the world any length of time and buys more than it sells, or sells more than it buys, leaves its people in a very bad fix, and for no great length of time can it do it.

If I buy a thing and pay for it, why do I buy it? Because I had rather have the thing than the money. Why had I rather have the thing than the money? Because I have more use for the thing than I have for the money. Why have I more use for it? Because it will enrich me more to have the thing, either for consumption or resale, than it will to have the money.

Now, if I sell anything for money, why do I sell it? Simply because I would rather have the money than to have the thing; because I see that the money will enrich me more than the thing that I am parting with. How? By buying something of greater value to me. And so, your gold and silver, which is money everywhere, is, in international relations, a commodity like other things.

Now, then, the balance-of-trade theory of prosperity reminds me of a quarrel that my old stepgrandmother had with me about swapping knives when I was a boy. She was an old Scotch woman and answered a good deal to Samuel Johnson's definition of a Scotchman in one respect, that the skull of a Scotchman had to be split open and a joke put in bodily before he could see it. She was one of the best women that ever lived, and a woman of magnificent sense and character, but she had never done any trading, and her family had never done any, either.

I came home one day with a Barlow knife. "Where did you get that knife, John?" "I swapped it for my knife with such and such a boy." She said: "Well, now, you have to be taught to stop that right now. I am going to give you a whipping. I am not going to have that sort of a thing go on. Gran"—one of the other grandchildren—"started out that way and finally got to swapping horses."

After the old lady had slapped me, she said: "John, I want you to understand why I slapped you. When you swapped knives with that other boy you did one of two things—you acted either a fool because you let him cheat you, or a knave because you cheated him." [Laughter.] That is the laughable theory, that when peoples trade together one must necessarily be chiseled and swindled. I heard a gentleman from Pennsylvania a moment ago say that "our trade with Canada" was so much, and that "their trade with us" was so much.

How can there be any of "our" trade with Canada unless it is equally Canada's trade with us, and how can there be any "their trade" with us unless it is equally our trade with Canada? And unless we make upon both sides of the transaction then our mutual trading must soon stop, unless we are simply foolish or altruistic traders. That is all. Now, when we trade with Great Britain during the years 1903 and 1904 it does not follow that we have gotten any advantage of Great Britain or she of us.

This follows, that we have each gotten advantage of each, or think we have gotten advantage. Paradoxical in sound, but true in fact. The very phrase "balance of trade" is deceptive. And why? When you come to count up your exports from the United States, you value them at the prices of the article in the United States, and when foreigners come to count them where they are delivered as imports of theirs they value them at their

increased price in the market to which they are shipped, and vice versa with what they sell us, so that two nations can not come to any agreed statement about it at all.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] said that the Democratic platform declared that "as practiced, reciprocity is worse than protection," and the sort of reciprocity to which the Democratic platform was referring is worse than protection—the sort that would be practiced by the Republican party, or the sort that the Democratic platform makers thought would be practiced by the Republican party.

And the gentleman proved it here to-day; but the right sort of reciprocity is almost as good as the right sort of tariff revision, all along the line, because it reduces tax burdens somewhere at any rate. It untaxes the American consumers at our end of the line and unburdens foreign consumers at the other end of the line, thereby increasing their purchasing power, and thereby increasing the volume of our shipments to them.

The gentleman said there are two kinds of reciprocity, and there are. There is a sham reciprocity, the seeming reciprocity, which is Republican reciprocity, and then there is "the real thing," and that is Democratic reciprocity. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And why? The gentleman told you why; because Republican reciprocity, according to him, is reciprocity in "noncompeting" articles altogether.

Now, as all of your noncompeting articles are already on the free list, or very nearly so, what do you mean by Republican reciprocity, "reciprocity in noncompeting articles," except sham and humbuggery and pretense? Why? Because the only way in which you can lower a duty on noncompeting articles, the same being now not on the dutiable list, is, first, to put those articles on the dutiable list. In other words, go through the farce of taxing a thing upon which the consumer is not already taxed and then removing the tax thus levied, in order to get the foreigner to do what?

To levy and remove a duty upon one of his "noncompeting" articles. And why? Because if the foreigner allows you to "reciprocate" only in noncompeting articles, noncompetitive in your market, then you have got to assume that the foreigner is a fool if he allows you to send anything except "noncompeting" articles into his market.

So that you have this magnificent piece of mutual humbuggery at the two ends of the balance, "Republican reciprocity," as defined by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]: We take off the free list a certain number of noncompeting articles and tax our consumers on them, and then France takes off her free list a certain number of noncompeting articles and taxes her consumers upon their consumption.

Then the two of us get together through diplomacy and say, "We will remove these things that we put on for the purpose of 'trading,' and we will call it 'reciprocity.'" Now, that is Republican reciprocity, according to the gentleman's definition, if I understand it; unless we assume that the foreigner, as highly civilized as we, as alive to his own interest as we, knowing just as much about the course of trade as we—in France, Germany, and Great Britain—is a fool. Why? Because he knows that we have got to consume his noncompeting articles anyhow.

Such articles as they produce that come into our markets and that are noncompeting with ours, because we for any reason can not produce them, we have got to buy, and it does not affect them at all, no matter what import tax we put upon them.

The only effect of our tax on things, which we must have and can not produce, would be to make our own people pay more for them. We can not grow anything to compete with them, we can not grow anything to reduce their price, and we have got to accept them from their hands, they holding the monopoly of their production.

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] was not altogether right even in his statement of his own party's past position.

If so, will the gentleman tell me why it was, if Republican reciprocity as announced by Blaine and by McKinley and other great men in the Republican party, but not as announced by him to-day, was to be a reciprocity only in noncompeting articles—will the gentleman tell me why it was that sugar was one of the articles always designated and the one that has been most dealt with in reciprocity treaties? I am sure we have been raising sugar for generations.

A little bit later on in his speech he told us, that at the time of the enactment of the Dingley bill, sugar "had not grown to the proportions of a great national production." Had it not? If there is any reason at all that could be stated, it must be simply because sugar was at that time produced nearly altogether out of cane in Louisiana and was not at that time produced to any great extent in America out of beets raised in the Northwest.

Was what he really meant to say that it had not become a Northern product, that it was still a "sectional" product, and,

being raised in Louisiana, of course, it could be switched around just as the Republican party chose?

Now, the gentleman disputed what I said in that magazine article. I shall insert in my remarks section 4 of the Dingley bill, which proves that I am exactly right.

The gentleman says that that section was inserted after the schedules of the bill had been fixed. What difference does it make whether it was inserted after you had drawn up your schedules or before? If it was inserted afterwards, it was simply a confession of the fact that you had beforehand made the duties 20 per cent higher than, in your own opinion even, was necessary. That is all.

If it had been inserted contemporaneously, it might have proven that you had had the two provisions in view at the same time; but if inserted subsequently, it proves that you, as the makers of the law, believed that you could spare 20 per cent of the duties named in the schedules of the bill and still have a bill which from a protectionist standpoint even would do what you say protection will do, namely, "protect American labor."

The gentleman says that during a certain period of our treaty with Canada we gained 11 per cent in "our trade" (as if our trade with them was not their trade with us, you understand) and they gained 500 per cent in "their trade" with us. Now, if that were true—

Mr. DALZELL. I think the gentleman has made a mistake. I did not say anything of that kind.

A MEMBER. It was Mr. BATES.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I beg pardon of the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the mistake. It was an interruption of the gentleman's speech in which that language was used by Mr. BATES his colleague.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman from Mississippi will allow me to say that was not the language I used. I stated that during the life of that treaty of 1854 with Canada our exports to Canada increased only 11 per cent, while her exports to us increased 500 per cent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Somebody on the other side used that language. I think it was the gentleman himself, because I noticed particularly the manner of the expression used, and I turned at the time in that direction and said: "I wonder whether our trade with Canada is not their trade with us."

Mr. BATES. If it is the "manner" of expression which the gentleman challenges, then I beg him to ignore the "manner" of the expression and to address himself to the facts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am glad to do that, too; I am going to address myself to both, as is my right.

I say the very manner of that expression is one of the straws showing which way the wind blows—one of the oozings out of things not deliberately intended, showing more than a deliberate utterance would, the tendency of protectionist miseducation on the other side of the Chamber.

Now, the gentleman really had in his mind the idea that when Canada sells things to us we are buying something that we do not want and the buying of which is somehow a loss to us and somehow a greater advantage to Canada; and when we sell things to Canada, somehow or other there is an advantage to us and none to Canada.

That is, in one case the trade is an advantage to us and a disadvantage to them, and in the other case an advantage to Canada and a loss or detriment to us. That idea oozes out unconsciously as a result of this miseducation, economically, which protectionism brings upon men. We profited, I dare say, just as much and no more, proportionately, from the 11 per cent increase in our exports to her as we did from the 500 per cent increase in her exports, to us and vice versa.

I make this statement because I take it that this great Yankee nation, or rather the people composing it, are not fools and would not have bought anything from Canada unless, in their opinion, it paid them to get it, any more than they would have sold anything to Canada unless, in their opinion, it was an advantage to sell it.

