

Iowa, for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of W. T. Preston and 43 voters of Dunlap, Iowa, for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. I. Wiley and 100 voters of Orient Township, Iowa, for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, nine petitions of citizens of Cass County, Iowa, representing 981 voters, for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Gray, Iowa, asking the appointment of commissioners to investigate charges of violations of rules of Yellowstone Park—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petitions of members of the Methodist Church, Rev. S. Ramsdahl and 30 other voters; Rev. J. A. H. Johnson and 22 other voters, members of Robert Street Methodist Church; members of Plymouth Congregational Church, the First Baptist Church, and the First Congregational Church; members of the Presbyterian Church, and business men, all of Fargo; John Hermon and 9 others, of Milnor; L. E. Blake and 15 others, of Delamere, and members of the Methodist and Congregational churches of Tower City, N. Dak., for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts: Petition of the Massachusetts Pharmaceutical Association, of Boston, for the passage of bill H. R. 9303, for a reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THAYER: Resolution of the Citizens' Trade Association, Cambridge, Mass., relative to increasing powers of Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts State Pharmaceutical Association, in favor of bill H. R. 9303, for a reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of the Business Men's Association of Sherman, N. Y., against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Millville, N. Y., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Resolution of Captain Warren G. Moore Post, No. 389, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *March 3, 1904.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, if there be no objection, will stand approved. The Chair hears none, and it is approved.

SCHOONER LUCRETIA.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 5611) granting a pension to Juliette Westbrook.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (S. 89) granting an increase of pension to James M. Markham;

A bill (S. 148) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Smalley;

A bill (S. 153) granting an increase of pension to William W. Turk;

A bill (S. 154) granting an increase of pension to Hugh T. Crockett;

A bill (S. 156) granting an increase of pension to Harriet L. Ford;

A bill (S. 268) granting an increase of pension to Annie B. Johnson;

A bill (S. 312) granting an increase of pension to John F. Oviatt;

A bill (S. 317) granting an increase of pension to Mortimer Hallett;

A bill (S. 354) granting an increase of pension to Clara B. Griswold;

A bill (S. 386) granting an increase of pension to Homer D. Wells;

A bill (S. 562) granting an increase of pension to Emeline F. Emmons;

A bill (S. 588) granting an increase of pension to Wilber F. Little;

A bill (S. 681) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Lar-kins;

A bill (S. 693) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. De Rucker;

A bill (S. 727) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wetherell;

A bill (S. 819) granting an increase of pension to John B. Glover;

A bill (S. 822) granting an increase of pension to Marquis L. Stevens;

A bill (S. 893) granting an increase of pension to William W. Angelo;

A bill (S. 900) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Smith;

A bill (S. 935) granting a pension to Mary S. Clark;

A bill (S. 1372) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Rol-lins;

A bill (S. 1280) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wil-fong;

A bill (S. 1392) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hughes;

A bill (S. 1530) granting an increase of pension to Theron T. Lemphere;

A bill (S. 1554) granting an increase of pension to John D. Pickard;

A bill (S. 1555) granting an increase of pension to Owen E. Newton;

A bill (S. 1591) granting an increase of pension to James Hahn;

A bill (S. 1616) granting an increase of pension to Michael Donovan;

A bill (S. 1627) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo R. Kibbe;

A bill (S. 1642) granting an increase of pension to Blanche L. Chunn;

A bill (S. 1678) granting an increase of pension to Rudolph Reinhart;

A bill (S. 1796) granting an increase of pension to Mathew Woodworth;

A bill (S. 1803) granting an increase of pension to John M. Morgan;

A bill (S. 1834) granting an increase of pension to John W. Paul;

A bill (S. 1944) granting an increase of pension to John S. Stanger;

A bill (S. 2043) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Williams;

A bill (S. 2087) granting an increase of pension to George Rilea;

A bill (S. 2123) granting a pension to Ashley C. Riggs;

A bill (S. 2179) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Harkinson;

A bill (S. 2198) granting a pension to Thomas Irvin;

A bill (S. 2200) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Collins;

A bill (S. 2216) granting an increase of pension to Charles Reed;

A bill (S. 2237) granting an increase of pension to Louise Chandler;

A bill (S. 2239) granting an increase of pension to Theodore E. Chatfield;

A bill (S. 2278) granting an increase of pension to Harriet H. Howlett;

A bill (S. 2289) granting an increase of pension to Louisa R. Chitwood;

A bill (S. 2429) granting an increase of pension to John Dow;

A bill (S. 2445) granting an increase of pension to George M. Waters;

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

A bill (S. 2563) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Banta;

A bill (S. 2649) granting an increase of pension to William S. Burch;

A bill (S. 2662) granting an increase of pension to John H. Carrow;

A bill (S. 2688) granting an increase of pension to George M. Linch;

A bill (S. 2838) granting a pension to Louisa Lyon;

A bill (S. 2940) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Liddle;

A bill (S. 2948) granting an increase of pension to George Hyde;

A bill (S. 2955) granting an increase of pension to John Hogarth Lozier;

A bill (S. 2966) granting a pension to William Conover;

A bill (S. 2969) granting a pension to Henry Dority;

A bill (S. 2999) granting an increase of pension to Malvine C. Buzzell;

A bill (S. 3038) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Kennedy;

A bill (S. 3053) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. S. Wright;

A bill (S. 3085) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Lane;

A bill (S. 3130) granting an increase of pension to Nathan P. Bowman;

A bill (S. 3267) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Carson;

A bill (S. 3291) granting an increase of pension to John Olson Bakken, alias John Olson;

A bill (S. 3362) granting an increase of pension to Dan H. Wallace;

A bill (S. 3373) granting a pension to Eliza Williams;

A bill (S. 3397) granting an increase of pension to George B. Christy;

A bill (S. 3405) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Pentzer;

A bill (S. 3413) granting a pension to Henry P. Howard;

A bill (S. 3415) granting an increase of pension to Manluff W. Reynolds;

A bill (S. 3423) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Ottey;

A bill (S. 3452) granting an increase of pension to Charles Male;

A bill (S. 3470) granting an increase of pension to Richard Wilks;

A bill (S. 3480) granting an increase of pension to Swepston B. W. Stephens;

A bill (S. 3481) granting an increase of pension to James E. Harrison;

A bill (S. 3488) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. McIntire;

A bill (S. 3527) granting an increase of pension to Jerningham Boone;

A bill (S. 3534) granting an increase of pension to John S. Parker;

A bill (S. 3569) granting an increase of pension to John A. Chamberlain;

A bill (S. 3645) granting an increase of pension to Francis Hall;

A bill (S. 3656) granting an increase of pension to William Turner;

A bill (S. 3738) granting an increase of pension to Lenus S. Ludington;

A bill (S. 3812) granting an increase of pension to Charles Wheatland;

A bill (S. 3839) granting an increase of pension to George B. Abbott;

A bill (S. 3887) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Clark;

A bill (S. 3893) granting an increase of pension to John L. Rodgers;

A bill (S. 3902) granting a pension to George F. Smith;

A bill (S. 3945) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Lewis;

A bill (S. 3950) granting an increase of pension to Edward Blaisdell;

A bill (S. 4052) granting a pension to Alice K. Seligson;

A bill (S. 4090) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte J. Folsom;

A bill (S. 4091) granting an increase of pension to Nathan M. Gove;

A bill (S. 4141) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Dickey;

A bill (H. R. 7288) to authorize the Mobile and West Alabama Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Black Warrior River, in Tuscaloosa County, Ala., in section 3, township 21 south, range 9 west of Huntsville meridian; and

A bill (H. R. 11812) relating to applications, declaratory statements, entries, and final proofs under the homestead and other land laws, and to confirm the same in certain cases when made outside of the land district within which the land is situated.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. ALLISON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Denison and Waucoma; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Adair; of sundry citizens of Dumont and Pilot Mound; of the National Prohibition party, of Mitchell County; of sundry citizens of Elgin; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Manchester; of sundry citizens of Twigley, Washington, and Colfax; of General Geddes Circle, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Davenport; of sundry citizens of Alton, Gladbrook, Fredericksburg, Albion, and Rock Rapids; of the congregation of Friends' Church of Pleasant Plain; of sundry citizens of Shell Rock and Griswold, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented the petition of Mrs. J. J. Budlong and 6 other members of the Women's Clubs of Titonka, Iowa, praying that an appropriation be made to purchase a national forest reserve in the White Mountains of New Hampshire; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of Silver Grange, No. 1702, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hillsdale, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Silver Grange, No. 1703, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hillsdale, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of rural free-delivery mail carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

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

He also presented petitions of John T. Drake Post, No. 331, of Brooklyn; of T. J. Potter Post, No. 440, of Creston, Department of Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, and of N. A. Merrill Circle, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of De Witt, all in the State of Iowa, 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 Colfax, Le Grande, New Virginia, Seymour, Brownsdale, Fayette County, Clinton, Littleton, and West Chester; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of West Liberty; of Silver Grange, No. 1702, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hillsdale; of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Greenfield; of the prohibition central committee of Mitchell County; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Ida Grove; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Deloit; of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Eldon; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Eldon; of the congregation of the Christian Church of Eldon; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Waverly; of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Dubuque; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Sioux Rapids; of the congregation of the United Brethren Church of Des Moines, and of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Danville, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of Local Union No. 271, Iron Molders' Union, of Jersey City, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to develop the American merchant marine; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Woodbridge, the First Baptist Church of Phillipsburg, the Methodist Episcopal Church of East Rutherford, the Baptist Church of Glenwood, the Presbyterian Church of New Providence, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Freehold, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Raritan, the First Presbyterian Church of Long Branch, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Sharptown, and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Stanhope, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DRYDEN. I present a concurrent resolution of the legislature of New Jersey, favoring an appropriation for the purpose of deepening and widening the channel of the Passaic River from its mouth to the city of Paterson. I ask that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred

to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution requesting the Senators from this State in the Senate of the United States and the Members of Congress from the various districts of this State in the House of Representatives of the United States to use their best endeavors to secure an appropriation from the Federal Government for the purpose of deepening and widening the channel of the Passaic River from its mouth to the city of Paterson.

Whereas the Passaic River has always been a navigable stream, and from the early days of this Republic up to the time of the introduction of railroads the inhabitants of the greater part of northern New Jersey were dependent upon the commerce of the Passaic River for their supplies and household necessities; and

Whereas by reason of the increasing size and draft of vessels it is now impossible to navigate said river, except in vessels of very light draft, making it necessary to transfer the cargo from the larger vessels to the smaller ones in order to reach its destination, thus increasing the cost of transportation by water, to the detriment of the commerce of the Passaic River, and the consequent injury of a great number of the citizens of the State of New Jersey; and

Whereas there has been presented to the War Department of the United States and to the River and Harbor Committee of Congress strong and convincing arguments showing the great value and the necessity of the improvement of the Passaic River so that it may become a commercial highway, and that there exists an urgent public desire that this be done; and

Whereas by the report of the Chief of Engineers, embodied in the annual report of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, it appears that such a project is approved and recommended, and that the total cost of such improvement would not exceed \$1,000,000; and

Whereas by reason of the consolidation and centralization of the railroads of this country into great corporations operating thousands of miles of railroad under one management and controlled by a comparatively few men, it is desirable that the waterways of this country be kept open to navigation and commerce by water be extended wherever possible, to the end that competition in transportation of passengers and freight may not be entirely extinguished; Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the State of New Jersey (the house of assembly concurring), That the Senators from this State in the Senate of the United States and the Members of Congress from the various districts of this State in the House of Representatives of the United States be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested to use their best endeavors in urging upon the Congress of the United States the necessity of making an appropriation for the purpose of deepening and widening the channel of the Passaic River and making same navigable for vessels of medium size and draft to the city of Paterson.

Mr. DRYDEN presented a petition of Boiler Makers and Iron-ship Builders' Union, No. 271, American Federation of Labor, of Jersey City, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the development of the American merchant marine, for the extension of the coastwise laws of the United States to the trade between the mainland and the Philippine Islands, and also praying for the enactment of legislation to confine the carrying of the naval and war stores of the United States to American vessels; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the International Pottery Company, of Trenton, N. J., and a memorial of the Willett Manufacturing Company, of Trenton, N. J., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill," and also the anti-injunction bill; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Emanuel Baptist Church, of Newark; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Springfield; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Stewartville; of the congregation of the Sampson Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, of Long Branch; of the congregation of the Second Presbyterian Church of Bridgeton; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Dividing Creek; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Hamilton Square; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Basking Ridge; of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Clinton; of the congregation of the Reformed Church of Readington; of the congregation of the Reformed Church of Franklin; of the congregation of the Berean Baptist Church, of Bridgeton; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Dover; of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Merchantville; of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal churches of Milton, Stockholm, Canistear, and New Foundland; of the congregation of the St. Andrew's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Spring Lake; of the congregation of the First Methodist Protestant Church of Newark; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Karney; of the congregation of the First Congregational Church of Newark; of the congregation of the Amity Presbyterian Church, of Montclair; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Springfield; of the congregation of St. Mark's Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Trenton; of the congregation of the Third Christian Reformed Church of Paterson, and of Warren R. Neff and sundry other citizens of Jersey City, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BALL presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 4312) to correct the military record of W. H. Cleaden; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 3164)

for the relief of Albert S. Henderer; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of Lefthand Grange, No. 9, Patrons of Husbandry, of Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of rural free-delivery mail carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Citizens' Alliance of Denver, Colo., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "anti-injunction bill;" which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Live Stock Association, of Portland, Oreg., praying that an appropriation be made providing for an investigation of poisonous plants by the Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the National Live Stock Association of Portland, Oreg., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the removal of the duty on hides; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the National Live Stock Association of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National Live Stock Association of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a classified census of live stock, and also providing that all manufacturers of shoddy goods be compelled to mark the same; which was referred to the Committee on the Census.

He also presented a petition of the National Live Stock Association of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the transfer of the administration of forest reserves to the Department of Agriculture; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Denver, Colo., and a petition of Post No. 12, Department of Colorado, Grand Army of the Republic, of Colorado, 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 Grand Junction, Colo., 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 Local Union No. 3, Amalgamated Woodworkers' International Union, of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for an investigation of the labor troubles in that State; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Montrose and Greeley; of the congregation of the Capitol Hill Baptist Church, of Denver; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Canon City; of the congregations of the First Congregational, the United Presbyterian, and the Methodist Episcopal churches of Greeley; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pueblo; of the Leonard Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Denver, and of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Gunnison, all in the State of Colorado, 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 petitions of the Golden Fortnightly Club, of Golden; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rocky Ford; of the Christian Citizenship Convention of Fort Morgan; of sundry citizens of Trinidad, and of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Grand Junction, all in the State of Colorado, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOR, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kane, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of C. J. Heppe & Son and 12 other piano manufacturers and dealers of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the duty on denatured alcohol for industrial purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of West Chester, Pittsburg, Indiana, and Lansdowne; of the congregation of the Christian Church of Scottsdale; of the congregation of the Menonite Church of Scottsdale, and of the congregation of the United Brethren Church of Scottsdale, 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.

He also presented memorials of George F. Lasher and 17 other

citizens of Philadelphia, of Harry P. Pears and 8 other citizens of Pittsburg, of H. H. Smith and 6 other citizens of Pittsburg, and of Charles H. Ludington, jr., and 3 other citizens of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill;" which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorials of George F. Lasher and 18 other citizens of Philadelphia, of H. C. Dunlap and 5 other citizens of Philadelphia, of Harry P. Pears and 10 other citizens of Pittsburg, of H. H. Smith and 6 other citizens of Pittsburg, and of Charles H. Ludington, jr., and 3 other citizens of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "anti-injunction bill;" which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., and the petition of W. H. Heath and sundry other citizens of Allegheny, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called "Brownlow good-roads bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of Captain John Whitney Post, No. 368, of Laceyville; of Jacob Maynard Post, No. 377, of Mehoopany; of Captain E. J. Rice Post, No. 211, of Factoryville; of J. W. Reynolds Post, No. 98, of Tunkhannock; of Corporal Rufus Frear Post, No. 323, of Beaumont; of Local Post No. 254, of Sharon; of Local Post No. 246, of Harrisville; of George Smith Post, No. 79, of Conshohocken; of Major W. G. Soury Post, No. 548, of Pennsylvania; of Brandywine Post, No. 54, of Coatesville; of R. Foster Robinson Post, No. 36, of Pennsylvania; of Local Post No. 249, of Foxburg; of Manitoba Post, No. 592, of Winnipeg; of Local Post No. 381, of Pennsylvania; of E. M. Stanton Post, No. 208, of New Brighton; of James L. O'Neill Post, No. 537, of Pennsylvania; of Watkins Post, No. 68, of Towanda; of McPherson Post, No. 117, of Pennsylvania; of Captain E. F. Roberts Post, No. 437, of Pennsylvania; of Philandes Billings Post, No. 392, of Pennsylvania; of Colonel John D. Bertolette Post, No. 484, of Lehigh; of J. Ed. Turk Post, No. 321, of Dayton; of Pennington Post, No. 283, of Fairmount Springs, and of Colonel D. M. Jones Post, No. 172, of Tyrone, all of the Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of Pennsylvania, 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 Greenville, West Chester, Washington, Northeast, Johnstown, and Cambria County; of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of Greenville; of the Ministerial Association of West Newton; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Greenville; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Darby; of the congregation of the United Brethren Church of Johnstown; of the Twentieth Century Club of Mifflinburg; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bradford; of the Young People's Christian Temperance Union of Bradford; of the Woman's Literary Club of Bradford; of the Young Ladies' Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Greenville; of the Young Ladies' Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church of Greenville; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Chester County; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Penn Park; of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Greenville; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Sharpsburg; of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal and Baptist churches of North Bingham; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Johnstown; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Allegheny; of the congregation of the F Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Johnstown; of the congregation of the Grace Lutheran Church, of Johnstown; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Scottsdale; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Westmoreland County, and of the congregation of the Butler Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Pittsburg, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOR, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Woman's Study Club, of Winfield, N. H., 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.