But the gentleman is mistaken even there. The "balance of trade" even was not against us. He is not mistaken if he takes the last years of the whole period; but there was a part of the period of the life of that treaty when very abnormal conditions existed, namely, from 1861 down to 1866. If the gentleman will take the balance of that period not affected by the abnormal war conditions, he will find the truth.

Of course in time of war you buy more because you have less producers at home. A country with a million men in the field of war has to buy more than it does with those million men in the field of peaceful industry. Now, I am going to read to the gentleman a part of an article written by Eugene G. Hay, entitled "The future of Canada and reciprocity with the United States." I read from page 462 of the Review of Reviews for October, 1903:

Largely through the energy, the tact, and the skill of Lord Elgin, then governor-general of Canada, there was negotiated and ratified in 1854 a commercial treaty between the United States and the Canadian provinces. This

treaty, by its terms, was to continue for a period of ten years, and continually thereafter until twelve months after either government had given notice to the other of its wish to terminate the same.

The President of the United States, upon the direction of Congress, gave such notice in 1865, and the treaty was terminated in 1866. No provision was made in this treaty fixing the duty on dutiable articles, but it provided for the free admission from either country to the other of a long list of natural products, being the growth and products of Canada and of the United States, embracing most of the products of the farm, the forest, the quarry, and the waters of each country.

In the light of present conditions it is difficult to understand why the United States Congress terminated this treaty. The principal reason given was that with the enormous debt left by the civil war the United States was in need of all possible revenues, and must have the revenue that would come from the duty on Canadian imports.

It is possible also that a feeling of bitter hostility, growing out of the attitude of Great Britain and certain factions in Canada during our great civil conflict, had its influence upon Congress; but, more than all this, it is probable that the great pressing problems with which the statesmen of that day had to deal were so all-absorbing that the possible growth and development of our commerce did not receive due consideration.

It was in an era of war. Commercial benefit was not then the main aim of Congress in legislating, I will interpolate.

ITS PRACTICAL EFFECTS.

Figures—

Mark you—

which state the imports and exports do not always tell the full story of the value of a commerce. In any reciprocity arrangement that may be effected with Canada both nations would be benefited, not only by their increased sales, but by their increased purchases from the other. But, viewed entirely from the standpoint of the figures which state the exports and imports—

Viewed entirely from that standpoint—

an examination of these figures for the years preceding, during, and succeeding the period of the treaty will disclose the fact that both countries were benefited by its operation. Prior to 1854 there was comparatively little trade between Canada and the United States and prior to 1846 scarcely any, but during this time, while the trade was insignificantly small, our exports always exceeded our imports. With the ratification of the treaty in 1854 the trade between the countries increased at a bound.

"Our exports to Canada," a thing that you think makes us rich, increased nearly 300 per cent in two years, "grew from \$12,432,597 in 1853, the year preceding the ratification of the treaty, to \$34,362,188 in 1855, the first year in which the treaty was in force;" and "our imports during the same period increased from \$6,527,559 to \$15,118,289," or double, in round numbers. What we bought from them—the thing that you seem to think makes us poor—our purchases doubled, only, during the same period. I think the increase in both exports and imports is what equally enriched both of us.

This rapid increase continued, preserving almost the same ratio during the first two years the treaty was in operation. During our civil war the exports and imports grew nearer together, owing to the curtailing of our production and the increase of our consumption, until, in 1864, the imports exceeded the exports, and so again in 1865 and 1866.

And those are the only three years during the life of the treaty; and why? Because when men are fighting they can not plow. When men are on steamships at sea in deadly conflict with their foes they can not be working in shops on land manufacturing things. No country can go to war without increasing its consumption and decreasing its production.

The treaty terminated in 1866, and the excess of our imports over exports which began in 1864 continued until 1874, or a period of seven years after the termination of the treaty.

Why? Because we were still trying to catch up with the waste of the war.

The years when this treaty was in force were far more prosperous for the commerce between Canada and the United States than had hitherto been enjoyed.

Now, the trade may have been more prosperous at some periods since, understand me, because both countries have since become more prosperous, more populous, more productive, and therefore both possess greater interchangeable value, one for the other; but it was relatively prosperous then than at any equal period since.

In fact it was the very beginning of what has since developed into an enormous commerce between these two neighboring peoples. During the period of a little less than twelve years that the treaty was in force the balance of trade in our favor—

Taking the whole period together—

was \$37,479,531.

Now, if it had been the other way, provided the volume of trade, in the aggregate, had grown, it would still have proven that we had benefited; but still, for men who believe in the "balance-of-trade" theory, I give you the true figures to think about; even the "balance of trade" was in our favor.

Being more than double the entire trade between the countries during any year prior to the ratification of the treaty, and the total commerce grew during that period—

Now, hear this:

The total commerce grew during that period from \$18,000,000 per annum to \$76,000,000. As these countries have prospered and increased in importance, the commerce between them has continued to grow, until in the fiscal year just ended the total commerce reached almost to \$180,000,000, the balance of trade being greatly in our favor. The present condition can not, however, long continue.

Our average tariff on dutiable goods coming from Canada to the United States is 49.83 per cent, and the Canadian average tariff on dutiable goods going from the United States into Canada is 24.83 per cent. Unless commercial reciprocity is soon attained, Canadian tariffs will undoubtedly be raised

to approximately the level of our own, which will practically destroy commerce between the countries.

THE PROPOSED "BROWN DRAFT" TREATY.

In 1874 a treaty was negotiated between the United States and the Dominion government which is known in Canada as the "Brown Draft treaty." This treaty contained three schedules, and by its terms it was agreed that the duty on articles named in these schedules, being the growth, products, and manufacture of the Dominion of Canada and of the United States, on their importation from one country to the other, should, from the 1st day of July, 1875, to the 30th day of June, 1876, inclusive, be two-thirds of the rate paid at the date of the treaty, and, from the 1st day of July, 1876, to the 30th day of June, 1877, inclusive, be one-third of such rate, and on and after the 1st day of July, 1877, for a period of twenty-one years, all such articles should be admitted free of duty into each country, respectively.

Eighteen hundred and seventy-four was during General Grant's Administration. The treaty of that year was approved by him.

I want to remind you gentlemen upon that side of this House that General Grant, after he began to give up thoughts of military affairs and began to betake himself to thoughts about political affairs, was classed as a Republican.

Mr. LIND. Before the gentleman leaves that article, I would like to state to him that Mr. Hay, the writer of that article, is one of the Republican tariff commissioners or appraisers at the port of New York, recently appointed by President Roosevelt. He was the Republican candidate for Congress in my district at the last election.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add, he was not nominated.

Mr. LIND. Well?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Your President by appointing a man with his ideas, a man that could write that article showing such research and sound economical judgment, reflects more credit upon your party than was reflected upon it by having him beaten for a nomination in one of your districts. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I wanted to call your attention to the fact that in 1874 a treaty was negotiated under General Grant's Administration, he being very much in favor of it, being a repetition of the treaty of 1854, except that it went further.

Now the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] tells us that the treaties negotiated by Mr. Kasson, approved by Mr. McKinley (because Mr. McKinley sent them to the Senate), are "not Republican" treaties and that the Republican party was consistent and true to its idea in defeating them. Who had the better right to judge what is and what is not sanely Republican, Grant and McKinley or he, I leave as a thought to be digested by the country. Then he goes on to say, that, of course, I know, that "the period for ratifying these treaties under the Dingley bill has passed." That is true; but the period to obtain the fruit of these treaties in another way has not passed.

I have introduced into this House a bill—and if I could just get the Ways and Means Committee favorably to report and this House to pass all my bills that are pending in that committee, this country would be great, grand, and glorious beyond all precedent in less than three months. [Laughter.] I have introduced a bill into that committee, and the purpose of the bill is to fix the rates of duties upon certain articles as shown by a certain schedule in that bill.

Now, then, these articles and these duties shown by that schedule are the articles upon which the duties were fixed by us as our proposed import duties in the proposed treaty which was negotiated by William McKinley's administration with France. A clause of my bill provides that that schedule of reduced duties shall not go into effect until the President of the United States shall "by proclamation make known the fact that France" has done a certain thing. What? Why, the thing that France promised to do in the treaty, viz, give to American products in her market her minimum rates.

Now, here is my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who denies the Senate's right to enter into reciprocity treaties, anyhow, without the House, and here is my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] who takes that view also, I believe. Now, I have come in to their aid. I now say, by this bill, "Away with the Senate; brush it aside; let us have 'McKinley reciprocity,' by legislation originated in the House of Representatives." [Applause on the Democratic side.] And when you pass this bill I will introduce three or four others, based on treaties that Mr. McKinley approved and Mr. Kasson negotiated.

But get back to this matter of Canadian reciprocity. While I am upon that question, Mr. Chairman, I want to read something from Mr. McKinley:

The period of exclusiveness is past.

It has been read so often that it has become trite, but it is worth reading.

The expansion of our trade and commerce is the present problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations prevents reprisals.

If he did not fear reprisals, why did he want to "prevent reprisals?" The gentleman from Pennsylvania tells us to-day that

he has heard this wolf cry of "reprisals and retaliation" so often that he pays no attention to it. That is substantially what he said. Now, if it had that effect upon Mr. McKinley's mind, if he was not afraid of retaliation and reprisal, why did Mr. McKinley say:

Reciprocity is in harmony with the spirit of the times. Measures of retaliation are not.

Why did he say that, unless he was afraid that there would be "measures of retaliation?" Mr. McKinley had sense enough not only to feel, but to know, that there would be reprisals and measures of retaliation. Why, of course, you must have measures of retaliation unless you have the balance of the world in such a slavish adulation of you that they will stand still and give you all advantages to enter their markets while you deprive them of such as you can.

There is just one advantage that you can not deprive them of, and it is the advantage of their shipping to our markets the things which they grow or make, that we can not grow or make in this country—the noncompetitive articles.

These very things you propose to make the sole basis of so-called "Republican reciprocity." Do you really think that foreigners can be so foolish as not to know that you propose to get something for nothing, or that they will trade on that basis?

"Republican reciprocity" on noncompeting articles!

I hold in my hand President Eckhart's introductory address to the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, and a part of that I want to read. Now, I do not know whether President Eckhart is a Republican or a Democrat; some of you Illinois people do, I suppose. He says:

Great Britain, our largest consumer for our agricultural and manufacturing products, is now agitating the question of abandoning its old and cherished policy of free trade and adopting the policy of protection, with differential duties to its colonies, no doubt with the view of making reciprocal trade arrangements with other nations.

And in that connection, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania still has by him the North American from which he read this morning there are some figures there which I will insert in my remarks. I want to say—I can not remember the figures exactly—Canada first gave Great Britain 15 per cent preferential; she then gave her 25 per cent, and then she gave her 33½ per cent.

Mr. DALZELL. Twelve and one-half per cent was the first.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Twelve and a half per cent first, and then 25, and then 33½. Now, when Canada began that policy she found her purchases of Great Britain to amount annually to about \$29,000,000. I will put the right figures from the magazine in the RECORD. Now, those purchases from Great Britain have increased, at the expense of our manufacturers and our producers mainly, from \$29,000,000 to \$60,000,000, as I remember the figures. It has been a month nearly since I read the article and some time since it first came out.

Here is what the article says:

The Chamberlain proposition for colonial preferential trade creates a complication in the reciprocity issue at the present time. Last year Mr. Chamberlain spoke almost contemptuously of the Canadian preference in favor of Great Britain, of 33½ per cent, and declared that its effects were disappointing, and that it was chiefly valuable as an evidence of loyal sentiment. This estimate of value was wide of the mark. The preference had actually rescued the British export trade to Canada from practical extinction. This trade had gone down from \$68,000,000 in 1873 to \$29,000,000 in 1897. The effect of this Canadian preference has been to bring this trade up to \$59,000,000 in 1903.

Since the gentleman from Pennsylvania has read so much and commented so much on this article, I will supply the reader with more of it.

For example, this:

In the history of the two countries there was a period of twelve years, from 1854 to 1866, when their trade relations were of a mutually advantageous character, and were exerting a powerful influence in the creation of community of interest and the broadening of mutual relations. The civil war in the United States gave rise to circumstances that aroused unfriendly feeling toward Canada in that country, based upon misapprehension as to facts, for the great majority of Canadians were friendly to the Union.

A mistaken impression that the treaty was much more favorable to Canada than to the United States was also entertained by the majority of Americans. For the period during which the treaty was in force the balance of trade was decidedly in favor of the United States. According to Canadian trade returns, the total imports and exports, 1854 to 1866, inclusive, were:

Imports from the United States	\$332,927,000
Exports to the United States	259,875,000
Balance of trade in favor of the United States	73,052,000

These returns did not include Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, and British Columbia.

According to American returns, the total exports and imports to all of British North America, 1854 to 1866, inclusive, were:

Exports to British America	\$343,326,000
Imports from British America	318,790,000
Balance in favor of the United States	24,536,000

And this:

One of the unexpected trade developments of late years is the growth of an extensive demand in various parts of Canada for American farm products, and the fact that this demand has turned the tide of trade in this line in the direction of Canada. The Canadian market for American farm products is found in British Columbia and the Yukon and the Klondike region, in the maritime Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, and in the lumbering and mining regions of Ontario; and for Indian corn, hiles, flaxseed, wool, tobacco leaf, etc., in all parts of the Dominion.

In the fiscal year 1902-3 the importation of farm products into Canada for

consumption from the United States was as follows: Dutiable farm products, \$6,909,000; free farm products, \$14,672,000, a total of \$21,581,000. The same year the export of farm products to the United States was \$9,200,000, the Canadian excess of imports above exports from the United States being \$12,381,000. The dutiable portion of the imports was subject to the same rates of duty substantially as were imposed by the United States upon articles of the same class imported from Canada.

This condition of the trade leads to the conclusion that if free trade in farm products existed, the importation by Canada from the United States for domestic consumption would equal export in the same line to the United States for consumption. This, of course, would not apply to wheat, flour, and other articles of which both countries have a surplus for export, as the United States in importing such products would export either of them or a corresponding amount of United States products, and they would thus practically act as a factor, securing for American transportation routes, millers, dealers, and commission men a profitable and in every way desirable trade.

Also this:

The subjoined table, showing the Canadian importation of manufactures from Great Britain and from the United States since 1898, will be of interest, especially when taken in connection with the fact that Canada has given a tariff preference to Great Britain first of 12½ per cent, 1897 to 1898, then of 25 per cent to 1900, and of 33½ per cent since that time.

Canadian imports of manufactures.

Year.	From Great Britain.	From United States.
1898	\$36,243,000	\$41,510,000
1899	31,187,000	49,262,000
1900	37,328,000	60,473,000
1901	36,469,000	62,648,000
1902	41,675,000	69,536,000
1903	50,473,000	76,291,000

The Dominion of Canada is the third largest customer of the United States among the nations of the world, and is the largest customer for manufactured goods. In the year 1902 the exports of the United States to Canada exceeded by \$36,814,000 her total exports to Mexico, the Central American States, and all of South America from Panama to Cape Horn.

The question whether this great market is worth making an effort to retain is worthy of the serious consideration of American statesmen. That there is danger of its being seriously curtailed does not admit of doubt.

The present importance of this question is great. Its future importance is infinitely greater. In the Canadian northwest, as yet practically untouched, is a wheat-growing area as large as eight States like Illinois. Where now there are a few hundred thousand inhabitants there will be teeming millions, and the 60,000,000-bushel wheat crop of the present year will be swollen to a figure that will make this great region the granary of food-purchasing nations.

English statesmen comprehend the importance of the trade of Canada, and are evolving shadowy and theoretic schemes for preferential trade within the Empire, and possibly an Imperial Zollverein, the fundamental basis of which is to be the creation in the colonies of a preserve for British manufactures, from which foreign competitors to as great extent as possible shall be shut out; at the cost to Britain of preferential duties in the home market, as moderate as possible, for a limited list of colonial products.

This preferential scheme is now engaging the attention of the Canadian public. Various circumstances predispose Canadians to look upon it with favor. There is soreness over the Alaskan boundary settlement. There is a sense of injustice suffered at the hands of the United States in the character of their trade policy toward Canada. There is a charm about the idea of receiving preference over foreign countries in the British market, and the proposed policy appeals strongly to the Canadian sense of loyalty.

The day has now come for the United States to abandon a wrong position and retract false steps, and it is already high noon of that day. No fear need be entertained of being too liberal with Canada. The greater the liberality of treatment the more satisfactory will be the results.

This excellent gospel for full measure:

Free trade in natural products, and all other products, has continued in the United States since the Constitution was adopted. In that country there is great variety of soil, climate, productions, and cost of production, but free trade has been found to be mutually advantageous to all the States. The same policy will apply with equal force to Canada.

This also for patriotic Americans, whether of the United States or Canada:

The day will come when 400,000,000 people who speak the English tongue will occupy the 7,000,000 square miles which the Anglo-Saxon now possesses in America. Shall this great future be one of harmony, where justice, truth, good will, and mutually advantageous relations shall prevail? Heaven grant that it may; and let all thoughtful, well-meaning men in the two countries realize that the words and actions of Canadian and American jingoes are not in the interests of the future myriads for whom we are now laying down the lines.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. DALZELL. Does the gentleman mean to say that British exports to Canada have increased in larger proportion than ours?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No; I do not. No; I do not say that. I was telling just what they had increased. Why, when Canada began that policy Great Britain had almost lost the Canadian market. She had sunk so low she did not export to her own colony but about \$29,000,000 per annum, and now the amount has gone up to the neighborhood of \$60,000,000 a year.

It is increasing at the expense of our people, consisting of things that would have been shipped by us to Canada but for this preferential duty which enables Great Britain to sell the same articles cheaper.