He also presented a petition of the Pleasant Street Baptist Church, of Concord, N. H., and a petition of Rockingham Grange, No. 183, Patrons of Husbandry, of Epping, N. H., 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 State board of agriculture of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of sundry citizens of Elliotts-

town, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented the petition of George O. Latimer, of Spokane, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the division of the State of Washington into judicial districts; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Asotin, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction and maintenance of public highways; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of W. T. Kenny Circle, No. 12, Department of Washington and Alaska, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Blaine; of Local Post, Department of Washington and Alaska, Grand Army of the Republic, of Kent, and of Martha Washington Circle, No. 6, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Anacortes, all in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church, and the United Presbyterian Church, all of Waitsburg, and of Grand Lodge, Independent Order of Good Templars, 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.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of Spokane, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Owatonna, Geneva, and Northfield, 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.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Clinton Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent nullification of State laws; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DEPEW presented petitions of Alexander Hamilton Post, No. 182, of New York City; of Adam Wirth Post, No. 451, of College Point; of A. J. Hooker Post, No. 415, of Morristown, and of Farrell Post, No. 51, of Canajoharie, all of the Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Gilbert S. Graves Bible Class, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Columbus, West Hampton, Livingston County, Black River, Washington, Manlius, Amsterdam, New Albion, Newburgh, Webster, Delaware, and Groton; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Walworth; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Waterloo; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Waterloo; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Manlius; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Junius, and of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Angelica, 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. CLAPP presented a petition of the Sacred Thirst Society, of St. Paul, Minn., and a petition of sundry citizens of Preston, Minn., 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 memorial of the Minnesota State Association of Builders' Exchanges, 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 memorial of the Minnesota State Association of Builders' Exchanges, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "anti-injunction bill;" which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PATTERSON presented a petition of Left Hand Grange, No. 2, Patrons of Husbandry, of Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of rural letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Local Post, No. 2, Department of Colorado and Wyoming, and a petition of Sedgwick Post, No. 12, Department of Colorado and Wyoming, in the State of Colo-

rado, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Mount Olivet Baptist Church, of Denver; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Georgetown, and of the Mesa Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pueblo, all in the State of Colorado, 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 Shakespeare Club, of Aspen, Colo., and a petition of the Faith Union Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Denver, Colo., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against the 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 the Mesa Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pueblo; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Georgetown, and of the congregation of the Mount Olivet Baptist Church, of Denver, all in the State of Colorado, praying for a continuance of the present anticanteen law, and also for the construction of gymnasiums at army posts, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HEYBURN presented a petition of G. A. Hobart Post, No. 27, Department of Idaho, Grand Army of the Republic, of Idaho, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of the Western Association of Shoe Wholesalers, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of Pierpoint Circle, No. 11, Department of West Virginia, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of West Virginia, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Protestant Church of Weston, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUARLES presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ashland and Plainfield, in the State of Wisconsin, 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 Fort Atkinson and Packwaukee, 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 Builders' Exchange of Memphis, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Haven, Cheshire, Branford, New London, Mystic, Groton, Stonington, Goshen, Thomaston, and Terryville; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Colchester; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Groton and Stonington; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Groton; of the Epworth League of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Mystic; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cheshire, and of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal and First Congregational churches of Cheshire, all in the State of Connecticut, 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 memorials of sundry citizens of the Indian Territory, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the annexation to or absorption by Oklahoma Territory of the Indian Territory or any part thereof; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. FRYE presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sturgis, Mich.; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Kenesaw, Nebr.; of the Epworth League of Windom, Kans., and of the congregation of the Congregational Church of La Moille, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1718) to compensate the Old Point Comfort Improvement Company for the demolition and removal of the

Hygeia Hotel property from the Government reservation at Old Point, Virginia, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MALLORY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4142) granting to the Davenport Water Power Company rights to construct and maintain wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River, in Scott County, Iowa, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4563) for the delivery on the Pacific coast of two light-vessels now being built in New York and New Jersey, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DEPEW, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4074) constituting Utica, N. Y., a port of delivery, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FULTON, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2113) for the relief of Bernard W. Murray, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1950) removing the charge of desertion from the record of James A. Bell, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8878) to extend the provisions of the act of January 21, 1903, to the Osage Reservation, in Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4585) to authorize the Southern Indiana Railway Company to construct a railroad bridge across the Wabash River in Vigo County, Ind., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 952) to refer the claim of John S. Mosby against the United States for the value of certain tobacco to the Court of Claims, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

MAP OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I wish to call up the report I made yesterday from the Committee on Printing, which was objected to by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON]. It is the joint resolution (S. R. 55) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to print an extra edition of the map of the United States for 1903, and making the appropriation for maps made in the act of April 15, 1900, and of March 3, 1901, available for that purpose. I ask for its present consideration. I will state that it is not objectionable to the Senator from Colorado now.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been read.

Mr. PATTERSON. The map I had in mind is not in shape for printing. The plates are not made. It is a map prepared by the Geodetic Survey. It is a most excellent map; better than any we have yet had printed, and I hope the Committee on Printing will look into it and, if possible, let us have some copies of that map.

So far as the pending joint resolution is concerned, I think it ought to be passed.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 4742) granting an increase of pension to Earl B. French; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4743) for the relief of the estate of Andrew J. Gill, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4744) for the relief of Charles P. Allen; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 4745) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Dixon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4746) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Gridley Parker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4747) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Fesenmeyer; which

was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 4748) for the relief of Isaac P. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 4749) granting a pension to Martha J. Patterson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PATTERSON introduced a bill (S. 4750) granting a pension to Asher Helm; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DOLLIVER introduced a bill (S. 4751) granting a pension to Michael Fitzpatrick; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALGER introduced a bill (S. 4752) granting a pension to Emma L. Daniels; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4753) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Spencer; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 4754) for the relief of Charles A. Thomas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 4755) granting an increase of pension to David Keller; A bill (S. 4756) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Umsted;

A bill (S. 4757) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Gehr; and

A bill (S. 4758) granting an increase of pension to Kate A. Manion (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. BALL introduced a bill (S. 4759) granting a pension to John M. Manlove; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4760) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Riggs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 4761) for the relief of the estate of Marcus Walker, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 4762) granting a pension to Vincent L. McGuire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 4763) for the relief of the trustees of the Big Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church, of Atlanta, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 4764) granting a pension to Cyrus L. Mobley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut (for Mr. HAWLEY) introduced a bill (S. 4765) granting an increase of pension to Adrian Terry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 4766) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Clark; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed:

An amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the improvement and protection of the harbor and river front of the District of Columbia, the enforcement of laws and regulations, construction and maintenance of wharves and buildings, and for other necessary items and services, from \$3,000 to \$5,000;

An amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the Washington Home for Incurables from \$2,000 to \$4,000; and

An amendment proposing to increase the salary of the assistant surveyor of the District of Columbia from \$1,800 to \$2,500.

Mr. TELLER submitted an amendment providing that the sum of \$40,000 appropriated in the fortifications appropriation bill, approved March 3, 1903, to increase the price of the metal work of the Emery gun carriage, shall be due and paid to E. H. Emery on the passage of the fortifications appropriation bill, to enable him to proceed promptly in the work of building his 12-inch disappearing gun carriage, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the fortifications appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the Washington Home for Incurables from \$2,000 to \$4,000, 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. SCOTT submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 to aid in the reconstruction and completion of the building of the National Homeopathic Hospital, 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.

CANAL BETWEEN ST. JONES AND LITTLE RIVERS, DELAWARE.

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

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made from the St. Jones River, at Dover, Del., to a point on Little River, and thence to Delaware Bay, for the purpose of determining the advisability and cost of constructing a canal between the said rivers, and the deepening and widening of Little River, so as to provide a channel suitable for the needs of commerce from Dover, Del., to Delaware Bay.

INSPECTION OF MEAT, ETC.

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

Resolved. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia report to the Senate what inspection is made of meat, poultry, game, fish, and oysters imported into the District of Columbia in cold storage or refrigerator cars, giving details of when, where, and the manner of such inspection.

PROPOSED ALASKAN LEGISLATION.

Mr. HALE and Mr. BEVERIDGE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Indiana has a statement to make.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, by unanimous consent today was to be given to Alaskan legislation, not to interfere with appropriation bills. I understand that the Senator from Maine desires to call up the naval appropriation bill. That, therefore, displaces the Alaskan legislation for this day.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, on account of the imperative necessity for these Alaskan bills, which will not be objected to, that immediately on the conclusion of the bill which the Senator from Maine will now present the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Alaskan legislation, not to interfere with appropriation bills—

Mr. KEAN. Or the unfinished business.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. As part of my request, to continue until disposed of, not to interfere with appropriation bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in whose charge is the unfinished business, is not present in the Chamber.

Mr. HALE. I was going to suggest to the Senator from Indiana, in the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts, that that Senator would want nothing done which would displace his bill, which is the unfinished business. The Senator can later, when he has conferred with the Senator from Massachusetts, make his request.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to make a suggestion.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then I will withdraw my request for unanimous consent for the present, and will renew it after I have conferred with the Senator from Massachusetts, according to the suggestion of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. STEWART. It might be well also to confer with the Senator from Nevada. The consideration of the milk bill was pretty much terminated yesterday, and I want to get a vote on it at some time. I do not want to have that bill excluded by a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I shall be very much pleased to confer with the Senator from Nevada.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12220) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

Mr. HALE. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the committee amendments be acted upon as they are reached.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the com-

mittee amendments shall first receive consideration. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read the bill.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I do not observe that there is a report from the Committee on Naval Affairs upon this bill, as there is in another branch, where, I am told, it is the rule or custom to state in a report the general provisions of the bill.

I ask the Senator from Maine whether it would be entirely convenient for him at this stage to give the Senate an idea what the bill contains and what is proposed to be done with the amounts involved in the direct appropriation, as well as the obligations to be incurred if the provisions of the bill become law.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the report of the committee to which the Senator refers is very brief. It states the amount of estimates for the next fiscal year covered by this bill at \$100,866,000 in all. The House sent to the Senate a bill appropriating \$96,674,000. The Senate committee has not interfered much with the bill as passed by the House and has added to the House items of \$96,674,000 only \$327,000. So the bill as reported to the Senate carries \$97,001,733.94, the estimates having been cut down about \$5,000,000.

As to the general question suggested by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], I have prepared some figures, and I think it proper, as the Senator has asked, that I state the reasons for the bill and the purposes to which the money is to be applied and that I should lay the tables before the Senate. My general practice, as Senators know, has been to make no speeches upon appropriation bills, but only to answer questions.

I think it is well, Mr. President, while we are reporting a bill covering a very large increase, the largest increase ever allowed in any one year excepting last year, that the country and the Senate should realize what our situation is as to the Navy, so that all may know just where we stand as to our naval establishment, in which the Senate and the country have a great pride and a great interest.

I do not think it has been appreciated that while we are going on with a large programme, and do not propose this year to change it, a great deal has been done heretofore for the Navy.

I have here a list of the appropriations which have been made and expended up to the present time, including the appropriations for this year, which, of course, have not been expended. I begin in 1883, for that is the beginning of the present United States Navy.

Total amounts of naval appropriation acts for each year from act of March 3, 1883, to and including act of 1904.

1883	\$14,819,976.80	1894	\$22,104,061.38
1884	15,894,434.23	1895	25,327,126.72
1885	14,980,472.50	1896	29,416,245.31
1886	15,070,837.95	1897	30,562,660.95
1887	16,489,907.90	1898	33,003,234.19
1888	25,767,348.19	1899	56,088,733.68
1889	19,942,835.35	1900	48,069,969.58
1890	21,692,510.27	1901	65,140,916.67
1891	24,136,035.53	1902	78,101,791.00
1892	31,541,654.78	1903	81,876,791.43
1893	23,543,385.00	1904	100,000,000.00

The subject of the new Navy came up in the Administration of President Arthur. While some preliminary steps were taken by Secretary Hunt, who was then a member of the Cabinet and Secretary of the Navy, he remained in office but a short time, and his successor, Secretary Chandler, afterwards and for many years an associate of ours in this Chamber, took up the work in earnest, and in 1883 we began appropriating for the new Navy, after full hearings and examinations by the Committee on Naval Affairs of officers in the Navy, the Secretary, and wherever any information could be obtained.

We began in a modest way, and provided that year for the new ships the *Atlanta*, the *Boston*, and the *Chicago*, cruisers, and the *Dolphin*, a general boat for the uses of the Navy. It amounted to only 13,000 tons in round numbers, much less in all for that year than a modern battle ship.

At that time, Mr. President, we not only had no establishments for armor or for plate, but we could not build the machinery, castings, and other things essential to the building of a naval cruiser, saying nothing of a battle ship or protected cruiser or an armored cruiser, but an ordinary cruiser.

There the modern Navy began, and I do not go beyond that. From that time we have appropriated from year to year for the increase of the naval establishment, continuing first in building cruisers, gunboats, and second-class battle ships until 1900. I will not read the list, but the appropriations were larger, perhaps, than Senators are aware. Beginning with 1883, when we appropriated only \$14,000,000, as the table given shows, we have gone on increasing the Navy, so that, including this bill and the deficiencies of this year, we have already appropriated for the Navy \$760,896,567.75.

Mr. CLAY. Since when?
Mr. HALE. Since 1883, for the new Navy, the present Navy.

The table already given shows the appropriations from year to year.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator give us a synopsis of that table? We shall hardly get an opportunity of seeing it before the bill is disposed of.

Mr. HALE. It is simply a statement of what the appropriation each year is that makes up the total of \$760,000,000.

Mr. TELLER. It is a printed statement?
Mr. HALE. Yes; it is a printed statement.

Mr. TELLER. Very good. I thought it would be something else.

Mr. HALE. No; it is simply a list of the appropriations from year to year. The aggregate is \$760,896,567.73.

Now, as showing the growth of the Navy—

Mr. GORMAN. Right there, will it interrupt the Senator if he will give further figures? The appropriations are given at \$760,000,000, but will the Senator state how much will be due upon the vessels already ordered and now being constructed—

Mr. HALE. Rear-Admiral Bowles in his last report as the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repairs says that the total estimated cost of completing these vessels, exclusive of armor and armament, is \$76,438,055. This does not include the *Idaho* and *Mississippi*, the 13,000-ton ships, which will add \$11,478,000. To this must be added the future appropriations for armor and armament for these ships, for which I have not got the exact figures, but the total must be not far from \$130,000,000.

Now, as showing the growth of the Navy in another respect, I have a list of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, boys, etc., in the Navy at the time when we began the work of building the new Navy, and for each year up to the present time. At that time the Navy consisted of 8,250 men, petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and all. We have gone on increasing so that, including the number provided for in this bill, the new American Navy, as against 8,250 when we began, now consists of 34,000 men. I put in a table here showing the increase each year:

Number of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, boys, etc., for each year from act of March 3, 1885, to and including act of 1904.

Act of March 3, 1885 (48th Cong., 2d sess.)	8,250
Act of July 26, 1886 (49th Cong., 1st sess.)	8,250
Act of March 3, 1887 (49th Cong., 2d sess.)	8,250
Act of September 7, 1888 (50th Cong., 1st sess.)	8,250
Act of March 2, 1889 (50th Cong., 2d sess.)	8,250
Act of June 30, 1890 (51st Cong., 1st sess.)	8,250
Act of March 2, 1891 (51st Cong., 2d sess.)	8,250
Act of July 19, 1892 (52d Cong., 1st sess.)	8,250
Act of March 3, 1893 (52d Cong., 2d sess.)	9,000
Act of July 26, 1894 (53d Cong., 2d sess.)	9,000
Act of March 2, 1895 (53d Cong., 3d sess.)	9,000
Act of June 10, 1896 (54th Cong., 1st sess.)	10,000
Act of March 3, 1897 (55th Cong., 1st sess.)	11,750
Act of May 4, 1898 (55th Cong., 2d sess.)	13,750
Act of March 3, 1899 (55th Cong., 3d sess.)	20,000
Act of June 7, 1900 (56th Cong., 1st sess.)	20,000
Act of March 3, 1901 (56th Cong., 2d sess.)	25,050
Act of July 1, 1902 (57th Cong., 1st sess.)	28,000
Act of March 3, 1903 (57th Cong., 2d sess.)	31,000
Act of 1904 (58th Cong., 2d sess.)	34,000

I have also tables showing what we are doing and have done for the Navy, covering the entire pay of officers and men, beginning in 1884-85 and ending with the present session. The amount at that time was \$6,940,780. In the pending bill it is \$19,824,093, and I put this table in, being in line with my treatment of the subject:

Entire pay for officers and men for each year from act of March 3, 1885, to and including act of 1904.

Act of March 3, 1885 (48th Cong., 2d sess.)	\$6,940,780
Act of July 26, 1886 (49th Cong., 1st sess.)	7,000,000
Act of March 3, 1887 (49th Cong., 2d sess.)	7,000,000
Act of September 7, 1888 (50th Cong., 1st sess.)	7,082,404
Act of March 2, 1889 (50th Cong., 2d sess.)	7,250,000
Act of June 30, 1890 (51st Cong., 1st sess.)	7,250,000
Act of March 2, 1891 (51st Cong., 2d sess.)	7,300,000
Act of July 19, 1892 (52d Cong., 1st sess.)	7,300,000
Act of March 3, 1893 (52d Cong., 2d sess.)	7,300,000
Act of July 26, 1894 (53d Cong., 2d sess.)	7,475,000
Act of March 2, 1895 (53d Cong., 3d sess.)	7,649,329
Act of June 10, 1896 (54th Cong., 1st sess.)	8,100,873
Act of March 3, 1897 (55th Cong., 1st sess.)	8,235,385
Act of May 4, 1898 (55th Cong., 2d sess.)	9,125,490
Act of March 3, 1899 (55th Cong., 3d sess.)	13,500,171
Act of June 7, 1900 (56th Cong., 1st sess.)	12,810,897
Act of March 3, 1901 (56th Cong., 2d sess.)	15,200,284
Act of July 1, 1902 (57th Cong., 1st sess.)	16,128,199
Act of March 3, 1903 (57th Cong., 2d sess.)	17,706,099
Act of 1904 (58th Cong., 2d sess.)	19,824,093

The additions to the Navy during the last year were twenty-nine in all, including battle ships, turreted monitors, torpedo boats, torpedo-boat destroyers, and submarine boats.

The year 1894 marked another era in the building of the new Navy. It was in that year that the first battle ship came into the Navy, having been appropriated for in 1890, when Congress provided for the three great battle ships, the *Oregon*, the *Massachu-*

sets, and the *Indiana*, of about 10,000 tons each, three ships which I still believe were in many respects the best ships ever built in the American Navy for actual war purposes. They carry the same number of large guns as the enormous ships which cover 16,000 tons displacement, and are, in my judgment, better ships for offensive naval purposes than the others. But that I am not going to discuss, because we have gone on since, upon the recommendation of the boards, increasing the Navy, so that last year we adopted the largest programme for building of any nation in the world, even including England—three immense battle ships of 16,000 tons each and two others of 13,000 tons each. Since 1894 we have gone on building battle ships, armored cruisers, and protected cruisers, which are smaller cruisers, gunboats, torpedo boats, torpedo-boat destroyers, and submarine boats, as the following table shows:

SUMMARY OF VESSELS IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY.

Vessels fit for service, including those under repair.

First-class battle ships	11
Second-class battle ship	1
Armored cruisers	3
Armored ram	1
Single-turret harbor-defense monitors	4
Double-turret monitors	6
Protected cruisers	15
Unprotected cruisers	3
Gunboats	12
Light-draft gunboats	3
Composite gunboats	6
Training ship (Naval Academy), sheathed	1
Special class (<i>Dolphin-Vesuvius</i>)	2
Gunboats under 500 tons	21
Torpedo-boat destroyers	16
Steel torpedo boats	29
Submarine torpedo boats	8
Wooden torpedo boat	1
Iron cruising vessels, steam	5
Wooden cruising vessels, steam	6
Wooden sailing vessels	4
Tugs	39
Auxiliary cruisers	5
Converted yachts	23
Colliers	16
Supply ships and hospital ships	14
Total	254

Vessels under construction or authorized.

First-class battle ships	13
Armored cruisers	8
Protected cruisers	8
Gunboat for Great Lakes (not begun)	1
Composite gunboats	2
Steel torpedo boats	6
Training ships	2
Training brig	1
Tugs	2
Total	43

Vessels unfit for sea service.

Iron single-turret monitors	5
Wooden cruising vessels, steam	10
Wooden sailing vessels	8
Total	23
Grand total	320

But, as showing what we are doing now as compared with what we did, not before 1884 when we began the Navy, but in 1894 when we received the first battle ships, I have a comparison showing what the appropriations for last year and this year are as compared with the appropriations entire from 1884 to 1894 when we began the battle ships.

The following table shows the tonnage and final cost of all the ships provided for in last year's bill and this year's bill:

Vessels provided for in the act of March 3, 1903.

	Trial displacement.	Cost of hull and machinery.	Cost of armor.	Cost of armament.	Total cost.
Battle ships.					
Minnesota	16,000	\$4,110,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,520,857	\$7,430,857
Kansas	16,000	4,165,000	1,800,000	1,520,857	7,485,857
Vermont	16,000	4,179,000	1,800,000	1,520,857	7,499,857
Idaho	13,000	2,999,500	1,689,500	1,050,000	5,739,000
Mississippi	13,000	2,999,500	1,689,500	1,050,000	5,739,000
Total	74,000				33,894,571
Training ships.					
Cumberland	1,800				370,000
Intrepid	1,800				370,000
Total	77,600				34,634,571

Vessels provided for in the act of 1904.

	Trial displacement.	Cost of hull and machinery.	Cost of armor.	Cost of armament.	Total cost.
Battle ship.					
One	16,000	\$4,400,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,520,857	\$7,720,857
Armored cruisers.					
One	14,500	4,400,000	1,175,000	880,088	6,455,088
One	14,500	4,400,000	1,175,000	880,088	6,455,088
Scout cruisers.					
One	3,750	1,800,000	25,000	375,000	2,200,000
One	3,750	1,800,000	25,000	375,000	2,200,000
One	3,750	1,800,000	25,000	375,000	2,200,000
Colliers.					
	56,250				27,230,933
One	12,000				1,250,000
One	12,000				1,250,000
	24,000				2,500,000
Total	80,250				29,730,933
Total two years	157,850				64,365,504

^aEquipment outfit.

Mr. PROCTOR. May I ask a question?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. I should like to ask whether this cost includes the armament?

Mr. HALE. I am giving the total cost.

Mr. PROCTOR. Ready for service?

Mr. HALE. Ready for service. I am glad the Senator has asked me that question, because I did not content myself with getting what is carried in the bills for the hull and machinery, but I have the figures for the entire finishing of the vessel and ready for service. The battle ships of the size which we have been building lately have each cost about \$7,500,000.

Mr. ALLISON. Give the aggregate for the two years.

Mr. HALE. The aggregate for the two years is \$64,365,504.

Mr. BACON. Do I understand the Senator to say that each of these largest battle ships would cost \$7,500,000?

Mr. HALE. Yes; but as showing the constantly increasing cost of these enormous ships the estimated cost of the corresponding battle ships in the present bill is \$7,720,857—

Mr. BACON. Each?

Mr. HALE. That is the total cost of this one battle ship. There are small items of cost, but that includes armor and armament. I have no doubt that when the ship is fitted and commissioned and goes to sea and all the additions are made, as is always the case, before officers and men are put on board, the cost to the Government of one of these enormous battle ships will be little, if any, under \$8,000,000.

Mr. MALLORY. Does that apply also to the 13,000-ton battle ships, two of which we are now building?

Mr. HALE. The Senator was not here when I stated it.

Mr. MALLORY. What is their cost?

Mr. HALE. In the table I read I gave the cost of each one of the 13,000-ton ships. It is \$5,739,000 each.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator please state what is the cost of the armor on that \$8,000,000 battle ship?

Mr. HALE. I can not, perhaps, answer the question with exactitude.

Mr. BACON. I thought the Senator had the figures before him.

Mr. HALE. I have the figures showing the cost of both armor and armament for each of these great ships, which is \$3,320,857. I have given the totals. The cost, as I have given, for these two years is \$64,365,504. The entire cost of the ships of the new Navy which came into the Navy up to the year 1894 was \$59,692,350.82.

All the vessels that came into the Navy under the new programme from 1884 to 1894—ten years—cost \$59,692,350.82, as against \$64,365,504 which we appropriated in the last year's bill and this bill.

I give the figures because Senators ought to know and ought to realize that we have not been remiss heretofore. Senators have said to me during this session, "It is a shame that we are not building up the Navy. The sentiment of the country is for it;" and it has not been realized or understood what Congress has done for our new Navy, or how great and powerful it is to-day or what it will be when the ships now being built are finished.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. What is the character of the vessels which are in process of construction?

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will allow me, I am coming to that and shall state each ship which is under construction. That comes a little later in the order I have arranged.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. That is what I wish to ascertain.

Mr. HALE. As the Senator has asked a very pertinent question, I will now give the table showing the kinds of ships now under construction and the degree of completion of each.

Vessels under construction, United States Navy.

No.	Name.	Speed.	Where building.	Degree of completion.	
				Dec. 1, 1903.	Jan. 1, 1904.
<i>Battle ships.</i>					
12	Ohio	18	Union Iron Works	83.5	84.5
13	Virginia	19	Newport News Co	50.4	52.5
14	Nebraska	19	Moran Brothers Co	33	35
15	Georgia	19	Bath Iron Works	40	42.5
16	New Jersey	19	Fore River Ship and Engine Co.	48.9	49.43
17	Rhode Island	19	do	48.8	50.61
18	Connecticut	18	Navy-yard, New York, N. Y.	24.7	26.7
19	Louisiana	18	Newport News Co	31	34.5
20	Vermont	18	Fore River Ship and Engine Co.	1	2.76
21	Kansas	18	New York Shipbuilding Co.	2	2.6
22	Minnesota	18	Newport News Co	8	12
<i>Armored cruisers.</i>					
4	Pennsylvania	22	William Cramp & Sons	63.2	64.9
5	West Virginia	22	Newport News Co	67.3	70.5
6	California	22	Union Iron Works	48	51
7	Colorado	22	William Cramp & Sons	67.4	69
8	Maryland	22	Newport News Co	63.1	65.4
9	South Dakota	22	Union Iron Works	44.5	47
10	Tennessee	22	William Cramp & Sons	12.9	15.1
11	Washington	22	New York Shipbuilding Co	9.7	12
<i>Protected cruisers.</i>					
14	Denver	17	Neaife & Levy	98	98
15	Des Moines	16½	Fore River Ship and Engine Co.	96	97
16	Chattanooga	16½	Lewis Nixon	72	72
17	Galveston	16½	Wm. R. Trigg Co	69	70.5
18	Tacoma	16½	Union Iron Works	96.5	99
19	St. Louis	22	Neaife & Levy	34.8	36.2
21	Milwaukee	22	Union Iron Works	38.5	41
22	Charleston	22	Newport News Co	55.2	56.9
<i>Gunboats.</i>					
17	Dubuque	12	Gas Engine and Power Co.	15	20
18	Paducah	12	do	13	16
<i>Training ships.</i>					
	Cumberland	Sails.	Navy-yard, Boston	7	12
	Intrepid	Sails.	Navy-yard, Mare Island	0	5
<i>Training brig.</i>					
	Boxer	Sails.	Navy-yard, Portsmouth	8	6
<i>Torpedo boats.</i>					
19	Stringham	30	Harlan & Hollingsworth	93	93
20	Goldsborough	30	Wolf & Zwicker	99	99
27	Biarely	26	Geo. Lawley & Son	99	99
29	Nicholson	26	Lewis Nixon	99	99
30	O'Brien	26	do	98	98
34	Tingey	26	Columbian Iron Works	100	100
<i>Steel tugs.</i>					
8	Pentucket	12	Navy-yard, Boston	96	100
9	Sotoyomo	12	Navy-yard, Mare Island	95	98

Now, as valuable a table as I have been able to find—and I shall ask to have it put with other tables into the form of a public document—Senators who have seen the table have suggested this. It is in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Sunday, February 28, by Mr. P. Lyle Weaver, who has, for that paper, searched the records of the Navy Department in a more thorough way, I am free to say, than I have been able to do or than anybody else, so far as I have seen, has been able to do. I have examined this table by the light of all the figures which I have gained from the reports from the Department itself, and it is much more exhaustive than anything that I have been able otherwise to procure.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Maine if he has any objection to asking that, in addition to its going into the RECORD, that table shall be printed as a Senate document?

Mr. HALE. That is in the line of my suggestion. Mr. GALLINGER. I have examined it very carefully. It would be a document that doubtless would be called for; and it would be very convenient to be able to furnish it in that form.

Mr. HALE. I am glad the Senator, who is a prominent member of the Naval Committee, agrees that it is a very valuable table.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is indeed. Mr. HALE. This writer has a summary of all vessels already built and now in the Navy, going completely into the subject. He gives in the table the name of each vessel.

The tonnage of all these different classes at present in the Navy is 531,886 tons. In addition to that is the statement of vessels building and authorized, to which I have referred, and of which I will give the tables in detail, and those amount to 349,431 tons, with an aggregate of our Navy, when the present building is completed, of 881,317 tons, with the immense horse power of 1,248,386, and requiring a force of sailors, seamen, and petty officers of 45,881 men when the present programme is carried out. As to the vessels now building and authorized—

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me? Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it is important in this connection to state that this table shows that in the matter of tonnage the United States to-day stands third among the nations of the world. I think that is correct.

Mr. HALE. It is undoubtedly. I shall have some further figures to present on the question of tonnage.

Mr. CLAY. I should like to ask the Senator does he mean to say that we stand third in tonnage now, compared with the other powers of the world, or that we shall stand third when the ships provided for are constructed?

Mr. HALE. We stand third at present.

Mr. CLAY. England first, France second, and is not Germany now ahead of us in tonnage?

Mr. HALE. No; not including the small ships in our Navy—those under 1,000 tons.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not according to the figures in these tables, I will say to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLAY. I thought that Germany was ahead of us, not taking into consideration the ships we have in process of construction; but taking into consideration the ships now under process of construction, then we would be ahead of Germany.

Mr. HALE. I have tables which will show where the Senator gets his idea of Germany being ahead of us, which I shall come to presently.

Mr. GALLINGER. That has been, I will say, the general opinion; indeed, it was the opinion I myself had until, from a careful analysis of this table, I found, if this gentleman is correct, that we stand ahead of Germany; that we stand third to-day.

Mr. CLAY. I got my information from the report of the House committee.

Mr. PROCTOR. May I ask a question? Mr. HALE. Certainly; I have no set speech that questions will interrupt. I am only giving the figures, and shall be glad if Senators will ask me questions.

Mr. PROCTOR. On the question of the relative force of our Navy compared with that of other nations I should like to ask if the Senator can tell what it was at the beginning of the Spanish war, in 1898, and whether we were not then counted in naval power sixth or seventh amongst the governments of the world?

Mr. HALE. Quite likely.

Mr. PROCTOR. I think one of the reports I saw stated that we were seventh.

Mr. HALE. I beg the Senator's pardon, but that particular year has gone, and what I am dealing with now is the present status of the building programme we have already authorized.

Mr. PROCTOR. I was trying to show our rapid advance.

Mr. HALE. It has been exceedingly rapid. There was a time when we were behind every other nation, when we only appropriated \$14,000,000 a year for the naval establishment—for ships, officers, men, and everything else—and the whole naval world was ahead of us. We then began the work of the building up of the new Navy, and what I am trying to show is what we have already done, including the authorization of this year.

Mr. PERKINS. I should like to ask the Senator to state, in passing, that in the effectiveness, in the improvements of our war ships, and in their appurtenances and appliances and machinery we are second in the navies of the world. We have profited, in other words, by the mistakes made by European countries in building up their navies.

Mr. HALE. We have this great advantage, Mr. President, let me say in answer to the suggestion of the Senator from California, that up to, I will say, 1884, we stood by and saw other nations making experiments in different kinds of new ships. They spent hundreds of millions of dollars upon ships that have since been abandoned as obsolete, and other kinds of ships are being constructed to make their present navies; but in reckoning the entire tonnage of the foreign navies they have reckoned what both the Senator from California and the Senator from New Hampshire suggest, and all of these old and practically obsolete ships that are still existing are counted in their tonnage, while our tonnage is of the new ships that have been built and are fit for some service.

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

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. ALGER. During the Spanish-American war a large number of yachts—inferior boats, you might call them—were purchased, but they would be of no use in time of war.

Mr. HALE. Twenty-three of them.

Mr. ALGER. I want to know whether they are included in this number.

Mr. HALE. They are not included in the list of ships of sea strength and fit for war service, to which I am coming. They do not amount to much either in tonnage or armament or anything else; but they balance against just the same kind of ships that are found in foreign navies, and that adds to their total. They are of the same kind.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will suspend one moment while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2259) to regulate shipping in trade between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine asks that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, that the Senate may proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HALE. But I have not been content myself, Mr. President, to rest there; and I have tables, which I will put in the RECORD, showing the sea strength of the principal naval powers up to the present year and not including small ships less than 1,000 tons.

I do not say that in a system either of warfare or of peaceful conduct of a naval establishment gunboats and light-draft gunboats are not very valuable vessels. They are not only valuable in time of peace and are used more than the larger ships, but in time of war they are excellent as scouts. But I do not reckon them in the tables which I am going to give now. I am dealing with the larger vessels, which may, perhaps, be termed "sea strength."

Mr. LODGE. I ask the Senator if the table is the same as that found in the report on the House bill?

Mr. HALE. I think there may be some little change, but it is practically the same thing.

Mr. LODGE. That table shows the sea strength.

Mr. HALE. I was going to explain what it shows.

Mr. LODGE. Do the Senator's tables show the character of ships that are at present building?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, in reference to the interrogatory on the part of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ALGER], I wish to say that the total tonnage to-day is 531,886, and the converted yachts have a tonnage of 10,880. So

they are included in the total, but it is inconsequential as a matter of fact.

Mr. HALE. They make no figure.

Mr. GALLINGER. No.

Mr. HALE. Now, treating of what we may call the sea strength of the larger ships, that is here given for Great Britain, for France, for Russia, for Germany, for the United States, for Italy, for Japan. The table gives the number of battle ships, coast-defense ironclads, armored cruisers, protected cruisers of the first and second class, and cruisers and scouts over 1,000 tons. That, of course, includes all armored ships and all battle ships whenever built. It gives for Great Britain a tonnage of 1,516,040; France, 576,108; Russia, 416,158; Germany, 387,874; the United States, 294,405; Italy, 258,838; Japan, 243,586; Austria, 93,913. That is the tonnage of ships that are now commissioned.

Mr. ALGER. They are built.

Mr. HALE. Yes: they are now in commission.

Mr. CLAY. I should like to ask the Senator how is it possible, with only the tonnage he has stated, for the United States to be the third naval power in the world?

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator let me complete my statement?

Mr. CLAY. Certainly; with pleasure.

Mr. HALE. I have also shown—and that is included in this table—what the strength of this country alone and of each country will be when the present building programme is carried out.

Senators may say that that is not all carried out yet; that we have got to wait. Of course, we have to wait. You can not build a ship in a day. Great Britain can not and Germany can not. But, as showing what we have done and are doing, I have another table which shows that when the building going on is completed of these larger ships, the tonnage of Great Britain will be 1,867,250; of France, 755,757; of the United States, 616,275; Russia, 558,492; Germany, 505,619, or more than 100,000 tons less than we have; Italy, 329,000; Japan, 253,000; Austria, 149,000—all including the present building programme when it is carried out. I put in, Mr. President, these most important tables:

OFFICE OF NAVAL INTELLIGENCE,
February 5, 1904.