In the light of all these facts—

Says Mr. Eckhart—

how much longer may we hope to continue to find a ready and profitable market for the increasing surplus of our agricultural and manufacturing

products with our gates of commerce swinging but one way? Has not the time come for our doors to be so hung that they can swing both in and out?

In connection with that, I want to insert in the RECORD, for my voice is in a bad condition, a part of the speech made by John Charlton, a member of the Canadian congress, the author of the very article read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, at the Auditorium, Chicago, November 10, 1903, on "Reciprocity with Canada."

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. You mean member of Parliament?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I meant member of Parliament, of course. There is a little that I would like to read, though—the first beginning of it:

Between the Gulf of Mexico and the Republic of Mexico on the south, and the Arctic Ocean on the north, stretches a vast territory, 7,000,000 square miles in extent, with resources of soil, mine, forest, and fisheries many times in excess of present development; bounded on the east, west, and north by oceans; invulnerable to foes if united in purpose; inhabited at the present moment by 84,000,000 English-speaking people; the home of the highest form of civilization, and possessed of the most advanced condition of human liberty.

What shall be the future of this most favored of all of earth's continental areas? Shall this early morning of its history advance to a resplendent noonday of power, development, and mutually peaceful and advantageous relations, with, ultimately, 300,000,000 of our race dwelling together in peace and unity, or shall we deliberately shape the conditions of the present in such a manner as to secure the establishment of two rival, mutually repellent, and possibly hostile powers, swayed by the influences of prejudices and animosities, and spurning the conditions that will bear the blessed fruits of peace, harmony, and mutual advantage?

I want to read you some figures now which the gentleman has not read. I want to call the gentleman's attention, and I shall insert in the RECORD the Canadian free list—the list of the things that they now admit from our market free:

CANADIAN FREE LIST.

Of Canadian imports from the United States last year, \$69,485,000 were upon the free list, and embraced in this list were the following:

Manufactures	\$23,000,000
Forest products	4,986,000
Indian corn	3,250,000
Flaxseed	1,303,000
Tobacco leaf	2,241,000
Hides and skins	2,612,000
Wool	307,000
Sundry agricultural products	2,050,000
Sundry animals and products	2,267,000
Total	42,016,000

These are the things which they will put a duty upon, if they are driven by hostile legislation, or rather by a continuance of it, to retaliate. Again:

CANADA AS A CUSTOMER FOR OUR MANUFACTURES.

Even under her moderate tariff Canada has become the best customer for manufactures that the United States possesses, and her trade with the United States largely exceeds that of all Latin America, with 56,000,000 inhabitants. The imports of manufactures from the United States were:

Manufactures from United States, 1902	\$69,536,000
Excess over Great Britain in 1902	27,030,000

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman tell me what American manufactures are on the Canadian free list?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not know specifically, I can probably get the details before to-morrow morning, and if so, I will put them in the RECORD. There were twenty-three millions of our manufactures imported into Canada, which were, in 1902, on the free list.

Now, then, "under moderate tariff Canada has become the best customer for manufactures that the United States possesses, and their trade with the United States largely exceeds that of all Latin America with 56,000,000 inhabitants."

This vast market will expand indefinitely. Canada has room for 100,000,000 inhabitants. The question is whether we shall preserve that market or whether we shall act in such a way as to close it by reprisal and retaliation.

Now, a great deal has been said this morning about Canadian reciprocity hurting our farmers in the Northwest. I want to call the gentleman's attention to these figures:

WHEAT.	
United States production, 1900	\$369,945,000
United States importation from Canada for consumption	536,000
Proportion of import to production, 0.02 per cent.	
OATS.	
United States production, 1900	\$217,098,000
Importation from Canada for consumption, 1903	39,062
Proportion of import to production, 0.02 per cent.	
BARLEY.	
United States production, 1900	\$41,631,000
Importation from Canada for consumption, 1903	17,148
Proportion of import to production, 0.05 per cent.	
POTATOES.	
United States production, 1900	\$98,380,009
Importation from Canada for consumption, 1903	55,960
Proportion of import to production, 0.03 per cent.	
HAY.	
United States production, 1900	\$434,254,000
Importation from Canada for consumption	1,924,598
Proportion of import to production, 0.04 per cent.	

HORSES.	
Value in United States, 1900	\$1,050,526,000
Importation from Canada, 1903	340,239
Proportion of importation to stock held, 0.004 per cent.	

CATTLE.	
Value in United States, 1900	\$1,516,307,000
Importation from Canada, 1903	292,238
Proportion of importation to stock held, 0.004 per cent.	

SHEEP.	
Value in United States, 1900	\$170,881,000
Importation from Canada	961,109
Proportion of importation to stock held, 0.06 per cent.	

EGGS.	
Production in United States, 1900	\$144,240,000
Importation from Canada, 1903	6,436
Proportion of importation to production, 0.005 per cent.	

LUMBER.	
United States production, lumber and lumber products, 1900	\$506,621,000
Importation from Canada, 1903	16,977,000
Proportion of importation to production, 3 per cent; proportion of importation of sawn lumber to production, about 2 per cent.	

Ah, but I hear some gentleman say that if we reduce the duty more farm products will come in. I know that will be so on some parts of the boundary, because it is a queer fact that at one end of the long line of division we buy a thing of Canada and at the other end she will buy the same thing of us. It will work both ways.

Mr. Charlton further says:

It must not be supposed that the trade in natural farm products would be exclusively from Canada to the United States. At the present time and for years past the interchange of farm products has been greatly in favor of the United States. In 1903 the export of farm products from Canada to the United States was \$9,300,000. The import of farm products from the United States to Canada, exclusive of raw cotton, was \$21,601,000, of which \$3,900,000 was dutiable and \$14,692,000 free. So that we sell more farm products to Canada than Canada buys from us by a very great deal—more than twice as much.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. May I ask the gentleman what he is reading these statistics from?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. From the speech of John Charleton, a member of Parliament, made before the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, November 10, 1903, and I so stated when I began to read them.

Mr. PAYNE. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says the Republican party is not engaged in "bookkeeping reciprocity." I thought that just what the Republican party believed in in connection with the tariff laws, whether treaties, reciprocity laws, or general laws, was "bookkeeping."

I have been hearing so long that the Republican party was "up-building the private industries of the country" that I thought they kept a credit and debit account with every private industry in the United States—manufacturers getting protection, Republicans getting campaign funds. But I think if the gentleman does want to keep books in connection with reciprocity he will find the books are more apt to bring prosperity to the United States in proportion as he takes the trammels off our trade.

The gentleman then says, "What is the matter with our foreign trade?" Why, our foreign trade is all right, except in just so far as it is trammelled by Republican legislation. What we want is to make it "all righter." The gentleman quotes our imports from foreign parts of the world, and he boasts about the amount of our imports and says they are increasing.

That is a very high tribute to the laws of God as against the laws of the Republican party, because if you could have carried your Republican policy to its ultimate analysis you would not have any imports at all except in noncompeting products. And what sort of products are there upon the face of this globe that would be strictly noncompeting in the American market?

A Republican policy carried to its bitter end would build a wall against every article in the world the like of which could be raised in the United States. What are the articles the like of which can not be raised in the United States? Polar bears, guava, and breadfruit, and a few things of that sort constitute about all. [Laughter.]

The gentleman would quit buying from any country under the sun anything except the things that could not, even with legislative hothousing, be produced in the United States. Every dollar that we import is a blow at the success of your miserable Republican tariff legislation, and is a proof of the inability of human legislation to violate always and forever the laws of God and of trade. The gentleman says our foreign trade has grown. So it has. But our domestic trade has grown, too. It has grown a great deal more, and nobody contends that the tariff has had anything to do with that.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit an interruption, my recollection of the debates in the

Senate last fall is that Senator DOLLIVER, in a colloquy over there as to whether or not Mr. Dingley placed reciprocity rates in the Dingley tariff, said he had placed and that there were in the present Dingley law reciprocity rates for the purpose of forcing foreign countries to enter into specially good reciprocal rates with us. Did the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] allude to that in his argument?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I was not here, and I did not hear all of his speech.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman did not allude to what Mr. DOLLIVER said. I knew of that.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The point I was about to make is this: They put the rates in the tariff law, and yet they have not entered into any reciprocal contracts with foreign countries, and the result is that we pay a revenue and a protection rate and the reciprocity rate as well.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And Senator DOLLIVER said that Mr. Dingley had told him just what the gentleman says, but others have disputed that, and thus that is a question of veracity into which I did not care to enter. The fact is that the Dingley bill itself proves that that was the author's view of the law, because it contains a clause enabling the President to enter into reciprocal relations with a 20 per cent reduction.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Just a moment more. There was a reciprocity convention held in the city of Washington since this tariff law was enacted, and it is in the proceedings of that convention that one gentleman, or several gentlemen, came here for the purpose of getting reciprocal trade relations entered into, and they were informed by leading Senators here, so the report states, that it is a fact that these reciprocal rates were placed in the Dingley tariff and are there now. At a convenient season I will exhibit the pamphlet to my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] or any other gentleman on the other side who desires to read it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I wish to say this, that not all the misapplied figures and not all the mere narrow nationalism of the world can divide the world any further than God has already divided it—by oceans, by speech, by mountain ranges, and by racial characteristics.