Memorandum of information prepared for Hon. EUGENE HALE, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, United States Senate, in response to his request of February 4, 1904. Contents: Ships in commission of various naval powers; sea strength (printed table) of the principal naval powers.

SEATON SCHROEDER,

Captain, United States Navy, Chief Intelligence Officer.

VESSELS IN COMMISSION FOR ACTIVE SERVICE AND ATTACHED TO CRUISING SQUADRONS.

[NOTE.—Not included: Cruising training vessels, gunboats of less than 1,000 tons, river boats, special-service vessels of all classes, cruising vessels in commission, but attached to shore stations.]

Class of vessel.	Number.				
	England.	France.	Germany.	Italy.	Russia. ^a
Battle ships, first class.....	35	16	9	17	9
Coast-defense vessels.....	3	3	4	1	1
Armored cruisers.....	15	15	4	5	6
Protected cruisers.....	74	9	22	16	7
Unprotected cruisers.....	5	2	2	5
Gunboats.....	17	5	2	7

^a Vessels in the Baltic and Black seas are not in commission during the winter season.

The demarcation between vessels in and out of commission is less sharply drawn in foreign services than in the United States, and it is often difficult to determine from the fact of a foreign vessel being or not being in commission whether or not she is in condition for war service. The accompanying table (printed) of the sea strengths of the principal naval powers gives a fair exhibit of the numbers of vessels either in commission or in condition to be quickly commissioned for war service.

SEA STRENGTH OF THE PRINCIPAL NAVAL POWERS.

Number and displacement of war ships, built and building, of 1,000 or more tons displacement.

Type.	Great Britain.				France.				Russia.				Germany.			
	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class ^a	50	669,000	9	142,600	20	223,621	6	87,800	17	301,129	8	112,864	14	152,581	6	77,982
Other battle ships and coast-defense ironclads.....	6	49,900	20	94,615	12	66,679	16	90,773
Armored cruisers.....	27	262,800	14	166,000	15	113,767	8	91,849	8	71,261	3	28,144	3	28,048
Protected cruisers, first class (above 6,000 tons).....	21	201,950	4	31,513	6	82,546	3	19,905
Protected cruisers, second class (3,000 to 6,000 tons).....	53	235,880	7	21,000	19	79,752	5	19,450	3	9,445	9	46,949
Other cruisers and scouts (above 1,000 tons).....	44	96,510	8	21,610	18	32,840	11	18,093	31	69,427	4	11,715
Total.....	201	1,516,040	38	351,210	96	576,108	14	179,649	50	416,158	14	142,274	73	387,874	13	117,745
Combined total.....	239, of 1,867,250 tons.				110, of 755,757 tons.				73, of 558,432 tons.				86, of 505,619 tons.			

Number and displacement of war ships, built and building, of 1,000 or more tons displacement—Continued.

Type.	United States.				Italy.				Japan.				Austria.			
	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class ^a	11	125,129	11	166,700	14	173,276	5	63,125	6	84,300					3	31,800
Other battle ships and coast-defense ironclads.....	12	47,945			3	12,244			3	13,004			11	62,480	2	16,720
Armored cruisers.....	2	17,415	8	111,800	5	31,891	1	7,264	8	73,550			2	11,520	1	7,400
Protected cruisers, first class (above 6,000 tons).....	2	14,750	3	28,800												
Protected cruisers, second class (3,000 to 6,000 tons).....	15	56,393	4	12,400	5	17,490			10	41,223	3	10,095	2	8,123		
Other cruisers and scouts (above 1,000 tons).....	23	32,773	2	2,170	11	23,937			17	31,506			6	11,785		
Total.....	65	294,405	28	321,870	38	258,838	6	70,419	44	243,586	3	10,095	21	93,913	6	55,920
Combined total.....	93, of 616,275 tons.				44, of 329,257 tons.				47, of 253,681 tons.				27, of 149,833 tons.			

^a Battle ships, first class, are of (about) 10,000 tons or more displacement, and are not more than 20 years old. (The few exceptions as to age have been reconstructed and are given a modern armament.)

^b Contract not yet awarded for two additional authorized.

N. B.—Gunboats and other vessels of less than 1,000 tons are not given in the table, nor are transports, dispatch vessels, converted merchant vessels or yachts, or obsolete cruisers. Vessels not begun are not included in the table.

Number of torpedo vessels and submarines, built and building.

Type.	Great Britain.		France.		Russia.		Germany.		United States.		Italy.		Japan.		Austria.	
	Built.	Build- ing.	Built.	Build- ing.	Built.	Build- ing.	Built.	Build- ing.	Built.	Build- ing.	Built.	Build- ing.	Built.	Build- ing.	Built.	Build- ing.
Torpedo-boat destroyers.....	125	21	25	13	49	9	32	12	16		11	2	19		7	
Torpedo boats.....	90		200	30	185	5	93		30	4	142	8	67	18	61	
Submarines.....	9	10	30	10	1			3	8		1	2			1	
Total.....	224	31	315	53	215	14	125	15	54	4	154	12	86	18	69	
Combined total.....	255		368		229		140		58		166		104		69	

Relative order of war-ship strength.

At present.			As would be the case were vessels building now completed.		
Nation.	Tonnage.		Nation.	Tonnage.	
Great Britain.....	1,516,040		Great Britain.....	1,867,250	
France.....	576,108		France.....	755,757	
Russia.....	416,158		United States.....	616,275	
Germany.....	387,374		Russia.....	558,432	
United States.....	294,405		Germany.....	505,619	
Italy.....	258,838		Italy.....	329,257	
Japan.....	243,586		Japan.....	253,681	
Austria.....	93,913		Austria.....	149,833	

But, Mr. President, I will say here—
 Mr. STEWART. Is that for this year under this bill?
 Mr. HALE. That includes this year's expenditures, but not this year's building programme.
 Mr. CLAY. That does not include the \$29,000,000 for new ships, does it? It simply includes ships that are now in process of construction?
 Mr. HALE. These items do not include the present bill.
 Mr. CLAY. That is what I thought.
 Mr. HALE. It is figured up to last December, as I have stated. Now, one thing is noticeable, in which the situation is very marked. The whole Japanese navy, already built and building, is only 47 vessels; in all, 253,681 tons.
 Mr. PROCTOR. Built and building?
 Mr. HALE. But Japan is at home. In any possible controversy that may arise her base is only a few hundred miles from any naval or military operations. The largest figures that Japan can show are small compared with those of every other country that I have cited, except Austria; but she has this immense advantage of being near at home in her fighting.
 Mr. OVERMAN. I will ask the Senator what position relatively we shall obtain when the present bill is passed?
 Mr. HALE. That will not change it very greatly, except that I will say this: Germany is not keeping up a large new programme. Her programme is not nearly as large as ours. France's programme is not as large as ours, excepting in some smaller vessels. The only power that is keeping up an increase as large as we are in these large ships is Great Britain.
 In looking over these figures of the showing of total tonnage, from a compilation secured at the Department, of the navies of the world, I find that to make up this great tonnage of large vessels of other countries there is included a great many vessels that were built before we began to build our new Navy. Many of these large vessels are old; they are set aside; they are found in naval stations and navy-yards, but they help the figures of these large

powers. Included in the list of England are 14 battle ships and 2 armored cruisers, ranging from 6,000 tons, with a total tonnage of 76,900 tons, that were ordered before we began to touch our Navy, that is, before 1884. While they are in the figures, they do not, I say, like ours, represent actual offensive strength.
 In her total of 755,757 tons, France has 106,000 tons of these ships that were built before 1884, or twenty years ago, and not one of them can be used for offensive purposes. Deducting this 106,000 tons makes her about 33,482 tons ahead of us. This deduction of old and comparatively obsolete ships from France's effective navy, with another table which I shall give, brings us up with our naval programme with France, and with her next to Great Britain, which has got of these old ships, built before 1884, 130,000 tons. Germany has 34,000 tons of what you might call obsolete ships and 25,000 tons of armored cruisers. Russia has 40,000 tons.

NUMBER OF BATTLE SHIPS AND ARMORED CRUISERS OF CERTAIN GREAT POWERS LAID DOWN PRIOR TO OR IN 1884.

Great Britain.		Tonnage.
Battle ships (12):		
Benbow.....		10,800
Anson.....		10,600
Camperdown.....		10,600
Rodney.....		10,300
Howe.....		10,300
Collingwood.....		9,500
Colossus.....		9,420
Edinburgh.....		9,420
Devastation.....		9,330
Thunderer.....		9,330
Conqueror.....		6,200
Hero.....		6,200
Total.....		111,800
Armored cruisers (2):		
Imperieuse.....		8,400
Warspite.....		8,400
Total.....		16,800

France.	
Battle ships (10):	
Hoche	10,950
Magenta	10,600
Marceau	10,581
Neptune	10,630
Amiral Baudin	12,150
Formidable	12,150
Amiral Duperre	10,487
Courbet	10,000
Devastation	10,000
Redoubtable	9,400
Total	106,948
Armored cruisers, none.	
Germany.	
Battle ships (5):	
Baden	7,400
Bayern	7,400
Wurttemberg	7,400
Sachsen	7,400
Oldenburg	5,200
Total	34,800
Armored cruisers (3):	
Kaiser	7,676
Deutschland	7,676
Konig Wilhelm	9,757
Total	25,109
Russia.	
Battle ships (4):	
Ekaterina II	10,181
Tchesme	10,181
Sinop	10,181
Petr Veliki	9,665
Total	40,208
Armored cruisers (5):	
Dmitri Donskoi	5,893
Vladimir Monomach	5,754
Gerzog Edinburgski	4,604
General Admiral	4,604
Kniaz Pojarski	5,000
Total	25,855

Mr. MALLORY. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. MALLORY. We have some ships which are pretty old, but which are in good condition—for instance, the *Atlanta*, the *Boston*, the *Chicago*, and that class of vessels. They were built before 1884, and yet those vessels are now—

Mr. HALE. No, they were not built before 1884.

Mr. MALLORY. They were finished about 1884.

Mr. HALE. They did not get into the Navy before 1886, or even later.

Mr. MALLORY. Well, 1885 or 1886.

Mr. HALE. I am only taking now the ships not of that kind; I am only taking now the ships of other powers that were built before that time.

Mr. MALLORY. Even conceding that, the point I want to make is this: We have repaired those vessels. The *Chicago* has been completely transformed and the *Atlanta* has been recently entirely overhauled; I do not know about the *Boston*; but those vessels to-day are in first-class condition, though they are comparatively old.

Mr. HALE. They are in our Navy; they are in good condition.

Mr. MALLORY. Can you determine from the fact that a vessel was built before 1884 that she is necessarily out of date?

Mr. HALE. Well, I do. When we come to the number of ships that Great Britain has got in commission, I see where these obsolete ships are accounted for. But I am coming to that.

Mr. MALLORY. Possibly the ships of the countries which the Senator has termed "obsolete" may have been repaired, as we have repaired ours.

Mr. HALE. In addition to that, Mr. President, I have made another table, which shows the tonnage that goes to make up these figures of these other great powers between 1884 and 1894, when we began to introduce the battle ships. Those that I have already given are older than any battle ships, older than any cruisers or any gunboats, or anything we have got.

Again, I have got an additional table of large vessels built between 1884 and 1890. This table shows that Great Britain has an additional 115,600 tons of battle ships that were built before we began to introduce battle ships, and 39,000 tons of armored cruisers, making in all 164,000, which is to be taken from these figures of large ships that Great Britain has, as compared with ours, all of which have been built and taken into the Navy since 1894. France adds to that 31,533 tons. So that in effective large new ships we will be, when this programme is completed, away beyond either Germany or Russia or Japan, alongside of France, and up

much nearer to Great Britain than anybody would realize if they did not know what these figures show.

NUMBER OF BATTLE SHIPS AND ARMORED CRUISERS OF CERTAIN GREAT POWERS LAID DOWN FROM 1885 TO 1890, BOTH INCLUSIVE.

Great Britain.	
Battle ships (9):	
Sans Pareil	10,470
Barfleur	10,500
Empress of India	14,150
Repulse	14,150
Royal Oak	14,150
Royal Sovereign	14,150
Hood	14,150
Nile	11,940
Trafalgar	11,940
Total	115,600

Armored cruisers (7):	
Australia	5,600
Galatea	5,600
Narcissus	5,600
Orlando	5,600
Undaunted	5,600
Aurora	5,600
Immortalite	5,600
Total	39,200

France.	
Battle ship: Brennus	10,983

Armored cruisers (4):	
Chanzy	4,750
Amiral Charner	4,750
Latouche Treville	4,750
Dupuy de Lome	6,800
Total	20,550

Germany.	
Battle ships, none.	
Armored cruisers, none.	

Russia.	
Battle ships (5):	
Georgei Pobiedonosets	10,280
Navarin	9,476
Dvrienadsat Apostolof	8,500
Imperator Nicolai I	9,700
Imperator Alexander II	9,900
Total	47,856

Armored cruisers (3):	
Admiral Nakhimoff	8,500
Rurik	10,940
Pamyat Azova	6,700
Total	26,140

Mr. LODGE. That is assuming that they do not change their present programmes.

Mr. HALE. Well, there is no sign that they will, as I have stated.

Mr. LODGE. I mean is it perfectly fair to take that for granted? Of course, they may change.

Mr. HALE. Well, if they do so, we can. I mean the programme that is now laid out and provided for by law.

Great Britain undoubtedly, as I see from what has taken place in the House of Commons, has a large, but not a detailed, programme this year. Great Britain evidently does not know just how she will want to build ships for the next year.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator in regard to those vessels he was speaking of as built before 1884? Is it not true about every armored ship built and ordered at that time that the armor was iron plate? I do not remember the technical name, but they were plates that were superseded by steel plates.

Mr. HALE. Entirely.

Mr. LODGE. It is armor that no country would think of using now.

Mr. HALE. There may have been some composite armor, but it is only within a very few years, Mr. President, that any nation has begun to use the best modern armor.

Mr. LODGE. They were compound iron plates.

Mr. HALE. Composite iron plates.

Mr. President, I put in here a memorandum from the Bureau of Naval Intelligence:

Memorandum.

FEBRUARY 18, 1904.

By 1908 the following ships should not be counted in the main line of defense, but should be disposed as indicated below:
Battle ships: *Indiana*, *Massachusetts*, *Oregon*, *Texas*; coast-defense squadron.
Monitors: *Miantonomoh*, *Amphitrite*, *Terror*, *Puritan*; harbor defense only.

So it seems they are already talking in the Navy Department of putting the *Oregon*, the *Massachusetts*, and the *Indiana* onto the retired class for coast defense.

Mr. STEWART. I hope they will keep the *Oregon* off of it.

Mr. HALE. They ought to. I think the *Oregon* is one of the best ships that ever was built.

Mr. LODGE. It is a good ship to-day.

Mr. HALE. It is a good ship to-day.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to see another like it built.

Mr. HALE. But it does not fill the fancy of a naval officer. She has not the room on her for staterooms and for comforts and for conveniences and for all the intricate machinery that a 16,000-ton ship has. But she has the same number of 12-inch guns and the same number of turrets and the same efficient force, so far as the great guns go. She is smaller, more easily handled, and when she goes to the bottom, as any battle ship will from the impact of a torpedo, like the jab of a prize fighter's fist, instead of seven or eight million dollars going to the bottom, it is only \$5,000,000, for which sum a ship of that kind can be built to-day.

So we have to reckon with this as showing why it is that we are continually asked by the naval officers and the naval boards for the largest programme. They want the biggest ships that ever were built. They do not want any other nation to beat them. There is not to-day, Mr. President, on the waters of the globe a ship of 16,000 tons displacement, and yet we are building these of late years, and all other battle ships are turned down by the naval boards.

Mr. ALLISON. Are there any building now?

Mr. HALE. There are a few building, but very few in addition to what we are building. England has talked about building a vessel even larger than that, but I think it has been abandoned, and most of the building is of the 11,000 and 12,000 ton class and along there, with the same armament of big guns.

Mr. STEWART. I wish we had ten or fifteen like the *Oregon*.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Maine pardon me for a moment?

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

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. It is in connection with what the Senator from Maine has just been saying.

The fact is developed and recognized by all that changed conditions will make a ship which would otherwise be good comparatively worthless. It becomes obsolete. For instance, the matter suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts as to the changed character of the armor. It makes valueless a ship armored with armor which twenty years ago was considered good.

The particular point to which I wish to direct the attention of the Senator from Maine is this: As I understand, the armor which is now placed upon ships is designed as protection against projectiles from other ships. In other words, the armor is not complete protection, at least against torpedoes or other submarine offensive machinery.

Now, if the development of this class of submarine offensive vessels, torpedoes and submarine boats, etc., continues in a very high degree, so that in the possible near future it may be regarded as the most dangerous class of offensive weapons against ships, will it not be true even as to the ships now being constructed—if there is a great revolution in that particular—that they will practically be worthless and become obsolete, even though they may be perfect in their capacity to resist projectiles from other ships?

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator want—

Mr. BACON. I was trying to direct a question to the Senator, but I saw his attention was diverted.

Mr. HALE. I will look straight at the Senator's good face and will look at no other.

Mr. BACON. The point to which I desire to ask the attention of the Senator, and it is rather in furtherance of the suggestion he makes now as to the superiority of the \$5,000,000 ship rather than the \$8,000,000 ship, is this: Will not the development of submarine weapons of naval architecture, if it continues in the ratio in which it has recently increased, make it possible that in the near future, that being relied on as the principal weapon of offense, these great ships, while they may be perfect in their capacity for resistance to projectiles from other ships, will themselves become almost obsolete, by reason of their inability to defend themselves against torpedoes and other submarine vessels and weapons of that kind?