Men can not live as nations upon any different footing than the footing upon which they must live as individuals, and nations must prosper and grow and be loved or be hated for the same reasons that individuals, in dealing with other individuals, prosper and grow and are loved or are hated. All the Chauvinism in the world can not change the eternal principle that in trade relations, as in our other relations in the world, friendship is better than enmity, peace is better than war, reciprocity is better than retaliation.

You can not continue always to take and never to give. You can not continue always to sell and never to buy. You can not continue always to frame your legislation upon an assumption that foreigners are necessarily enemies and have them treat you otherwise than as enemies. What is the consequence of all this?

You have gone on until you have erected a great house, that will have to be taken down very gradually to keep from hurting your own people, and yet taken down it must be in the course of time, not by us alone, but by all nations in the world, who are indulging in the same sort of laws of corelationship. Every barrier to trade, every barrier to transportation and travel, every barrier to the access of literature and the productions of art, is a step in the direction of keeping the peoples of the world apart, an obstruction in the pathway along which they ought to travel in getting together.

The gentleman may talk; he may produce abnormal figures, all he pleases; but I say he is standing to-day with his face turned backward toward the time when foreigners were regarded as necessarily enemies, and when people thought that if they had any trade with foreigners at all everything bought was that much lost.

It is true also that those of us who are looking the other way, whether we succeed immediately or whether it be a long time before we succeed, have our faces turned to the future—the future when men would rather live in amity than live at war—the time when they would rather “live, and let live,” treating one another as trade equals, one buying from the other that which the other, with his climate and soil and industrial character, can best and most effectively and most cheaply produce, and the other buying from him that which, with his climate and soil and peculiar genius, he can most effectively and most cheaply produce.

All the statistics in the world cut no figure in comparison with the eternal principle; but since the gentleman has undertaken to furnish figures for the policy which he follows, I have undertaken to furnish the counter figures; and if I had had time to hunt up at my room the things which I have there, lying around helter-skelter, I could have supported my proposition even more conclusively than I think I have done already.

There is not a shred of fact in the statement that even from the

standpoint of a “balance-of-trade” economist, except during the few abnormal periods of war time, your reciprocity treaty with Canada carried even “the balance of trade” against us. I have shown that; and the true test—the growth of the volume of trade, both exports and imports—I have also furnished. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LOVERING].

Mr. LOVERING. Mr. Chairman, I have always believed in reciprocity that did not sacrifice the interests of our home manufacturers. It seems to me that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has very aptly set forth the only correct principles upon which we can establish reciprocal relations with any foreign country.

The lines of the true and only practical reciprocity lie parallel with the great American system of protection to our home industries. We recognize this as a principle, and in providing legislation for reciprocal trade with foreign countries we must bear in mind that when it is sought to have any product, manufacture, or commodity placed on the reciprocal list it must first be ascertained whether the interests of American labor are threatened or not. But, Mr. Chairman, we are prone to lose sight of or obscure the fact that what our industries are most suffering from to-day is the want of an enlarged outlet for our surplus products.

There is another way far more potent and practicable to extend our foreign trade than by reciprocity. It is by liberalizing our drawback laws.

The trend of public opinion with reference to new markets for American products shows that our manufacturers now keenly realize that production has passed far beyond consumption, and that new markets in the foreign field must be found if our workmen are to continue to receive adequate employment.

There is one fundamental principle underlying our tariff legislation which, I regret to say, has not been adhered to by Congress, and which in a large measure is responsible for the loss of very valuable foreign markets, viz., that the tariff was only intended to protect the home market from foreign competition. The protection which American manufacturers now enjoy was based on that implied condition.

Opposition to the amendment of our drawback laws and bonded warehouse system on the part of certain large manufacturing interests has proved effective up to the present time.

After we have attained all that is practicable under reciprocity there still remains an enormous field for the expansion of our foreign trade by enlarging and extending the scope of our drawback laws, by amending the administrative act of the tariff, and this may be done without disturbing a single schedule or taking a single step in the direction of the revision of the tariff.

Whatever it may, sooner or later, be thought best to do in this direction, there is no reason why these wholesome provisions for a rebate of the duties on foreign materials entering into domestic manufactures for export should not at once be made.

It is well known that our manufacturers have lost millions and millions of dollars of trade and that thousands and thousands of our workmen have been deprived of employment since the passage of the Dingley bill that might easily have been saved to the people of our country excepting for the neglect of Congress to adopt a very simple amendment to the administrative act of the Dingley bill.

We may ignore it if we please. Members of either party may shut their ears to the cry for relief. They may despise and belittle the honest efforts of those who are laboring to accomplish needful legislation. A languid leadership may not care to be awakened from its indolent slumbers nor be stirred to an active regard for the public welfare, but the fact remains that while all this inert and stand-pat policy prevails the great ship of business is drifting onto the rocks and our boasted prosperity is fast coming to an end.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer a few remarks upon what seems to me to be a very critical situation of one of our industries to-day. With a crop of hardly more than 10,000,000 bales of cotton this season we shall be facing a cotton famine. Next to food crops of the world, the cotton crop holds the most important place.

The wool crop, the flax crop, and the silk crop might be total failures and not carry with them so much discomfort and hardship as the failure of the cotton crop.

Cotton has come to be a more important article of clothing than even wool. The articles and purposes for which it is used have multiplied within the last score of years to a degree which would amaze the uninformed or casual observer. Even when found combined with wool it is generally to the advantage of the manufactured article.

It must not be thought that because good cotton is mixed with wool that the joint product is a shoddy fabric. True it is cheaper, but properly manufactured it is not less useful, less enduring, or less sightly.

Mixed goods of this kind are not to be classed with what are

called "shoddy." Shoddy manufactures are generally made from torn-up woolen rags which have already served a purpose and have been cast aside. Such goods are not to be compared with those made of wool and cotton mixed or even of cotton alone.

It will be seen, therefore, that a short crop of cotton is a great hardship. Its cheapness is not alone its greatest recommendation, although the fact that it is ordinarily the cheapest known fiber brings its manufactures within the reach of everyone.

More people in the world are clothed entirely in cotton than in wool or any other material. The price at which cotton is being sold to-day restricts its use in many fields.

I believe the day is not far away when the cotton belt of this country will have to produce 15,000,000 bales of cotton. I believe there is no place in the whole world where cotton can be grown so cheaply and to so good advantage as in this country, and while I regret that the present price will bring distress to the spinning industry, I congratulate our good southern neighbors upon the great wealth it is bringing to the planters.

The cotton manufacturers of the world are prospecting everywhere for new cotton fields. England, France, Germany, and Russia are using every endeavor and are subsidizing the growth of cotton wherever there is the least promise of a crop.

While it may seem impossible that the supremacy of the southern planter shall be wrested from him, it is not well to ignore these efforts. The South should stir itself to raise all the cotton it can rather than to be devising plans to curtail its production.

The highest price is not always an unmixed blessing. It stimulates production elsewhere and restricts its use. The cotton States can, if they will, grow all the cotton the world needs, and for all time cotton may be king, so long as he exacts only a reasonable tribute from all mankind.

Cotton is a tender plant and has its enemies. It is subject to the vicissitudes of the weather and the ravages of parasites. I believe the Government should spare no expense to study and exterminate the boll-weevil pest. I should favor any reasonable additional appropriation for the purpose.

The value of last year's cotton crop, including cotton seed, was \$565,000,000, and it is confidently estimated that the present crop of cotton and cotton seed will yield a value exceeding \$625,000,000. When it is taken into account that the South adds still further to the value of its great staple by spinning two and a half million bales of cotton, and by making oil and other by-products from the cotton seed, we begin to form some idea of what a source of wealth cotton is to the Southern States and to the whole country. And let me say right here to my friends from the Southern cotton belt, you possess a wealth there which has never been worked out. Year after year we denude the forests in the North to make paper. Thousands and thousands of acres are cut down every year, and our forests are gradually disappearing. You grow every year in the South cotton stalks that will make the paper of this country five times over, but you burn it and use it for fertilizer or plow it in for fertilizer. You have a wealth there which you know little about. I have samples of cotton paper pulp which surpass anything except the finest pulp made from linen rags.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will come down there and help us manufacture that as he has helped us to manufacture our cotton, we certainly shall welcome him.

Mr. LOVERING. I beg to say that steps are already being taken to develop that industry. It is said that the State of Texas alone can grow the cotton crop for the world. Probably the only obstacle to growing a 15,000,000-bale crop of cotton is the absence of labor in the right places at the right time to pick the crop, and this brings us to the consideration of a question which must, sooner or later, engage the attention of the planters of the South.

Accurate statistics of the growth of cotton in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas show that in 1876 40 per cent of the total crop was made by whites and 60 per cent by negroes; whereas in 1900 statistics show actually the reverse, namely, 60 per cent of the cotton was made by the whites and 40 per cent by the negroes.

I will submit tables showing this, with other tables to be printed with my remarks in the RECORD. But the most interesting phase of the question is in connection with the relative increase of the white and colored population of the South, as shown by the census of 1900. Taking the States of Texas, Mississippi, Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, Tennessee, Florida, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, North Carolina, Virginia, and Kentucky, we find that the white population in 1880 was 5,576,933, and in 1900 was 8,772,950, an increase of 57.3 per cent. The population of the negroes in the same States in 1880 was 4,409,210, and in 1900 was 6,061,748, an increase of 37.5 per cent.

The cotton crop of 1880 was 5,721,026 bales. The crop of 1900 was 9,250,303 bales, or 61.7 per cent increase. I ought to say right here that I have only taken what are known as the cotton-growing counties in these States, which number 749, and for the purpose of comparison have taken only those same counties at each period.

The white population in these States in 1900 was 59.1 per cent of the total and the negro population was 40.9 per cent of the total, while in 1880 the white population was 55.8 per cent of the total to 44.2 of the negro population, showing plainly that the negro population has relatively decreased as compared with the white population.

I have another table which shows that while the tendency of the whole population is to become urban and less rural, it is more marked in the case of the negro than in the white. The tendency of the negro to the cities is greater than that of the white. If this relative increase of the white population to the colored continues, we will find in another score of years the white population in the neighborhood of 65 per cent of the total to 35 per cent of colored.

To raise 15,000,000 bales of cotton will require an increase of laboring population, and the South must look to immigration to supply it. Immigration not necessarily from abroad, but from other parts of the country, and in immigration, I believe, will be found the ultimate solution of the race question.

It would appear that the comparison of the crops shown by census years 1880 and 1900 is reliable. The crop of 1900 (growth of 1899) was the smallest produced in the five years between 1897 and 1902. The average crop of this five-year period was 10,595,070 bales, or more than 1,000,000 bales in excess of the growth of 1899. The 1900 crop was 9,534,707 bales, of an average net weight of 471 pounds. The quantity of cotton accounted for in Table 1 for 1900 is 9,250,303 bales. The quantity not accounted for (284,404 bales) is practically the crop of Oklahoma and Indian Territory. The Territories have been omitted from the table because of the impossibility of making the comparison with 1880.

The total number of counties producing cotton in 1900 was 767,^a and of this number 749 are included in Table 1.

The growth of 1879 (census year 1880) was 5,761,252 bales, of an average net weight of 454 pounds. The average crop of the five-year period between 1877 and 1881 was 5,333,604, or 427,648 bales less than the growth of 1872. This goes to show that the tendency indicated by the statistics of Table 1 would be increased were the average crops of these two periods taken as the basis of the comparison instead of the crops afforded by the census years. [Applause.]

^a Table 6.—Cotton-Ginning Bulletin No. 206, p. 7.

State.	Population.						Cotton (bales).			Number of counties.
	White.			Negro.			1900.	1880.	Per cent increase.	
	1900.	1880.	Per cent increase.	1900.	1880.	Per cent increase.				
Total.....	8,772,950	5,576,933	57.3	6,061,748	4,409,210	37.5	9,250,303	5,721,026	61.7	749
Texas.....	2,206,901	1,158,168	98.3	613,772	389,925	557.4	2,505,481	805,116	211.2	174
Mississippi.....	641,200	479,338	33.8	907,630	650,291	39.6	1,313,798	963,111	36.4	75
Georgia.....	1,112,233	772,553	44.0	973,449	683,987	42.3	1,231,699	813,954	51.3	129
Alabama.....	1,001,152	662,185	51.2	827,307	600,103	37.9	1,106,840	699,654	58.2	66
South Carolina.....	557,807	391,105	42.6	782,321	604,322	29.4	881,422	522,548	68.7	40
Arkansas.....	944,580	591,531	59.7	906,856	210,666	74.1	709,880	608,256	16.7	75
Louisiana.....	425,401	239,709	77.5	484,498	349,747	38.5	709,037	508,245	39.5	48
North Carolina.....	675,660	619,954	41.2	542,626	462,102	17.4	459,558	389,064	18.1	69
Tennessee.....	528,257	417,844	26.4	287,312	238,116	20.7	233,961	318,718	26.6	29
Florida.....	150,335	83,948	79.1	148,569	98,606	50.7	61,000	52,933	15.2	22
Missouri.....	152,809	69,612	119.5	4,923	2,624	87.6	25,493	19,529	30.5	10
Virginia.....	77,969	84,555	7.8	119,647	117,106	2.2	10,789	19,595	44.9	11
Kentucky.....	8,706	6,371	36.6	2,838	1,605	76.8	1,345	300	348.3	1
Percentage.....	59.1	55.8		40.9	44.2					

^a Decrease.

Table of urban and rural population of nine cotton States, compiled by finding the white and negro population of all towns of 2,500 inhabitants or more (Table 19—Population, 1890; Table 23—Population, 1900) for the urban and subtracting this total from the total population.

POPULATION OF THE COTTON STATES: 1900 AND 1890.

State.	Year.	Total.		Urban.		Rural.	
		White.	Negro.	White.	Negro.	White.	Negro.
Alabama	1900	1,001,152	827,907	119,499	98,204	882,653	729,103
	1890	833,718	678,489	82,574	69,607	751,144	608,882
Arkansas	1900	944,580	396,856	74,461	37,171	870,119	322,685
	1890	813,752	309,417	47,560	25,491	771,192	283,226
Georgia	1900	1,181,294	1,094,813	185,123	161,061	996,171	873,752
	1890	978,357	858,515	133,515	123,822	844,842	734,953
Louisiana	1900	729,612	650,804	248,830	116,954	480,782	533,850
	1890	553,395	559,193	198,612	83,354	354,783	470,839
Mississippi	1900	641,200	907,630	63,118	56,825	578,082	850,805
	1890	544,851	742,559	25,797	34,192	509,114	708,267
North Carolina	1900	1,263,603	624,469	110,576	76,169	1,153,027	548,300
	1890	1,055,382	561,018	60,049	55,605	995,333	505,323
Oklahoma	1900	307,524	18,831	30,759	5,387	306,765	18,444
	1890	62,300	2,973	6,486	435	56,814	2,538
South Carolina	1900	557,807	782,321	86,827	84,353	470,980	697,963
	1890	462,068	683,934	54,604	64,146	407,464	624,788
Tennessee	1900	1,540,186	480,243	196,420	131,144	1,343,766	349,099
	1890	1,336,637	430,678	145,282	95,624	1,191,355	335,054
Texas	1900	2,426,669	620,722	400,709	119,329	2,025,960	501,393
	1890	1,745,935	488,171	271,809	79,644	1,474,126	408,527
Total	1900	10,653,627	6,313,966	1,515,322	889,602	9,138,305	5,427,394
	1890	8,396,335	5,319,947	1,088,228	637,050	7,308,107	4,683,097
Increase		2,257,292	994,019	427,094	242,552	1,830,198	744,297
Increase, per cent.		26.9	18.7	40.2	39.2	24.2	15.8
Difference, per cent.		8.2		7		8.4	

TABLE NO. 1.—Cotton production.^a

State.	1900.		1890.		1880.		1870.		1860.		1850.	
	Bales.	Per cent.										
Total	9,534,707	100.0	7,472,511	100.0	5,755,359	100.0	3,011,996	100.0	5,387,053	100.0	2,469,093	100.0
Texas	2,506,212	26.3	1,471,242	19.7	805,284	14.0	350,623	11.6	431,493	8.0	58,672	2.4
Mississippi	1,313,798	13.8	1,154,725	15.5	993,111	17.2	564,908	18.8	1,292,507	24.0	494,292	19.6
Georgia	1,287,592	13.5	1,191,848	15.9	814,441	14.1	473,934	15.7	701,840	13.0	499,091	20.2
Alabama	1,168,840	12.2	915,210	12.2	609,654	10.6	429,482	14.3	989,955	18.4	594,429	23.9
South Carolina	881,422	9.2	747,190	10.0	522,548	9.1	224,500	7.5	353,412	6.6	300,901	12.2
Arkansas	700,880	7.4	691,494	9.3	608,256	10.6	247,908	8.2	367,333	6.8	65,344	2.6
Louisiana	709,041	7.4	659,180	8.8	508,569	8.8	350,532	11.7	777,733	14.5	178,757	7.2
North Carolina	459,707	4.8	396,261	5.3	389,598	6.8	144,935	4.8	145,514	2.7	73,845	3.0
Tennessee	334,592	3.5	190,579	2.5	330,621	5.7	181,842	6.0	298,464	5.5	194,532	7.9
Others	325,223	3.4	114,784	1.6	113,277	2.0	42,967	1.4	120,766	2.2	49,850	2.0

^a Census statistics covering the growth of the preceding year.

TABLE NO. 2.—Number and percentage of increase of whites and negroes in the nine cotton States.

WHITES.