Mr. HALE. Now, that is a matter which we have considered in committee, and I think the fair way to look at it is that the present war in the East may develop a condition which will show that so large a proportion of the expenditures for naval ships should not be concentrated upon battle ships. But nobody will know what to do—Great Britain, which is watching with eagle eye everything that is taking place there, because her great possessions are there, does not know what to do—until the smoke clears up. Nobody knows now whether a battle ship that costs between seven and eight million dollars, or a torpedo boat that costs \$300,000, will be the more effective battle engine in the years to come.

Therefore, as the House bill has put on only one battle ship, where last year we put on five, and has two armored cruisers, which to my mind will be found more valuable than the big battle ships, and then certain small cruisers for speed to accompany

the fleet, we did not think it desirable to still more change our programme until—I use my same metaphor—the smoke lifts from the war which is going on in the East, and we see whether such a revolution in naval architecture and naval ships has been wrought in one season as was caused by the advent of the little *Monitor*, when she steamed into the bay below the mouth of the Potomac and saved Washington and subverted every idea that anybody ever had had of the efficiency of ships.

We are proceeding at an immense expense on some things that may be proved to be valueless in one season. I found in my investigation one thing which I had not known before. It was a startling thing. We are building all our battle ships with revolving turrets. We put in them the big guns, the 12 and 13 inch guns. You have got down to 12-inch guns, and I wish we were down to the 10. We put them all in revolving turrets.

A few years ago the naval board, thinking it was a picturesque innovation, provided for a second story—a second turret—to be put on top of the main turret, and they built two ships, the *Kearsarge* and the *Kentucky*, with those turrets. I have a copy of their report. The naval board reported that those were to be the ships of the future. They argued it all out. We built them. We gave them the money to provide for them. One of them went to Germany and received a great ovation, and our officers and men had a very gratifying time. But the German naval officers remarked: "If the United States is going to build that kind of a ship in the future, and put its money into those ships, we will not trouble ourselves much about them, because they are not practicable."

The next year the Board turned around and said they did not want any more of those ships, and we took their word; and we provided these immense ships with one-story revolving turrets for the big guns. My study has been interesting. Looking over this book of the modern battle ships, which is accepted by the different naval establishments of the world as to a degree official, although not gotten up by any department, I did not discover, to my surprise, any British turreted battle ships. I could not find any such turrets for large guns. I said, "It can not be we are going on building revolving-turreted battle ships, and England, which is the great naval power in the world and the authority, is not building them;" and I sent to the Department and asked if that were true, and I got this:

All British first-class battle ships less than 10 years old have their 12-inch guns en barbette.

They will not touch a revolving turret.

Mr. PATTERSON. Just what is that?

Mr. HALE. The revolving turret is a cylinder—

Mr. PATTERSON. I mean en barbette.

Mr. HALE. It is a platform instead of a turret. It is a platform outside upon which the guns are imposed, and sometimes they are hooded, but they are stationary. They are platform guns.

Then I followed this thing up to see why it was that while we are going on, asking no questions, and building nothing but revolving turrets for these guns, England is not building one of them. The reason is that they are afraid of them. They say they are subject to an ordinary accident; that if a revolving turret jams from any cause—the listing of the ship or a single shell hits it—the ship is good for nothing; the big guns can not be used. They say that if an explosion were to take place in a turret—and anybody who has ever been in them can understand that—the results would be horrible. So it is the fact that the great power of Great Britain, which is the great accredited authority on naval structures, is not building a single revolving turret for large guns. We are building all.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. I should like, if the Senator will yield to me, to ask him if we have not had an explosion in a turret?

Mr. HALE. We have had accidental explosions.

Mr. TELLER. Accidental explosions.

Mr. HALE. We have had. They are horrible. We have had nothing in battle.

The Senator from Illinois asks me what we are doing now in this bill. We have adhered to the old way because we have only one battle ship in the bill.

Mr. TELLER. There is only one battle ship provided for in this bill?

Mr. HALE. Only one.

Mr. CULLOM. Are we allowing the turrets to remain?

Mr. HALE. I think it is proper that attention should be called to this matter. It is not the Secretary; it is the board of naval officers who decide these matters. Of course, they may be right; it may be we are all right. But if we are all right, Great Britain is all wrong. And if Great Britain is all right, we are all wrong.

We have not had enough discussion of the naval programme heretofore.

Mr. TELLER. How about Germany?

Mr. HALE. I have looked also into the other powers. Germany builds a few, France a few, but generally the ships that are building, those by Great Britain entirely, are barbette ships, although some of the other nations are building turreted ships. But Great Britain is building none of them.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HALE. Certainly,

Mr. CARMACK. I understand that all our battle ships now are turreted.

Mr. HALE. Every battle ship has its big guns put into cylinder revolving turrets.

Mr. CARMACK. How about the cruisers?

Mr. HALE. The cruisers do not have the big guns. The question does not arise with the cruisers.

Mr. CLAY. With the Senator's permission, I am frank to confess that I do not understand this matter. The Senator, I am sure, can explain it. He has put on record the enormous tonnage and gun power of the United States ships, by Mr. Weaver. His statement is simply this: The total tonnage of the ships now in the United States is 531,886 tons. The 31 vessels now building have an aggregate tonnage of 349,431 tons. This makes a grand total of all ships in commission, when these in process of construction are completed, of 881,317 tons, and makes the United States the second naval power of the world.

Now, from the Navy Department comes the information, which the Senator has just read, that when the ships now under process of construction are completed the United States will have a tonnage of 616,275, making a difference of over 200,000 tons and making us the third naval power of the world.

Mr. HALE. I have explained that. I am sorry the Senator was not here or that I was dull in explaining it.

What I have taken as the actual basis are the figures they have given for ships over a thousand tons—what is called "sea strength."

Mr. LODGE. The fighting force.

Mr. HALE. The fighting force. The addition is made up not only in our Navy, but in other navies, of smaller vessels which are valuable vessels, but are not of what is called the "fighting force." Therefore I have not considered it a fair comparison to take the figures that are given there, which are correct, as they include everything—

Mr. CLAY. The table that the Senator has inserted in the RECORD embraces all the ships.

Mr. HALE. All of the ships will show in the table to be printed as a public document. This includes Mr. Weaver's tables.

Mr. CLAY. And the report from the Navy Department simply embraces those of a certain size?

Mr. HALE. They will give you just what is in that report. Their attention has been called to this matter, and a reply has been given. We have asked them to give us what is called the "sea power," the "fighting power," and these late figures which I have in the table all cover the fighting power, what is called the "sea power," and do not include the fifty or sixty vessels, as I suppose there are in our Navy, which are below a thousand tons.

Mr. ALLISON. The same rule runs through the entire table?

Mr. HALE. It runs through the entire table, and also runs through the tables of other powers.

Mr. ALLISON. Of all the ships of all the countries?

Mr. HALE. All ships of all countries.

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

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in what the Senator from Maine said about guns being mounted on barbette instead of in revolving turrets, and I entirely agree with his expression of doubt.

Mr. HALE. It applies to the Army just as to the Navy.

Mr. PROCTOR. There is a parallel case in the Army. I have argued here against using the disappearing carriage to the great extent we have, in which respect ours is entirely different from the policy of any other country. The same is true in regard to turrets. The reason is very much stronger in the case of the Army because the barbette gun, being on an elevation, a fort, is very much more protected than it would be on board ship. We have spent many millions for mounting guns in forts; some of them at an elevation of two or three hundred feet, on disappearing carriages, which a single shot might disable, and in my opinion it would be very likely to. Even a shot throwing gravel or the debris of the concrete from the fortification would put the gun out of service. I am very glad to hear this discussion.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator before he sits down whether there has not been a report made on that subject since the last discussion?

Mr. PROCTOR. I am not aware of any. We have gone on. I think the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] can tell us about that.

Mr. PERKINS. I refer the Senator to the report of the Chief of Ordnance, Board of Ordnance and Fortification, commencing at page 67, where the report of the board that was appointed on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont to investigate the practicability and desirability of using the disappearing carriage as against the barbette is given fully. When the fortifications bill is up we will discuss that proposition.

Mr. PROCTOR. I should like to ask the Senator from California if this report indorses a change of the system?

Mr. PERKINS. No; the board—

Mr. PROCTOR. That is what I supposed.

Mr. PERKINS. They are in favor of disappearing carriages.

Mr. PROCTOR. I wish merely to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are in that matter differing from the policy of every other nation, the same as we are in the use of the revolving turret. I think we are making a mistake, surely in the case of the Army.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to say that I think the Senator from Vermont is mistaken. The disappearing carriage is used in some countries besides the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Of course it is.

Mr. PROCTOR. Only to a very limited extent, and our disappearing carriage is not used anywhere.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to say further that the disappearing carriage is an American invention.

Mr. PROCTOR. So is the turret.

Mr. HALE. Let these army experts fight it out on the army bill. I am dealing with the Navy.

Mr. FORAKER. I should like to inquire if there has been any trouble with the turret of any battle ship? I ask only for information.

Mr. HALE. The fortunate fact is that we have not gotten into war yet. They have not been tried yet. Nobody knows. The British officers and authorities go on the assumption that when you get into conflict the unforeseen things will happen, the turreted ship is subject to a much larger percentage of accidents. We, fortunately, never have tried it in battle. I do not know, and I do not claim—

Mr. FORAKER. The theory is that the turrets are more liable to accident?

Mr. HALE. One can see that where the—

Mr. FORAKER. As a matter of fact, there has not been any?

Mr. HALE. None in war.

Mr. FORAKER. They were used in the Spanish-American war at Santiago.

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. The *Indiana* and the *Oregon* were turreted ships.

Mr. HALE. The ships that showed in that fight, the two ships that did most of the fighting, were the *Oregon* and the *Brooklyn*.

Mr. FORAKER. Yes.

Mr. HALE. The *Oregon* is a turreted ship, but there was no ship that she was contending with. She had nothing to contend with in the way of a battle ship.

Mr. LODGE. Was not the *Iowa* a turreted ship?

Mr. HALE. All our battle ships are turreted.

Mr. LODGE. The *Iowa* certainly engaged in it.

Mr. HALE. Yes; but the most prominent were the *Oregon* and the *Brooklyn*.

Mr. LODGE. The *Massachusetts* was not there.

Mr. HALE. The *Massachusetts* was not there; the *Texas* was.

Mr. FORAKER. I am asking only for information. May I ask the Senator from Maine how does the question arise now? Does the bill provide for ships without turrets?

Mr. HALE. No. We have left that to the Department.

Mr. FORAKER. Oh!

Mr. HALE. I first tried to enlighten myself and then to enlighten the Senate and the country as to what the conditions are and how we are going on as compared to other great naval powers.

Mr. FORAKER. It is not only interesting, but very important.

Mr. HALE. I think it is important as a matter of administration.

Mr. CARMACK. Will the Senator permit me just a moment?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. I understand the drift of the Senator's remarks and those of the Senator from Vermont to mean that there is a very serious doubt as to whether the vast sums of money which we have been expending for military and naval purposes have been intelligently expended.

Mr. HALE. I should not go so far as that. There has been

great intelligence. Whether there has also been wisdom—intelligence and wisdom are not the same—

Mr. CARMACK. Wisdom, I meant.

Mr. HALE. Whether everything has been done in the wisest way is a question. I do not mean to censure the naval officers. I do not think any navy in the world has a finer complement of naval officers than we have for intelligence, for courage, of course, for patriotism, and for every quality that goes to make up usefulness in time of war or to make great sailors, great officers, great captains. But the naval officer is a naval officer pure and simple. The one thing that bounds his horizon is the United States Navy. It is the sea. If he is, as nearly all the officers are, graduates of Annapolis, it is the scene of every incident in his eventful life from boyhood until he retires. To him the building of the Navy is the one essential thing over and above all other things.

When he is confronted with the question whether we will appropriate money for a navy or for the dwindling merchant marine, he is for the Navy. That is his profession; that is his business. And the naval boards, I think, have run too much in the direction of building the most enormous ships.

I tried last year to keep the size of the ships down, and instead of building three 16,000-ton ships, at almost \$8,000,000 apiece, I would have built five like the *Oregon* and the *Massachusetts*; and it was declared that I had lost all sense of patriotism, that I was an impediment and an encumberer of the ground, and had no business to advance any such proposition against the naval programme.

I have not changed my mind. I think instead of three great 16,000-ton battle ships, five like the *Oregon*, the *Massachusetts*, and the *Indiana*, with the same number of guns that the others have, but not the room, not so many small guns, although they have a great many of them, but not the room and not in appearance the wonderfully potential engine of war as the big ships, would have been better. But the naval officers believe in the biggest ships. In some respects they are like the farmer who wants to raise the biggest pumpkin. They do not want to be beaten by their neighbors. They do not want England or Germany to excel us in the size of ships.

As to the relative merits of the larger ships and torpedo boats, in future construction, ex-Secretary Chandler has given a very valuable interview on the subject, which I will incorporate in the Senate document which is to include the tables used in my remarks.

Now, the present year's appropriation, including this bill and the deficiency—there will always be about the same amount of deficiency—will equal in round figures \$100,000,000.

The naval programme of the naval boards and naval officers is that, as against twenty-four battle ships which we have built and building, and with this bill twenty-five, and ten armored cruisers, we shall go on and build until we have forty-eight battle ships and twelve armored cruisers—forty-eight battle ships, in round numbers, at \$8,000,000 apiece, twenty-three of which will be hereafter authorized, and twenty-four armored cruisers at six millions each, nearly. If we adopt that programme (and it is said we have no business to ask questions, but we must give everything that is asked), we will have a naval appropriation bill next year of \$115,000,000 or \$120,000,000; and when you get the forty-eight battle ships and twenty-four armored cruisers no appropriation of less than \$300,000,000 a year will run the Navy.

Mr. ALLISON rose.

Mr. HALE. And long before that you will have to build to take the place of obsolete ships to keep up the complement of forty-eight battle ships. Great Britain has only thirty-four battle ships in commission to-day, and yet the naval boards and naval officers tell us that we want forty-eight battle ships. They are in earnest; they are honest about it from their standpoint, and think the country can not do better than devote its money to this purpose.

I think that while the committee this year has not thought it wise to interfere with this programme, it is well worth the while for the Senate to consider in the future to what all this will inevitably lead. I am not in favor of stopping the building of ships. I am not in favor of impairing the usefulness of the Navy. I think we ought to have the second or third navy in the world. I think when anyone says we ought to go on and have a navy as big as Great Britain that we are dealing with conditions that are entirely different from those of Great Britain, and that the contemplated force is too large; that it is more than the revenues will sustain. Does the Senator from Iowa arise to a question?

Mr. ALLISON. I was waiting; I did not know but that the Senator would reach the comparison that I think he ought to make at this stage. I should be glad to know what will be the appropriations necessary for the maintenance of the Navy as it will be when all the present ships are put in commission which are under construction and those authorized heretofore and in this bill. Then I should be glad to know, in comparison, what, under the pro-

gramme which the Senator has just announced as the programme of the Navy Board, the annual appropriations would be, and what would be relatively the number of sailors.

Mr. HALE. I have given what the annual naval appropriation would ultimately be, \$200,000,000 per year. The number of men will be from 80,000 to 90,000.

Mr. SPOONER. As against what?

Mr. HALE. As against 34,000 now.

Mr. ALLISON. I will ask the Senator in the course of his observations to state what the number of men will be when the ships now under construction are completed.

Mr. HALE. It will be 43,000. It would be just about double that under the larger programme, if we carry it out. Now, we are not seeking even any restriction or shrinkage this year, because the conditions are peculiar. We do not know what this first locking of horns between two great powers—and they are both great powers—will demonstrate upon the question of the naval establishment.

The committee did not think it wise, all the more, as I have said, because the House reported only one battle ship, to interfere with their programme. But I will say, in answer to the Senator from Iowa, that if we simply keep a navy of the size which ours will be when the ships provided for in this bill and those now under construction are completed, then we need not have an appropriation much, if any, larger than it is now. I have made these calculations as correctly as I can.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, Mr. President, I know how difficult it is to make accurate estimates, but I should like to have the Senator state, so far as he can, what the annual appropriation will necessarily be when the present construction and authorization is completed and the ships are in commission.

Mr. HALE. That would depend upon whether we go on and add every year a lot of new ships. If we stop, then I can tell; but if we keep adding while this programme is being carried out, then the appropriations will increase all the time. I do not know what we will do; but if we stop and do not do anything more for the present or the near future than what is necessary to keep good our twenty-five battle ships and corresponding cruisers, then we can get along and get along well.

The appropriations for the ships in this bill do not come in until the next year, because they do not get to work this year any more than to be ready to build the ships. The second year is more than the first. The carrying out of the programme of vessels already organized runs through a period of from three to five years. But if we only make good and add only one battle ship a year and some scouts and cruisers, and an armored cruiser, then we can keep the appropriations down to about what they are now.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that this bill carries \$31,000,000 for the construction of ships already being constructed and authorized.

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. That is, for construction?

Mr. HALE. Yes; for work on ships already authorized.

Mr. ALLISON. So that if we stop the building of new ships hereafter, allowing the programme to remain as it is under these bills, then the annual appropriation, as I understand the Senator, will not be increased.

Mr. HALE. It will not materially, I think.

Mr. ALLISON. But suppose we also, each year, add to the Navy for the purpose of keeping it in full use, allowing for wear and tear and new ships to take the place of old ones, etc., will there not be a considerable addition thereby every year to the annual appropriation?

Mr. HALE. That is a matter about which one can not tell exactly. When we get through with the appropriation of \$31,000,000 to carry out the building programme, that reduces the subsequent appropriation bills so much, so that the current appropriation will be less, and then we will have room for a moderate increase that shall keep the Navy up to the position it will be in when the present building programme is carried out. But I do not claim anyone can make figures exactly. I should think, under those conditions, if we do not go on with the larger programme hereafter and run it up to forty-eight ships, we can get along with about \$100,000,000 a year.

Mr. President, I did not intend to consume so much time. Senators will bear me out that on appropriation bills which have been placed in my charge I have not taken any time in making speeches. I have only—

Mr. PROCTOR. We are getting a great deal of very valuable and interesting information, and I should like to ask the Senator from Maine a question on the matter of expense. He has spoken of the programme of the Naval Board as retiring some ships, placing them on the retired list, so to speak—the *Oregon*, *Indiana*, and *Massachusetts*. I should like to ask the Senator what he thinks or what, in the opinion of the Naval Board, would be about the average life of a ship; that is to say, in about how many years would the question come up whether it was worth while to repair

the ship, put in all the modern improvements, or relegate her to the scrap heap or to defense purposes?

Mr. HALE. I do not know. One of the communications I had from the Department, which I have already quoted, singled out the *Oregon*, *Massachusetts*, and *Indiana* as not being in the first line of offensive warfare and as being relegated to coast defense. They are none of them yet 10 years old. They were launched, I think, in 1895 or 1896. That is the only answer I can give.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I will state—

Mr. PROCTOR. The point I wish to bring out is whether, with this large number of battle ships—forty-eight—supposing their life for offensive purposes is an average of ten years, whether the expense of renewal would not be very great?

Mr. HALE. If they would last only ten years we should have to build four battle ships every year to keep it good.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. I think I can answer the question of the Senator from Vermont in a certain way. On page 546 of the House hearings Admiral Dewey says:

The battle ships, you know, cost too much money to be cruising about in uncharted waters. These ships ought to last one hundred years.

It is the largest-sized battle ship which Admiral Dewey advocates as the principal ship for use in our Navy.

Mr. HALE. The German authorities say twenty years.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I was about to say in answer to the Senator from Vermont that a rule prevails in the merchant marine by which they write off 5 per cent of the valuation every year. If the vessel is kept in ordinary repair, that makes the life of an iron or steel vessel about twenty years. I think that our battle ships are good for thirty years, because they are kept in excellent condition, corrosion is not permitted to take place, and they have an ample crew, both in the engineering and deck department, to keep them in good order. I think, therefore, we can safely say that the life of a battle ship is thirty years.

But constantly we are making improvements. As has been stated by the Senator from Maine, our ships to-day are far more effective than many of those which belong to the great navies of the world, because we have profited by their mistakes. We have improved upon their improvements, and to-day our officers can handle our ships more expeditiously, our guns and our parapets and our turrets are all, notwithstanding the criticism, better equipped to-day, and they have given evidence of it wherever they have been in any contest, although the great contest has yet to come, as the Senator from Maine says, and it is experimental in a great measure.

I think that instead of censuring or adversely criticising our officers of the Navy and the boards they are entitled to great credit for what they have accomplished. We as citizens of this great Republic, those of us who have had experience in the maritime service of the country, look at our vessels afloat with admiration, and we will compare them most favorably to our advantage against the ships of any other nationality.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I detract nothing from the merit of the naval officer. When you come to war he will take care of the glory and honor of the American Navy as no other sailor and officer will. They are entitled to our thanks for the labor that they have bestowed, but I have thought it desirable, not in any way unduly finding fault, to bring out actual conditions now and in the future.

We have some responsibility, Mr. President, in the Senate and in the House. We have to raise the money and we have to appropriate it. We have a right to know how it is going, whether it is in the best ways, and whether we will be called upon for larger appropriations with dwindling revenues relatively.

Whether I am charged with lack of patriotism because I choose in a fair and open way to somewhat criticise, I am not to be deterred from it by the fact that I may be myself criticised. I am in favor of a great, efficient, powerful navy, and there are certain conditions that oblige us to have a larger navy than we would have otherwise. We have got the Philippines on our hands, 7,000 miles away, and they are our vulnerable point. We have now twenty-four naval ships keeping the peace out there.

Some distinguished officer I saw quoted the other day, who said if the Navy were not there we could not hold the Philippines three months. We have got to have ships there; we have got to have a navy commensurate for that purpose; and it is different from what it would be if we were at home, as the Japanese are, and did our fighting here. If we ever get into war, the first thing we will have to do will be to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in protecting the Philippines.

Therefore I am in favor of keeping up a large navy. But England has only thirty-four battle ships in commission, and with fifty times the colonial possessions we have, over all the globe

everywhere, and taking into account the necessity of so large a naval force always in the oriental waters, still I believe that we do not need to keep up such an enormous programme as we carried out last year or as we are doing this year.

Mr. PATTERSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine this question: Did he understand from the gentleman to whom he referred why it was that if our Navy were not maintained in the Philippines we would not hold that country three months?

Mr. HALE. No. I only referred to that incidentally. I saw it in some newspaper. I do not quote it as authority, and quite likely it will be denied, although there is great force in the statement—

Mr. CARMACK. I do not understand that remark. I did not hear the Senator's statement.

Mr. HALE. I simply referred to some newspaper item that I saw, that a distinguished military officer, whether in the Army or Navy, had said that without our Navy there we could not hold the Philippines for three months. Now, I do not know who it was, and that is not of the slightest consequence.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to ask the Senator if it is not true that Admiral Dewey, in his testimony before the House committee, testified that without our Navy we could not support the army in the Philippines three months?

Mr. HALE. I do not know whether he went in that testimony so far as that, but he did say pretty nearly that, applying it to a condition of war. Of course, everybody understands that we need and must have, while we hold the Philippines, a large fleet there for any emergency.

Mr. BACON. I should like to get the opinion of the Senator on one point. He is chairman of the committee, and doubtless has given it very considerable thought. I ask it for information, which I am sure the Senator will be glad to give. What is the opinion of the Senator as to the magnitude of the fleet which he has just alluded to, which the retention of the Philippine Islands will make necessary? I am speaking about the part of it that will be necessary for the retention of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HALE. Now, that I do not know, because I have no expert knowledge as to the adaptation of the naval force to a colonial possession. I sent to the Department this morning and asked them what is the size of our fleet in and about the Philippines and in the Chinese and Japanese seas, and the answer is: "Twenty-four ships in Eastern waters."

Mr. BACON. Without any special information as to their size or character?

Mr. HALE. No, that is not given; but that can be easily obtained.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine another question before he sits down. When we have this large number of ships, whether on the present plan under our appropriations or under a more enlarged plan, will not the ships in time of peace be largely laid up in fresh water somewhere, or will they be required, practically all of them, to be in commission?

Mr. HALE. I am glad the Senator asked that question. It is one consideration that slipped my mind when I was talking. We have, owned by the Government, and only needing to be properly dredged and walled, the best place for a fresh-water naval lake in which to lay up ships that the world has ever seen, and that is at League Island. When we took that property, we luckily took a very large extent—five or six hundred acres. It is not like the other old yards in New York, Norfolk, and Boston, consisting of a comparatively small tract, but it is a great tract. I went there the other day with the Secretary and some of the Pennsylvania delegation, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and there is the best place in the world. But the hearings that were taken on the bill for this year showed, as the naval officers said, that they did not want ships put in there; they thought they ought to be kept out, and ought to be around in different parts of the world; that they ought to be protecting our commerce.

If I were the Secretary of the Navy, I will say to the Senator, I should certainly put, just as soon as that place is made available, a considerable portion of the battle ships in there, and they would be where in a few weeks or months they could be put into fighting condition if war blackened on our horizon. But nothing of that kind is contemplated at present. How much the Secretary of the Navy will do in overruling the desire to keep all these ships out I do not know. Of course he can do it.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator stated, I believe, that there are 254 ships now, in the aggregate. Are any of them now laid up?

Mr. HALE. Some of the little yachts, which do not figure much.

Mr. ALLISON. But as a general rule they are all in commission?

Mr. HALE. There are some that are being temporarily laid aside, and perhaps some under repair, and all that; but none of them is in such place as League Island; there are none of the modern ships there.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question? The Senator has given us some very interesting information as to the relative strength of our Navy compared with the navies of other large powers. I confess that the question which I am about to propound to the Senator is one which gives me a great deal of trouble, and which I am not able satisfactorily to answer for myself, or at least I can not answer it satisfactorily to myself.

Is it the Senator's idea that the Navy of the United States should be enlarged with reference to the needs for the protection of our harbors and for the protection of commerce in proportion to the size thereof, or that the size of that Navy should be regulated according to the size of the navies of other nations on the earth? What is the view of the Senator with reference to that? In order that we may have some opportunity to estimate for the future, are we simply to provide a navy to protect our coast efficiently in time of war for our defense, and such additional navy as may be necessary for representatives in different parts of the world for the protection of commercial interests, etc.? Shall that be the basis of limitation, or, on the other hand, shall we go on and regulate our conduct in the enlargement of our Navy in proportion as other nations may see fit to enlarge theirs? What is the view of the Senator with reference to the particular controlling interest which shall be our guide in the future?

Mr. HALE. Well, Mr. President, that is an entirely pertinent question. I do not know how I would answer it. I certainly do not think that we need to be put into any such attitude as Great Britain takes boldly and avowedly, and that is that she will, no matter how much it costs, have a navy bigger than any other two powers. Great Britain does not deny that; it was brought out in the debate the other day on the naval budget. Great Britain made that an essential postulate of her whole doctrine about a navy.

Now, I do not think that we need that, because our situation is entirely different. If we had not any foreign possessions and were at home, as the Japanese are, we have all the Navy now that we would need for any purpose. But we have got these possessions. I shall be glad for one to get rid of them, if we can; but as long as we have them we must have a navy commensurate with protecting them if trouble arises.

Mr. BACON. The Senator, then, as I understand it, gives it as his opinion that the enlargement of the Navy beyond its present proportions is made necessary only by the fact that our jurisdiction has been enlarged by what is popularly known as our "new possessions."

Mr. HALE. I think that is the great factor. When you come to the last additions to the Navy and make it a very large one, that undoubtedly is the largest factor.

Mr. BACON. Now, if the Senator will pardon me, I want to ask him another question. Of course it is recognized, when we speak about a navy that is sufficient for the protection of our commerce, we do not in that contemplate that we shall at each place have a naval force which will be sufficient to meet any naval force which might be brought against it. That is not what we have in view. It simply means that we shall have in different sections the ships which will be necessary to support the authority of the Navy in the protection of its citizens in case of an emergency.

Mr. HALE. We are very differently situated from England in that regard. We have not very much foreign shipping.

Mr. BACON. I am glad the Senator states that as his opinion. That is a pertinent consideration in the question I am about to ask, which is this: Taking that as the particular function and office of our ships in foreign waters, and then considering the needs we have for a navy for the defense of our harbors and coasts, is it or is it not the opinion of the Senator that, those two things considered, the present size of the Navy is ample for the needs of the Government?

Mr. HALE. I will say we have not, unluckily, much merchant marine engaged in foreign trade; and it is growing smaller at that. Great Britain's foreign trade is enormous, increasing all the time all over the globe. We have not that consideration.

We have these possessions, which we have got to protect, and we have this new enterprise, for which everybody has guaranteed us as sponsor—the great isthmian canal. We must have a military force sufficient for that purpose. I say a military force—it is all military, Army and Navy. We have got to have a navy that is ample, if any trouble arises there, to protect that canal, and we will always have. Great Britain has had great pride in her Mediterranean fleet, and, as the years goes by, our main fleet will be in southern waters. That is one of the things which adds to the necessity of a great deal larger navy than we had ten years ago, when we neither had the Philippines, nor Guam, nor Porto Rico, nor Hawaii, nor the isthmian canal on our hands. But without all of those possessions, we need a comparatively small navy.

Mr. BACON. The isthmian canal is, of course, nearer to us and will not be a matter which will require so large an increase of the Navy as is required by those far-distant possessions. Am I correct in that suggestion?

Mr. HALE. No; I think, on the other hand, if any trouble arose, if we had any war with any great European power, we would require a larger fleet of fighting vessels down there than we would in the Philippines.

Mr. BACON. Yes; but I am speaking now of the fact that they are near to us and that the same ships we have at home are available.

Mr. HALE. Yes; we do not need many ships for mere home protection. Our home-port cities are largely protected by fortifications, and with the modern guns and fortifications which have been built and are now building it is supposed that no hostile fleet will ever be able to destroy our cities; and with the line of harbor-defense vessels we have got we are pretty well equipped in that regard.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me for asking one other question, I was very much struck with the statement of the Senator as to the desirability of the ship of the pattern of the *Oregon* rather than the ship of 16,000 tons burden. I understand, from the statement of the Senator, that he regards the smaller type as fully as efficient as a fighting machine as the larger ship. If I am correct in my understanding, this bill carries a provision for the construction of 16,000-ton ships.

Mr. HALE. For one.

Mr. BACON. For one. That involves a difference of some \$3,000,000 in cost, if I understand correctly the opinion of the Senator, without being any more efficient as a fighting vessel. Now, of course, the Senator has a good reason for it, I know, and I simply desire to ascertain what that reason is. Why is it, with the views the Senator has in that matter, that he retains the provision for the 16,000-ton ship rather than substitute a provision for a ship of the pattern of the *Oregon*?

Mr. HALE. I offered that last year and could not succeed; and as the programme has been cut down from five battle ships to one and we inserted "not more than 16,000 tons," I am willing to leave it to the Secretary of the Navy to determine that.

Mr. BACON. It is not required that this vessel shall be 16,000 tons, but that is the limitation.

Mr. HALE. Yes; that it shall not be more than that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, on that point just a word. While as a member of the Naval Committee I have been interested in the position which the chairman of the committee has taken in reference to this matter as to the relative value of large ships and the smaller types, such as the *Oregon*, yet it is but fair to state that on that point there is a very marked difference of opinion. I think perhaps the weight of naval opinion the world over, as well as in our own Department, would be in favor of the large type. I think the chairman of the committee would admit that. I have been necessarily very strongly impressed with the position the chairman of the committee has taken, that the smaller type might become a more effective fighting force than these enormous battle ships; and yet, as I have stated, it is due that it should go in the RECORD that there is a marked difference of opinion on that point among those who are ordinarily recognized as authorities on questions of that kind.

Mr. MALLORY. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. MALLORY. As a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, can the Senator tell us whether we have in the Navy today any ships of the size of that 13,000-ton battle ship we are now building under the last appropriation act?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think so.

Mr. MALLORY. Have we to-day in commission any battle ship of the type of 13,000 tons?

Mr. HALE. I do not think we have in commission any battle ship larger than 13,000 tons.

Mr. MALLORY. I do not think any of them will reach quite that. I think their tonnage is 12,500 tons.

Mr. HALE. The *Kearsarge*, the *Kentucky*, and the *Iowa* are smaller.

Mr. MALLORY. And those vessels are nearly 2,000 tons larger than the *Oregon*.

Mr. HALE. Yes; they are larger than the *Oregon*.

Mr. MALLORY. The vessel provided for in this bill is 3,000 tons larger than they are.

Mr. GALLINGER. Three thousand tons larger than any vessel we now have.

Mr. HALE. Yes; about 3,000 tons.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say.

Mr. PATTERSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine a question.

Mr. HALE. Very well. I ask the permission of the Senate to incorporate with my remarks the tables I have given. I also ask that when I have the tables properly arranged they may be printed as a Senate document for the benefit of Congress.

Mr. ALLISON. And in the RECORD?

Mr. HALE. They will be printed in the RECORD with the speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the tables presented by him be printed as a Senate document. The Chair hears no objection, and that order is made. The Chair hears no objection to the request that they be printed as a part of his speech.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the very valuable speech which has been made by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. It has conveyed information which is necessary for our proper consideration of this bill and which is important to the country. The Senator is the greatest authority we have upon naval matters, outside of the experts and professionals, and any remarks he may make in regard to the Navy, its location, or the purposes for which it is to be used will be taken by the country very seriously. He made one observation the effect of which, without explanation, seems to me will be greater than was intended.

The Senator said, as I understood him, that we had twenty-four ships in Eastern waters, and that they were all necessary, according to the report, for the preservation under our flag of the Philippine Islands, and that this authority had stated that the Government of the United States could not hold the islands for three months unless it had a fleet of that size there.

Mr. HALE. No, I simply said that I had telegraphed to the Department to know what was the extent of the fleet in those waters; and that is all I got from the Department. The Department gives no reasons. Then I quoted what I had seen in a newspaper that a distinguished military officer had said we could not hold the Philippine Islands for three months without our Navy there; but I did not claim or assert that the Department had taken that ground.

Another Senator said that Admiral Dewey testified pretty much to that effect before the House Committee on Naval Affairs. I did not intend to say—and nothing that I said would bear the construction—that the Department stated to me that such a fleet was necessary in the Orient for that purpose. I only stated that the fleet is there.

Mr. DEPEW. I understood that the Senator from Maine did not state that the Department had so said; but I did understand him to say that a distinguished officer had made that remark, and I did not understand the Senator to disapprove of the statement. That being the case, it occurred to me that the statement, under such circumstances, virtually had the approval of the Senator from Maine; and if so, it was a very important one, and should be met at once either by a reply from the War and Navy Departments or here.

We have now twenty-four ships in eastern waters, but "eastern waters" are not the Philippines alone. They comprise the whole coast of the Orient. It means that the presence of our fleet in eastern waters is necessary owing to the difficulties which may arise because of the war between Japan and Russia. It means that we are alive to the duties imposed upon us and mean to show our interest in reference to the partition of China, and that we do not mean that any such event shall take place without a serious protest on our part.