State.	1900.		1890.		1880.		1870.		1860.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Alabama	1,001,152	20.1	833,718	25.9	662,185	27.0	521,384	0.9	526,271	
Arkansas	944,580	15.4	818,752	38.4	591,531	63.4	362,115	11.7	324,143	
Georgia	1,181,294	20.7	978,357	19.8	816,906	27.0	638,926	8.0	591,550	
Louisiana	729,612	20.7	558,395	22.7	454,954	25.7	362,055	1.3	357,456	
Mississippi	641,200	17.7	544,851	13.7	479,398	25.2	382,896	8.2	353,890	
North Carolina	1,263,603	19.7	1,055,382	21.7	867,242	27.8	678,470	7.7	629,942	
South Carolina	557,807	20.7	462,068	18.1	391,105	35.0	289,667	.6	291,900	
Tennessee	1,540,186	15.2	1,336,637	17.4	1,138,831	21.7	936,119	13.2	868,722	
Texas	2,426,669	39.0	1,745,935	45.8	1,197,237	112.0	364,700	34.2	420,891	

NEGROES.

Alabama	827,907	21.0	678,489	13.1	600,103	26.2	581,938	8.6	437,770	
Arkansas	396,856	18.7	309,117	46.7	210,666	72.4	160,963	9.8	111,259	
Georgia	1,094,813	20.5	858,815	18.4	725,133	33.0	585,415	17.1	465,938	
Louisiana	650,804	16.4	559,193	15.6	483,655	32.8	417,014	8.9	350,373	
Mississippi	907,630	22.2	742,559	14.2	650,291	46.4	543,849	1.6	437,404	
North Carolina	624,469	11.3	561,018	5.6	531,277	35.7	446,399	8.3	361,522	
South Carolina	782,321	13.6	688,934	14.0	604,332	45.3	508,326	.8	412,320	
Tennessee	480,243	11.5	430,678	6.8	403,151	25.1	343,085	13.9	283,019	
Texas	620,722	27.2	488,171	24.1	393,384	55.2	288,153	38.6	182,921	

TABLE NO. 3.—Nine cotton States shown in Table No. 1.

Year.	Population.				Cotton crop. ^a	
	Whites.	Per cent. increase.	Negroes.	Per cent. increase.	Bales.	Per cent. increase.
1850	3,399,945		2,364,902		2,469,093	
1860	4,322,174	27.1	3,042,285	28.6	5,387,052	11.82
1865 ^b	4,218,900	0.2	3,432,212	12.1	300,000	0.94.5
1870	4,738,942	9.6	3,822,139	25.3	3,011,996	44.1
1880	6,599,389	39.3	4,601,962	20.4	5,755,359	91.1
1890	8,394,065	28.3	5,316,974	15.5	7,472,511	29.8
1900	10,286,103	23.4	6,235,165	18.4	9,534,707	27.6

^a Census statistics covering the growth of the preceding year.

^b The statistics for 1865 are estimated. The census of negro population in 1870 is disregarded as incorrect, and an estimate based upon the average annual increase from 1860 to 1880 employed instead.

^c Decrease.

And then, on motion of Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota, 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. 12833, the District appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 2596. An act granting a pension to Frances S. Hopkins; and S. 2809. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse G. Finley.

J. HUDSON KIBBE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, February 29, 1904.

Resolved, That the action of the President pro tempore in signing the bill (S. 167) "granting an increase of pension to J. Hudson Kibbe" be rescinded, and that the bill be returned to the House of Representatives, with the request that similar action be taken by the House with respect to the signature of the Speaker, and that the passage of the bill be reconsidered, and that it be postponed indefinitely, the beneficiary of the same being dead.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the Speaker will consider himself authorized to cancel his signature to the bill.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

And then, on motion of Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

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

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment for property damaged by gun firing—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting petition of the Tobacco Workers' Guild of the Philippines respecting the tariff on tobacco and cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting reports relating to the use of canceling machines in the post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, 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. GROSVENOR, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 201) to establish a port of delivery at Salt Lake City, Utah, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1244); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 8130, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 13212) for the establishment of Dayton, Ohio, as a port of delivery, accompanied by a report (No. 1245); 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, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11402) granting an increase of pension to Agnes B. Hesler—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10916) for the relief of Morris F. Cawley—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

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. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 13202) to authorize the Lawton, Wichita and Gulf Railway Company to construct and maintain a bridge across Red River on the boundary line between the State of Texas and the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13203) to amend an act entitled "An act to define and punish crimes in the district of Alaska and to provide a code of criminal procedure for said district"—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 13204) for the erection of a public building in the city of Waukegan, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 13205) for the relief of sufferers by fire at Baltimore by rebate of duties on building material and suspension of certain internal-revenue taxes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODEY: A bill (H. R. 13206) to amend an act entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," approved June 21, 1902—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 13207) to increase certain pensions in proportion to length of service—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 13208) providing for the erection of a public building at Greenville, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 13209) to amend the act approved July 7, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," and to provide for the more efficient administration of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 13210) to amend the third subdivision of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 13211) conferring jurisdiction upon United States commissioners over offenses committed in a portion of the permanent Hot Springs Mountain Reservation, Arkansas—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSVENOR, from the Committee on Ways and Means: A bill (H. R. 13212) for the establishment of Dayton, Ohio, as a port of delivery—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. VAN DUZER: A bill (H. R. 13213) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Nevada—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILL of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 13214) to authorize a survey of the Yalobusha River, Mississippi, with the view to making same navigable—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 13215) to authorize the judges of the circuit and district courts of the United States to appoint stenographic reporters, fix the duties and compensation thereof, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 13216) to establish range lights in Niagara River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 120) for the printing and binding, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, of 7,500 copies of a portion of the Bulletin of the United States Fish Commission for 1903—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BELL of California: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 121) fixing the head of navigation on the Mokelumne River in the State of California—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A resolution (H. Res. 232) looking toward making the Post-Office Department self-sustaining—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEARRE: A resolution (H. Res. 233) referring H. R. 7803, for the relief of Andrew Jackson Moudy, to the Court of Claims under the Tucker Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 234) referring H. R. 11557, for the relief of Elizabeth Cramer, to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

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. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 13217) granting a pension to Emma Pare—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 13218) for relief of Adolph Weinholt—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 13219) for the relief of Warren A. Woodson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 13220) for the relief of Sidney J. Wetherell, assignee of A. V. Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13221) for the relief of Edward Cahalan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13222) for the relief of William S. McKnight and the heirs of James W. Richardson, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13223) granting a pension to Maria Horne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENTON: A bill (H. R. 13224) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Buxton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13225) granting an increase of pension to Nathan T. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 13226) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Shaffer and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13227) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Barnes and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: A bill (H. R. 13228) granting a pension to Caroline Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 13229) granting an increase of pension to Charles Otis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13230) granting a pension to Amos T. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13231) to restore the name of John Sharrocks to the pension roll, and granting him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13232) for the relief of Frederick H. Bell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 13233) for the relief of John V. Mason—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DEEMER: A bill (H. R. 13234) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13235) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Conser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 13236) granting an increase of pension to George H. Otis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 13237) to remove the charge of desertion against Michael Madigan Dillon and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 13238) for the relief of Charles Sommer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 13239) granting a pension to Ellen Agnes Donnelly—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13240) granting an increase of pension to Josephine B. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 13241) granting an increase of pension to David Deardourff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13242) granting an increase of pension to Jacob O. Stout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13243) granting an increase of pension to William F. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 13244) granting an increase of pension to George W. B. Wert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 13245) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Disbrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 13246) to reimburse Robert Murdock for extra clerk hire paid by him as postmaster of Logan City, Utah—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13247) granting a pension to Daniel Perdew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13248) granting a pension to W. B. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13249) granting a pension to P. S. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 13250) for the benefit of William H. Calvert—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 13251) granting an increase of pension to Maj. M. Virgin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 13252) for the relief of Henry Brandt—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 13253) granting a pension to Lars A. Rustad—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13254) for the relief of Alexander Perry—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 13255) for the relief of the estates of Phillip McGuire, deceased, and Catherine McGuire, deceased, late of Orleans Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13256) granting a pension to Luzzetta Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13257) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 13258) granting a reward to George A. Foster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAGE: A bill (H. R. 13259) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 13260) granting an increase of pension to William Starks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 13261) for the relief of the heirs of Henry N. Harris, deceased, late of Montgomery County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 13262) to confirm the title to lots 2, 3, 4, and 5, in square No. 979, in Washington, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 13263) granting a pension to Caroline E. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 13264) granting an increase of pension to John Travis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13265) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Wagner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 13266) for the relief of the estate of Robert N. Blake, deceased, late of Stafford County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 13267) for the relief of the heirs of Levander Jenkins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 13268) granting a pension to William Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 13269) granting a pension to Mrs. Amos Carpenter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13270) granting a pension to Joseph Osthelder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 13271) granting a pension to Lottie B. Galleher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 13272) granting a pension to Delana A. Lynch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13273) granting a pension to Mary C. Quinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13274) granting a pension to William J. Manley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13275) granting a pension to George W. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13276) granting a pension to James R. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13277) granting a pension to William C. Mullins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13278) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Morton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13279) for the relief of the legal representatives of O. F. Hendricks, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13280) for the relief of the legal representatives of O. F. Hendricks, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 13281) granting a pension to John Whitlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13282) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Craddock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 13283) granting an increase of pension to William York—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13284) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 13285) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Baublitz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 13286) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Doig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DUZER: A bill (H. R. 13287) for the relief of B. Klucny—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13288) for the relief of Chris Deiss—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARNOCK: A bill (H. R. 13289) to correct the military record of Eli Metcalf—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. W. Johnson and 70 other voters of Casey, Ill., and Mrs. M. J. Wild and 200 other residents of Loveland, Colo., for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Northern California Indian Association, praying for relief for the landless Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ACHESON: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 9677, granting increase of pension to Samuel Wise—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