If this statement were true, then the War Department or the President has made a great mistake in reducing the army in the Philippines. We began in the Philippines with an army of 70,000 men, and we have reduced it to 15,000, because of the statement which has been made by Governor Taft and the Commission and army officers of the United States in the Philippines that the conditions in the islands are so peaceful that we can maintain order, respect for law, and enforce it and maintain the authority of the United States with these 15,000 men, which can be reduced to 10,000, with the native constabulary. That there are twenty-four ships in the eastern waters, even if difficulties did not exist which now prevail there, would not be surprising when our Navy has become as large as it is. So long as it is in commission and is afloat it must be somewhere. There is a fleet in the Mediterranean, a fleet in the Atlantic, a fleet in the Caribbean Sea, a fleet in the Gulf of Mexico, and a fleet in the Pacific Ocean, and at the present time I should think it eminently wise that the greater part of that fleet is concentrated at a place where it is necessary to protect the interests of the United States, and that is in eastern waters; but I do not at all assent, nor do I believe, that any conditions exist in the Philippines by which we would lose them in three months if we did not have twenty-four of our best ships there for the purpose of maintaining our authority.

Mr. BACON. I should like, with his permission, to ask the Senator from New York a question for information. He says he does not recognize the fact that, in case of war, we would lose the Philippine Islands in three months. Possibly that is not the exact way to put it. But does the Senator conceive that it would be possible for us to hold the Philippine Islands without a fleet that would be sufficient to keep up communication between this country and the Philippine Islands as against any fleet which might seek to interrupt it?

Mr. DEPEW. I will say to the Senator that, in case of war, we would need our fleet there to meet any fleet which was of equal strength belonging to other nations; but, as I understand—

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator please repeat his statement; as, owing to the conversation around me, I was unable to hear it.

Mr. DEPEW. I say that, in case of war, we will probably want a larger fleet there than the twenty-four ships. We would then need a fleet as large as that which could be brought there by the nation with which we were at war. But the point I was addressing myself to was as to a misunderstanding which I thought existed, that, without war, the internal conditions of those islands were such that it would require a fleet to maintain our authority and the internal commerce between the different islands of the archipelago. That condition, however, does not exist.

Mr. BACON. I did not so understand. I supposed the inquiry was directed as to what was necessary in order to protect the islands against a foreign power.

Mr. DEPEW. No; there was no mention or suggestion, I will say to the Senator from Georgia, of a condition of war in the colloquy that was going on between the Senator from Maine and myself.

Mr. BACON. Then I misunderstood the Senator. I understood him to mean—and I was impressed by the fact that he did mean it—that in case of war we could hold the Philippine Islands with twenty-four ships. I think the Senator correctly stated the proposition when he said that in case of war we would require a fleet for the purpose of keeping up communication between the United States and the Philippine Islands which would be sufficient to cope with any fleet that an adverse power might send against it. I think that is a correct proposition. I did not know that the Senator referred simply to the internal conditions.

Mr. DEPEW. I would say, Mr. President, that in case of war the Philippine Islands would be the most valuable possession the United States has to defend, and the most valuable possession we have for the purpose of attack. The great powers of Europe, if they were in trouble with us, would not want to attack us because of our internal commerce, nor because of our relations with the islands in the Caribbean Sea, or the Gulf of Mexico, or South America, or with Canada. Their assault upon us would be for the purpose of driving us out of the competing trade in the Orient for the purpose of preventing us from competing with them in that market, which is the only one now open to competition to the great producing and manufacturing nations of the world. In case war occurred the first effort would be to take away from us the Philippines, in order that we might not have coaling stations and might not have the ability with which to maintain and to protect whatever commerce we have for the present and might have for the future in the Far East.

The Philippine Islands are providentially and commercially and in every way a most valuable possession for the growing commerce and expanding trade of the United States. They are the place which all the European nations regard as the port from which the United States is to be able to reach and protect trade with the Orient, because it is nearer than they can be.

Mr. PATTERSON. I want to suggest to the Senator from New York that he apparently disagrees with another distinguished citizen of New York, the late Secretary of War. The theory of the Senator from New York seems to be that the Philippines are a permanent possession, providentially given to us as a means of extending and making permanent our commerce with eastern countries. The late Secretary of War, in what appears to be an authentic interview published in the New York World, which doubtless the Senator from New York has read, gave the country distinctly to understand that the Philippine Islands were being held temporarily only, until such time as they would be fitted for self-government, when the United States would extend to them the same rights and privileges that were extended to the people of Cuba to form and maintain a government of their own, and to live in practical independence.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for my lifelong friend and now constituent, the late Secretary of War, and have the profoundest respect for his opinions on all questions; but if he has given as his judgment that the United States would at some time surrender and give up the Philippine Islands to an independent nation, in the line with Cuba, I do not believe that that condition will ever come about.

I will go one step further. If it does come about, it will be because the United States has educated those people up to a point of self-government where the judgment of the majority here is that they are capable of maintaining that government against the tremendous pressure which would be brought against islands, situated as they are, by all the great powers of Europe to gain possession of them; and if we did give them up, Mr. President, under such circumstances, it occurs to me that we would be compelled to assume obligations infinitely greater than we do while they are colonies of the United States.

While they are colonies of the United States no foreign nation is going to touch them, or going to assail them, or going to undertake to take them from us; but when they become independent, unless we guarantee by our Army and Navy to maintain their independence, in three months there would be a foreign fleet around their coast and a foreign army on their shores. If we do give them up it will only be when we are situated as we are with Cuba, where we have a naval station on one side and a naval station on the other, and she is so surrounded that no foreign nation could approach her under any circumstances.

Mr. PATTERSON. The only thing I desire to bring out is that, at least in the opinion of the distinguished Senator from New York, all propositions for the ultimate independence of the Philippine Islands are figments of the imagination so far as the party with which he is connected is concerned.

Mr. DEPEW. I want to say to the Senator from Colorado that the opinions which I have expressed are my own.

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

Mr. DEPEW. And the party is not responsible for them, nor is the Administration.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I desire to make a short reply to what the Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] has said with reference to the probability of war, and the Philippine Islands in such a contingency being the theater of war. I quite agree with the Senator that if we should have a war with a foreign power the Philippine Islands would be the theater of that war, but not for the reason mentioned by the honorable Senator—not because the Philippine Islands are so great a prize that in the event of war there would be an eager effort to secure them by the power with which we might be at war—not for that reason; but it would be the theater of war because every country at war naturally seeks to strike its enemy at its weakest point. For that reason the Philippine Islands would be the theater of war, just as we in our Spanish war did not send our Army to Spain. Even if the island of Cuba had not been involved in the controversy, the island of Cuba would not have been the theater of war between Spain and the United States, because we would naturally seek to strike her in her weakest point, which was in a country 3,000 miles away from Spain's base of supplies.

In case of war, if our enemies sought to make the Philippine Islands the theater of war, we would have to transport not only supplies, but all of our armies across the broad Pacific Ocean; we would have to have every transport convoyed by a fleet of war ships sufficient to meet the combined fleet of the enemy; we would have to have there an army sufficient to meet whatever army might be brought there by a European power, and we would have to supply that army by provisions sent from this country, and the ships carrying the provisions would also have to be convoyed by men-of-war sufficient to meet the combined fleet of the enemy.

I will not elaborate that, Mr. President—we have talked about that a good deal here—but I want to read, in connection with my former inquiry, to the Senator from New York what Admiral Dewey said on the very point which the Senator said was in controversy between himself and the Senator from Maine. I had not seen this document. It is headed, "Statement of Admiral Dewey on Philippine Islands station and naval programme," delivered by him before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives on the 4th of February of this year. I call the attention of the Senator from New York to the statement of Admiral Dewey. I read from the second page of the document.

Mr. COUSINS asked the Admiral this question:

Admiral, you think the city of Manila could not be defended against battle ships?

Admiral DEWEY. No, sir. I asked General Young the other day, when we were on the joint board, "In case we should have a war—which God forbid!—how long could the Army stay in the Philippines after the Navy left?" He said, "Six weeks; possibly two months." They could get nothing in the islands. We must keep our Navy there, I think, and the Navy must have a protected base.

Of course, by that Admiral Dewey meant that the Navy was absolutely necessary to keep the American Army provisioned in the islands, and that without a navy to keep it provisioned the Army could not stay there six weeks, because it would starve for the lack of provisions; and that would be the case whether it was an internal war or a foreign war.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine [Mr.

HALE] said something a while ago about the Panama Canal making it necessary to increase the Navy. I do not exactly agree with the Senator about that, for two reasons: In the first place, under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty we seem to be denied the right to blockade the canal in case of war. Then, again, with that canal built, the speed and facility with which war ships could be transferred from one coast to the other would rather have the contrary effect, it seems to me. It would have the effect of making each battle ship and each coast a defender of the other coast; to make every battle ship much more effective; so that it would be less necessary to have a large navy after we construct the Panama Canal than it was before. So this immense increase in the Navy that is projected is solely and entirely due to our possession of the Philippines.

Now, Mr. President, with all due respect, I think there is a great deal of wild imagination in what the Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] said about our great and growing trade in the Orient, and the necessity of holding the Philippine Islands for that purpose. I think my distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] absolutely shattered that argument in a speech made here several years ago, when the treaty with Spain was pending, and I should like to hear him and the Senator from New York debate that question between them. I do not think the Senator from Wisconsin left any ground for any probable contention upon that question.

Mr. SPOONER. Has the Senator the utterances to which he refers?

Mr. CARMACK. I quoted them yesterday. I have not got them to-day.

Mr. SPOONER. I was not here then, but I will look in the RECORD.

Mr. CARMACK. They are in the RECORD of this morning, and I should like to have the Senator read them.

Mr. SPOONER. I remember them.

Mr. CARMACK. And especially to have the Senator from New York read them. That will dispose of him without any further argument from me. [Laughter.]

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the Philippines, with their immense coast line, would be peculiarly subject to attack. I believe to defend the Philippine Islands in case of a foreign war would require a navy as large as or larger than would be required to defend the coast of the United States. It would be necessary also to fortify all the various islands of that archipelago, so that we should have to spend many million dollars every year, hundreds of millions of dollars every year, even in time of peace, preparing for a possible condition of war with a view to this immense trade in the Orient of which the Senator from New York speaks so feelingly. A single war, Mr. President, and the increased expenditures in time of peace, made necessary by our holding the Philippines, will be greater than the profits of all the trade we will ever get in the Orient.

In addition to the statement read by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] from Admiral Dewey, I call attention to a statement made by Admiral Sampson. I quoted it here once before in the Senate. It is published in Mr. Reed's book of Modern Eloquence. It is a speech delivered by Admiral Sampson, in which he said our possession of the Philippines would increase by 100 per cent the danger of a foreign war. So that the danger of our getting into a foreign war is greatly increased by our holding the Philippines, and our defensive strength is immensely weakened by our possession of the Philippine Islands. We are in greater danger of getting into a war and we would be a great deal weaker after we got into the war by reason of holding the Philippines.

The Senator from Georgia called attention a while ago to the fact that we defeated Spain in her island possessions. I think the Senator from Georgia would agree with me that it would have taken ten times as long and would have required ten times the expenditure of blood and treasure to defeat Spain in the Spanish Peninsula that it did to defeat her in Cuba and the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BACON. Undoubtedly; more than that.

Mr. CARMACK. If any other nation in the world could seize and hold a single island in the Philippine Archipelago against the United States, it would be a defeat for the United States. It would require us to bring our fleet and our men and soldiers and transport them 7,000 miles to meet the enemy there, when there is not a nation of Europe that could land a single regiment upon the soil of the United States.

Mr. DEPEW. Will the Senator from Tennessee allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CARMACK. Certainly.

Mr. DEPEW. How would the foreign nations get their troops there?

Mr. CARMACK. They could get them there a great deal more easily than they could get them here. As the Senator from

Wisconsin said in that great speech to which I have just referred—and I am going to let him continue the debate with the Senator from New York—the most distant point would be the point of first attack. There would be the great point of weakness. The Senator from New York and the Senator from Wisconsin can now have it out.

Mr. DEPEW. The Senator from Tennessee bases an argument as to the difficulties of defending the Philippine Islands upon conditions which do not exist. His argument would be all right if Great Britain, Russia, Germany, or France, which are the only nations that could be expected to take any part in a controversy of that sort, had contiguous territory. But those nations would have to mobilize their armies. They would have to carry them through the Suez Canal in order to get them there. They would have as much trouble to take troops there for offense as we would have to take troops there for defense. In the meantime we have a navy upon the sea which would take care of those vast transports which would be necessary to convey an army that would be efficient for any purpose in the Philippine Islands; and our Navy would make it utterly impossible for such an army to be carried to the Philippine Islands for offensive purposes.

Mr. CARMACK. The Senator is assuming, of course, that we have as great a navy as these other nations.

Mr. DEPEW. I am assuming that we shall have such a navy as is contemplated in this programme, which will make us the second naval power in the world.

Mr. CARMACK. I should like to know what the Senator from Wisconsin has to say in reply to that.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, before the debate is turned over to the Senator from Wisconsin, which I anticipate with very much interest and pleasure, I wish to say something in reply to the Senator from New York about the difficulty that European nations will have in case of war with the United States to transport their troops and supplies and munitions of war to the Philippine Islands. It is a mistake on the part of the Senator from New York that they would have as far to traverse the seas between their bases and the Philippines.

From the Straits of Gibraltar to Singapore is an unbroken chain of British fortresses. Aside from her fleet, every one of them is a base for the collection of supplies and for the massing of troops, and they would have no 7,000 miles to traverse between Singapore, which is one of her possessions, or from Colombo, which is a thousand or fifteen hundred miles farther, or even from any point in India or from Aden, in Arabia, or from the island of Perim, in the lower part of the Red Sea, which is another fortress of Great Britain, or from the island of Cyprus, or from Suez or Port Said or Malta, up to Gibraltar, which all together make a continuous chain of fortresses. It is called "the King's Highway."

It is an easy matter, two or three days' sail only, from Singapore to the Philippine Islands, and not nearly that far. This is to Manila. It is scarcely more than a days' sail from Singapore, one of the British possessions, to a part of the Philippine Islands.

What is true of Great Britain is also true in a less degree of other European nations. Several of them have colonies and dependencies in Asia which serve for military bases, and even from Europe they can transport their troops and supplies through the Red Sea and other southern seas more expeditiously and safely than we can transport a great army and its supplies across the Pacific.

Mr. DEPEW. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question.

Mr. BACON. With pleasure.

Mr. DEPEW. The Senator has been all over that country traveling?

Mr. BACON. It is not necessary to go there to know that. Those are matters of common knowledge.

Mr. DEPEW. The question I would ask him is this: Of course we know the tremendous land forces in numbers and equipment of Russia, Germany, France, and Austria, but how many troops has Great Britain available for foreign invasion? My impression is that that is her weak point, and that she does not possess any number of troops for a foreign invasion which would make her likely to attack for the purpose of conquest any country except a country like—

Mr. BACON. I think the British army is undoubtedly larger than ours, very much larger, to say nothing of the Indian army.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. STEWART. Do you think Great Britain would attack us anywhere in the world while we have Canada here?

Mr. BACON. That is another matter altogether. We might invade Canada, and we might take Canada—

Mr. STEWART. Would not that be an equivalent?

Mr. BACON. At the same time it would not be defending the Philippine Islands.

Mr. STEWART. Let us take Canada and let her take the Philippines.

Mr. BACON. I am willing to let her take the Philippine Islands and we get nothing in return. I think it is a very great burden upon us, with no compensation.

Mr. STEWART. I think the fact that we could take Canada is the best fortification we have against Great Britain taking the Philippines.

Mr. BACON. I would be glad to make an exchange on very much more favorable terms to Great Britain than those. But we are speaking of the question, in case of foreign war, of the influence upon the war of the possession of the Philippine Islands. Our contention is that it would be the theater of war, 7,000 miles away, with which we must keep up communication, that it would be our weak point, and necessarily add very much—

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator allow me for a moment?

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator was picturing the great danger we were in from Great Britain; that she has a line of forts all along the way. That is all true.

Mr. BACON. I will state to the Senator that I will change it, and instead of Great Britain I will take the little country of Japan.

Mr. STEWART. I think you had better dodge that question. Talk about one at a time. The Senator made his speech on Great Britain. While Canada lies by our side the Philippine Islands are sufficiently protected without a navy. They are sufficiently protected with one boat as against Great Britain. There is no doubt about that. She is not going to get into any fuss with us as long as we are capable of taking Canada. It is all right so far as Great Britain is concerned. As to any others going there and driving us away, I do not apprehend any danger from that source. They do not want the archipelago. They will not fight for it.

Mr. BACON. They do not want the Philippines. None of them want them. They are glad for us to have them.

Mr. STEWART. Yes; I do not think there is any danger of their being taken away from us.

Mr. BACON. Nobody regards them as worth having.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] that there is no reason that this country should have a navy as large as that of Great Britain, and when he stated that what he wished us to have was the second navy of the world he went as far, I think, as any sensible man, no matter how enthusiastic for the Navy, desires to go. But the second navy of the world in power and tonnage we ought most certainly to possess. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on the subject of the expense of such, and it is for this purpose that I have risen to speak.

The Senator from Maine pictured the large expense which the Navy now involves, and said it would probably involve a continued and increasing expenditure. There can be no doubt of that fact, Mr. President. The Navy is a large expense. It is not going to cost any less in the future. It probably will cost more. In my belief there is no money so well expended as that which we spend upon the Navy of the United States.

It was well said in the House not long ago that the Monroe doctrine "is as big as the United States Navy, and no bigger." It might also be said with equal truth that the Navy represents the peace of the United States. Whether we own the Philippine Islands or not, the Navy of the United States is not yet sufficient to guarantee and put above question the peace of this country. There is nothing that would involve this country in war so quickly as the abandonment of the upbuilding of the Navy or ceasing to maintain it at the highest point of efficiency and power.

No position could be worse than that of a nation which, like ours, is rich and aggressive if it is left unarmed and undefended. So long as we have a powerful navy the Monroe doctrine will stand and no one will venture to attack us. The decline of the Navy would mean war. The increase of the Navy means peace and power. The Navy, in a word, is the protection of the country. If we were to abandon the Philippine Islands to-morrow, we should still be obliged to have a naval station in Asiatic waters and maintain there, as we have always maintained, an Asiatic fleet. We should always need chiefly and before everything else a navy amply sufficient to protect our coasts, to uphold the Monroe doctrine, to guard the canal, to maintain our supremacy on the North American continent.