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

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Rev. George B. Burnwood and 20 others, of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN: Papers to accompany bills H. R. 12911 and 12912, for the relief of Kelly Johns—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 12913, for the relief of Edwin Calhoun—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bills H. R. 12909 and 12910, for the relief of Thomas G. Williams—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Petitions of Alex Carnes and 40 others, of Mount Hope, Wis.; P. H. Gunnison and 83 others, of North Freedom, Wis., and A. H. Connell and 14 others, of Mount Hope, Wis., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of St. Louis Typographical Union, No. 8, in favor of the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Frank P. Blair Post, No. 1, Grand Army of the Republic, of St. Louis, and Colonel Hassendeubel Post, No. 13, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of William H. Hahn and 37 others, of St. Louis, protesting against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Pacific, Mo., in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of 23 citizens of St. Louis, in favor of bill H. R. 5071, to regulate the retirement of veterans of the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Gottlieb Eyermann and others, of St. Louis, against the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of St. Louis manufacturers, petition of Gottlieb Eyermann and others, of St. Louis, and resolutions of the Citizens' Industrial Association of St. Louis, in opposition to the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Resolutions of the Georgia Industrial Association, of Atlanta, Ga., protesting against the passage of the anti-injunction and the eight-hour bills—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTON: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Buxton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Nathan T. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Resolution of Post No. 3, Department of Colorado and Wyoming, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE: Petition of citizens of Noank, Conn., against passage of bill H. R. 7033—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of citizens of New London, Conn., against passage of bill H. R. 7033—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRICK: Petition of Almon L. Clark and 42 others, of Star City, Ind., in favor of the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of J. W. Leet and Joseph B. Long and 73 other voters, R. O. Young and H. D. Sprouse and 63 other voters, N. C. Nash and 17 other voters, of Canton, and F. L. Lays and 58 other voters of Sherman, all in South Dakota, for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petition of citizens of Brownsville, Nebr., against the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of citizens of Brownsville, Nebr., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Amos T. Richardson; paper to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Charles Otis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: Paper to accompany claim of Frederick H. Bell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, memorial of farmers of Chester County, Pa., in support of the Brownlow good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Resolution of Grand Army of the Republic Post No. 370, of Auburn, Department of Illinois, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Papers to accompany paper for relief of John V. Mason—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANDLER: Petition of Hartwell B. Hilliard, praying reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of Mrs. Helen Tyler and 10 others, of Warwick, R. I., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. Helen Tyler and 13 others, of Warwick, R. I., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petition of W. K. Hosts and 31 others, and Rev. E. J. Guernsey and 14 others, of Middlebury, Vt., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of J. W. Dennis and 31 others, of Rockford, Ill., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Chicago Board of Trade, in favor of bill H. R. 7871—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Personal Liberty League, in favor of the Boutell bill for reduction of tax on spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Petition of James McKenzie and 14 others, of Willimansett, Mass., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of L. L. Merrick Post, No. 107, of Palmer, Mass., and Henry H. Johnson Post, No. 171, of Northfield, Mass., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Paper to accompany bill to increase pension of George W. B. Wert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Protest of launch owners at Saugatuck, Mich., against bill H. R. 7033—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of citizens of South Haven, Mich., in support of the Brownlow bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Resolutions of the Georgia Industrial Association, against certain pending legislation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of citizens of Marble Rock, Iowa, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, letters of business men of Mason City, Iowa, against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of A. J. Bee and 31 others, of Fredericksburg, Iowa, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of P. E. Chelf and 14 others, of Flintville, Va., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDGE: Petition of S. P. Wylie and 50 other voters of Washington, Iowa, for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petitions of Rev. L. M. Beebe, pastor of Presbyterian Church, and others, of Seymour, Iowa, and of J. M. Palmer and 51 others, of Grand River, Iowa, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILDEBRANT: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 11411,

granting a pension to Mary Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the general assembly of Ohio, in favor of bill to increase pay of rural carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petition of Rev. William Taft and 15 others, of Goshen, Conn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petitions of J. A. Branson and 87 others, of Alexandria, Nebr., and Ernst Von Ferell and 23 others, of Aurora, Nebr., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLINE: Petitions of the Ebenezer Evangelical Church and the United Evangelical Church, of Reading, Pa., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of L. C. Dam and 27 others, of Holyoke, Mass., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVER: Petition of Rev. W. B. Juthes, pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Leesville, S. C., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LILLEY: Petition of S. H. Wilson and 35 others, of Wilson, Conn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Resolutions of Kimball Post, No. 38, Department of Maine, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of David F. Nelson and 50 other voters of West Paris, Me., and C. N. Tubbs and 45 other voters of Norway, Me., for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Five Islands, Me., relative to bill to limiting the use of boats using gas, fluid, naphtha, etc.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of R. D. Leavitt and 43 others, of Turner, Me., and Rev. D. C. Abbott and 46 others, of Lisbon, Me., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of B. R. Young and others, of Alpena, Mich., against passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Burgess S. Hulen and others, of Wolverine, Mich., against passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Thomas Boughmer and 31 others, of Bay City, Mich., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, of Salem, N. J., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, in favor of the construction of a customhouse at the port of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Petition of Ernst L. Batten, of Longview, Va., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper to accompany bill for the relief of Alexander Perry—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: Papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Philip McQuire—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: Petition of Robert Patterson and 15 others, of Frankford, Philadelphia, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., against bill to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARRE: Papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Henry N. Harris—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Cornelius Virts, praying reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of residents of Astoria, Ill., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUJO: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Caroline E. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: Petition of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Kansas, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. A. Sweet and 33 others, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, Women's Christian Temperance Union and three societies, of Cawker, Kans., and A. E. Driskell and 66 others, of Natoma, Kans., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIDER: Resolution of the Albany board of supervisors, favoring passage of the Brownlow bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIXEY: Petition of heirs of Robert Embrey, deceased, praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Robert N. Blake—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolutions of the National German-American Alliance, in opposition to the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of Dr. C. F. Love and 76 others, of McMoresville, Tenn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of T. F. Lay and 53 others, of Lometa, Tex., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNOOK: Petition of Mathew Campbell and others, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of sundry citizens of New Haven, Conn., against the passage of an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Haven, Conn., against the passage of anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of T. S. Dewitt and 26 others, of Branford, Conn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPIGHT: Petition of Robert B. Fulton and 18 other voters of Oxford, Miss., for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Boston Associated Board of Trade, relative to reclassification of mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Boston Associated Board of Trade, favoring an arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Boston Associated Board of Trade, in opposition to bill S. 3571—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Papers to accompany the claim of Thomas D. Doig for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THAYER: Resolutions of the Boston Associated Board of Trade, relating to arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Boston Associated Board of Trade, relating to the reclassification of mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Boston Associated Board of Trade, protesting against the passage of bill S. 3571—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Petition of William F. Merrill and 42 others, of Malden, Mass., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Malden Prohibition Alliance, of Malden, Mass., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of F. E. Hardy and 190 others, of Camden, Me., relative to the extermination of dogfish and increase of sea-food supply—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of the patrons of the following free rural-delivery routes, in regard to salaries and privileges of rural free-delivery carriers: Routes Nos. 17 and 18, Lyndonville, Orleans County, N. Y.; route No. 14, Medino, Orleans County, N. Y.; route No. 2, Lockport, Niagara County, N. Y.;

route No. 23, Ransomville, Niagara County, N. Y., and routes Nos. 36 and 38, Middleport, Niagara County, N. Y.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Petition of J. H. Williams and 34 others, of Bolton, Miss., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of R. B. Hayes Post, No. 20, Department of West Virginia, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of bills H. R. 5760 and S. 1716; resolutions of R. B. Hayes Post No. 20, in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Resolutions of Lieutenant Eames Post, No. 582, Grand Army of the Republic, of Pennsylvania, in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYNN: Petition of officers and members of the Citizens' Association of Brookland, D. C., favoring the erection of a monument in the city of Washington to the memory of Thomas Jefferson and John Morton—to the Committee on the Library.