We do not need a navy so large as that of Great Britain. England requires a navy more than equal to the combined navies of any two countries, and if it were not for the navy of England, England's possessions would be torn from her and she would be ruined. She realizes that her defense and her strength rest on her navy, and for us it is just as important that we should have a navy so powerful that nobody will be tempted to attack us.

At this moment we stand fifth in the tonnage of fighting ships. If the present programme is carried out and there is no increase in foreign programmes, we shall soon stand third. But there ought to be no relaxation in the programme upon which we have entered. I do not mean to say that it is necessary to go as far as the naval board very possibly desires, but a steady building of the Navy is essential, in my opinion, to the safety and the peace of the United States.

Criticisms have been made to-day upon the attitude of our naval officers. Mr. President, a naval officer who does not believe that the Navy is the one essential thing and that all his efforts should be directed toward its upbuilding and development is not an officer whom we would desire to have. They, of course, if they have proper professional pride, are looking to the building and efficiency of the Navy and nothing else. They may ask what seems to us extravagant, but let us never forget that in time of stress the officers and sailors of our Navy have never failed. Their record is one of victory always and everywhere.

I do not pretend to pass upon the question of guns within revolving turrets or in barbette. Still less do I pretend to pass upon the question of disappearing gun carriages. We all have the utmost confidence in the judgment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], and yet I think, as laymen, we must be governed by the report of our military officers and not by his opinion. In the Navy, in the same way, we must depend ultimately upon professional judgment. Has that professional judgment failed or misled us in the past? The reply of history is an absolute negative. I think it is certainly a matter of great importance, as the Senator from Maine pointed out, that England has rejected the revolving turret and confines her armament to the barbette. But it does not follow that because we adhere to the revolving turret, which we invented when we put the *Monitor* afloat, we are necessarily making a mistake. Our officers are fallible; they may be wrong; it may not be the best system; but it is a little hasty to conclude that because other nations have not adopted it therefore it must be a mistake.

Everyone who is familiar with the history of the war of 1812 is aware that in that war we had a type of frigate and a type of armament entirely new to the world, and we won in eleven frigate actions out of thirteen. In that same war we introduced the practice of firing on the descending wave. Up to that time the practice had been to fire on the ascending wave. The system was entirely new when we introduced it, and yet that was one reason why we shot so much better than our opponents did. We revolutionized in that war the method of firing in the old frigates when engaged in action. Anyone who will turn to the book of Sir Howard Douglass, who was the great authority on naval actions, on gunnery, and all questions connected with the navy, will find that all his examples as to single frigate actions are drawn from the war of 1812, and that he admits in that book, which for many, many years was the standard book of the English navy, that the American practice, then introduced, of firing on the descending wave was the true practice and that we had revolutionized naval gunnery to that extent.

I merely cite this to show that it does not follow that because we are the only nation which adheres entirely to the system of revolving turrets we are therefore in error. It may or it may not be so. It is a serious matter that England is so confident that this system is a mistake that she has no ships with revolving turrets, but we, in the long run, must depend upon the opinion of our naval officers who study carefully all that is done by foreign nations.

Mr. President, the question has been raised here as to torpedo boats, and it has been suggested that in a very short time we may not need battle ships because they will be superseded by torpedo boats, and therefore battle ships should not be built. Torpedo boats and submarine boats can never supersede the seagoing fighting ships, because they can not keep to the sea. We must always and first of all have the fighting seagoing fleet. As to the value of torpedo boats, we have seen in the last few years the pendulum swing from one extreme to the other. In our war with Spain much was expected from torpedo boats, but in that war the torpedo boat was a failure, or rather accomplished nothing.

Our vessels blockading outside the port of Santiago were in a position most open to a torpedo attack. They were not attacked, and there was, therefore, no evidence in that war that a torpedo boat was particularly useful. Thereupon many persons drew the immediate and hasty conclusion that we did not need torpedo boats at all, and the result may be seen in the fact that we are far behind all other nations in that single branch of the Navy.

Now, there has been a night attack by the Japanese—a very successful one—in which torpedo boats were used upon the Russian fleet at Port Arthur. Apparently they attacked by surprise. The Russian fleet, instead of having searchlights, which would have made the whole bay as light as day, as we illuminated the

entrance to Santiago Harbor during the blockade, apparently did not have their searchlights out at all. A fleet of Japanese torpedo boats came in in the darkness. Some of them succeeded in getting home. It is not apparent, moreover, that one of those Russian ships lying there at anchor had out a torpedo net. It is not apparent that their gunnery was sufficiently good to hit the torpedo boats when they saw them.

In our war there was a torpedo-boat attack upon the *St. Paul*, which was being used as an auxiliary cruiser. The Spanish torpedo boat *Terror* came out of San Juan and pursued her. When she got within 3 miles—a long distance—the gunner of the *St. Paul*, with the 5-inch gun, the only heavy gun they had, struck her and sent her to the shore in a sinking condition. If there had been a complete illumination at Port Arthur, if Russian gunnery had been as good as we believe our gunnery to be, and with good reason, it is very probable that the Japanese torpedo attack would have had quite a different result.

Mr. President, neither the extreme opinion that torpedo boats were forever discredited by the results of our war or the opinion which seems to be forming that they are the only kind of vessel now needed, in view of the battle at Port Arthur, is correct. There is no doubt that torpedo boats and submarine boats have their most important uses, but they do not solve the problem. They can not constitute a navy; they are only one necessary part of it. We ought to have more torpedo boats. I have no question about that. It is a branch of our defense in which we are very weak. But it is impossible to substitute for the seagoing fighting fleet torpedo boats and submarine boats.

A word now, Mr. President, about the matter of expense. I have already said that the expense of the Navy is great. The absolute expenditure is very large. I have also stated that, in my judgment, it is likely to continue to increase if we keep the Navy where it ought to be kept. But it has been said here in previous debates that we were not following the practices of the fathers; that we ought to return to their policy and not waste these enormous amounts of money on the military branches of the Government.

There was an important statement made as to that question of present expenditure as compared with our practice in the past in the report of the Secretary of the Navy, and which led me to go into the matter with greater fullness in order to see what the general policy of the United States had been. There is only one way of testing the expenditure on any branch of the Government service, and that is to compare that particular expenditure with all the other expenditures of the Government. To say that we should spend on the Navy what was spent a hundred years ago would be absurd. There is no more relation between that obsolete expenditure and the expenditure to-day than there is between the little population of 5,000,000 and the population of 80,000,000, with the vast extensions of territory that we have made. The only way to arrive at any proper decision as to the amount of naval expenditure and whether it is excessive in comparison with the needs of the country is to take the proportion it bears to the other expenditures of the Government. In that way we can decide what the general policy of the United States has been.

The percentage of naval expenditure to the total expenditures of the Government last year was 17.3 per cent. Taking it by decennial periods, I find that in 1800 it was 46.5 per cent. So whatever the fathers may have done, there is not much doubt about what the grandfathers did. In 1810 it was 31.1; in 1820, 33.4; in 1830, 24.4; in 1840, 25.3; in 1850, 21.2; in 1860, 19.1; in 1870, 13.2 of the total of Government expenditures.

During the last period, from 1860 to 1870, is included all the enormous naval expenditures of the war, and yet the naval percentage has greatly declined—that is, the naval expenditures had risen absolutely very much; but the military expenditures and the other expenditures had risen so much more that the percentage of naval expenditures, instead of advancing, actually fell off.

In 1880 it was 8 per cent; in 1890, 8.4; in 1900, 12.5; in 1901, 12.6 per cent; in 1902, 15.3 per cent, and in 1903 it was 17.3 per cent, as I have stated. I have the table, which I owe to the kindness of the Secretary of the Navy, all worked out by single years, and I ask to insert it at the end of my remarks. (See Appendix.)

The average annual percentage of naval expenditures from 1800 to 1903 inclusive, has been 22.3 per cent, and the percentage of naval expenditures for 1903 was 17.3 per cent. If last year the average appropriation had been made, it would have been \$103,000,000, instead of \$82,000,000.

In other words, after all the great absolute increases in the Navy of late years, we are still 5 per cent behind the average expenditure of this Government on the Navy throughout its history as compared with other expenditures.

In time of war, as I have pointed out in regard to the civil war, the naval expenditures do not increase proportionately. In the time of the Spanish war there was an absolute increase in the

Navy, but relatively the naval expenditures were very much smaller than the average of our history. The percentage from previous years fell off. The great relative as well as absolute increase was in the military expenditures. In other words, the naval expenditures are distributed over the years of peace. The expenditure for the Army rises by leaps and bounds to enormous amounts in time of war. A naval vessel must always be prepared for war. The Navy must always be on a war footing. There is no possibility of sending a vessel to sea in any other condition. Hence the peace expenditures for the Navy seem large and the war expenditures, comparatively speaking, seem small.

I think I have shown that our naval expenditures, instead of being excessive, are to-day less—much less—than they were in the first decade of the century, or in any decade down to the period of the war. After the war the Navy fell into a condition of utter neglect. It was a discredit that it should have done so—a discredit to the Government, a discredit to the American people. It was neglected. No money was spent upon it. It fell to a point where it had to be built up from the very beginning. Since 1883 we have been building it up. We have now got a navy which is fifth in tonnage of the fighting force in the world. If the present programmes are continued, in a few years it will be third. I agree with the Senator from Maine that it ought to be second; that it ought to be maintained at the highest efficiency; that we ought to have the best ships. I for one do not grudge the expenditure of a dollar upon the American Navy; I rejoice in all we spend upon it, for behind the American Navy lies the peace of the United States.

APPENDIX.

The following is a comparison of the net ordinary expenditures of the Government with the expenditures for the Navy. The net ordinary expenditures include expenditures for war, Navy, Indians, pensions, and miscellaneous, constituting what may be termed current expenses, and not including payments for interest, premiums, or principal of public debt, or expenditures for postal service.

COMPARISON AT THE CLOSE OF DECENNIAL PERIODS.

Year.	Net expenditures.	For Navy	Percentage.
1800.....	\$7,411,370	\$3,448,716	46.5
1810.....	5,311,082	1,654,244	31.1
1820.....	13,134,581	4,387,990	33.4
1830.....	13,220,533	3,239,429	24.4
1840.....	24,139,920	6,113,897	25.3
1850.....	37,165,990	7,904,725	21.2
1860.....	60,058,755	11,514,650	19.1
1870.....	164,421,507	21,780,230	13.2
1880.....	169,030,082	13,536,985	8.0
1890.....	261,637,203	22,006,266	8.4
1900.....	447,553,458	55,953,078	12.5
1910.....	477,624,374	60,506,978	12.6
1902.....	442,082,813	67,803,128	15.3

COMPARISON BY YEARS AND TEN-YEAR PERIODS BEGINNING 1850.

1850.....	\$37,165,990	\$7,904,725	21.2
1851.....	44,054,718	8,880,581	20.1
1852.....	40,389,955	8,918,842	22.8
1853.....	44,078,156	11,067,790	25.1
1854.....	51,997,528	10,790,096	20.7
1855.....	53,316,198	13,327,035	25.6
1856.....	66,772,528	14,074,836	21.0
1857.....	66,041,144	12,651,695	19.1
1858.....	72,330,437	14,053,265	19.4
1859.....	66,355,950	14,690,928	22.1
Total.....	545,472,904	116,359,852	a 21.3

1860.....	60,058,755	11,514,650	19.1
1861.....	62,616,056	12,387,157	19.7
1862.....	453,379,897	42,640,353	9.3
1863.....	694,034,576	63,261,235	9.1
1864.....	811,283,679	85,704,964	10.5
1865.....	1,217,704,199	122,617,494	10.0
1866.....	365,954,731	43,285,662	11.2
1867.....	202,947,734	31,094,011	10.3
1868.....	220,915,088	25,775,508	11.2
1869.....	190,496,355	20,000,758	10.4
Total.....	4,311,259,070	458,221,727	a 10.6

1870.....	164,421,507	21,780,230	13.2
1871.....	157,583,828	19,431,027	12.3
1872.....	153,201,850	21,249,810	13.8
1873.....	180,488,657	23,526,257	13.0
1874.....	194,118,935	30,662,587	15.9
1875.....	171,539,848	21,497,626	12.5
1876.....	164,857,813	18,963,310	11.5
1877.....	144,209,963	14,959,925	10.3
1878.....	134,463,452	17,965,901	12.9
1879.....	161,619,365	15,125,127	9.3
Total.....	1,626,495,824	204,831,210	a 12.5

a General average.

COMPARISON BY YEARS AND TEN-YEAR PERIODS BEGINNING 1800—cont'd.

Year.	Net expenditures.	For Navy.	Percentage.
1800.....	\$169,030,082	\$13,536,985	8.0
1801.....	177,142,898	15,686,672	8.8
1802.....	186,904,233	15,032,046	8.0
1803.....	206,248,006	15,293,437	7.4
1804.....	189,547,866	17,232,601	9.1
1805.....	208,840,679	16,021,080	7.6
1806.....	191,902,996	13,907,888	7.2
1807.....	220,190,608	15,141,127	6.8
1808.....	214,938,951	16,926,438	7.8
1809.....	240,995,131	21,378,809	8.8
Total.....	2,005,801,422	160,207,083	a 7.9
1890.....	261,637,203	22,006,266	8.4
1891.....	317,825,549	26,113,896	8.2
1892.....	321,645,214	29,174,139	9.0
1893.....	356,213,562	30,136,084	8.4
1894.....	339,683,874	31,701,294	9.4
1895.....	325,217,268	28,797,796	8.8
1896.....	316,794,417	27,147,732	8.5
1897.....	327,983,049	34,561,546	10.5
1898.....	405,783,527	58,823,104	14.4
1899.....	565,175,255	63,942,985	11.3
Total.....	3,537,958,918	352,404,782	a 9.9
1900.....	447,553,458	55,953,078	12.5
1910.....	477,624,374	60,506,978	12.6
1902.....	442,082,813	67,803,128	15.3
1903.....	477,542,658	82,618,034	17.3
Total.....	1,844,803,303	266,881,218	a 14.4

COMPARISON BY TEN-YEAR PERIODS.

1850-1859.....	\$545,472,904	\$116,359,852	21.3
1860-1869.....	4,311,259,070	458,221,727	10.6
1870-1879.....	1,626,495,824	204,831,210	12.5
1880-1889.....	2,005,801,422	160,207,083	7.9
1890-1899.....	3,537,958,918	352,404,782	9.9
1900-1903.....	1,844,803,303	266,881,218	14.4
Total.....	13,871,891,141	1,558,905,872	a 11.1

a General average.

Average percentage of naval expenditures from 1800 to 1903, inclusive..... 22.3
 Percentage of naval expenditures for 1903..... 17.3
 If last year the average appropriation had been made, it would have been..... \$103,000,000

JULIETTE WESTBROOK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 5611) granting a pension to Juliette Westbrook, returned by the House in compliance with the request of the Senate.

Mr. SPOONER. While the bill was pending in the Senate the beneficiary died. The bill has passed both Houses. The gentleman in the House who had charge of it desired us to bring about its recall in order that it might be disposed of in the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the vote by which it was passed here be reconsidered and that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There being no objection, the vote by which the bill was passed will be reconsidered, and it will be indefinitely postponed.

SHIPPING BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent that there be a reprint of the Philippine shipping bill with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that there be a reprint of the Philippine shipping bill with amendments. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I desire to present a conference report, in order that it may get to the House to-night.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine presents a conference report.

Mr. HALE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11287) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 43, and 44.
 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42, and agree to the same.
 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the

Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by said amendment, and on page 15 of the bill, between lines 16 and 17, insert as a paragraph the following:

"Lourenco Marquez, Africa."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$490,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

EUGENE HALE,

S. M. CULLOM,

H. M. TELLER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

ROBERT R. HITT,

ROBERT ADAMS, JR.,

HUGH A. DINSMORE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Maine kindly state whether there are any amendments of any importance involved? We hear only the numbers read, and of course know nothing about the items.

Mr. HALE. No; there are none.

Mr. BACON. They are mere matters of detail, small matters?

Mr. HALE. All small.

The report was agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12220) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes.

[Mr. MONEY addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, there are several Senators who have said to me that they desire to discuss the bill generally, but prefer to do so to-morrow. If we can go on now with the reading of the bill and dispose of the committee amendments, after that has been done I will ask that the bill go over until to-morrow, so that Senators who desire to speak may have an opportunity to be heard.

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

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was under the subhead "Pay of the Navy," on page 2, line 6, after the word "constructors," to insert:

And civil engineers, assistant civil engineers, and professors of mathematics; and that after the passage of this act the pay and allowances of civil engineers and professors of mathematics shall be the same as are or may hereafter be provided for naval constructors, and for assistant civil engineers the same as for assistant naval constructors.

And in line 18, after the word "men," to insert:

And as many warrant machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint, not to exceed twenty in any one year.

So as to make the clause read:

Pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty; officers on shore and other duty; officers on waiting orders; officers on the retired list; clerks to commandants of yards and stations; clerks to paymasters at yards and stations; general storekeepers; receiving ships and other vessels; commutation of quarters for officers on shore not occupying public quarters, including boatswains, gunners, carpenters, sailmakers, warrant machinists, pharmacists, and mates, and also naval constructors and assistant naval constructors and civil engineers, assistant civil engineers, and professors of mathematics; and that after the passage of this act the pay and allowances of civil engineers and professors of mathematics shall be the same as are or may hereafter be provided for naval constructors, and for assistant civil engineers the same as for assistant naval constructors; pay of enlisted men on the retired list; extra pay to men reenlisting under honorable discharge; interest on deposits by men; pay of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and apprentices, including men in the engineers' force, and men detailed for duty with Naval Militia, and for the Fish Commission, 31,500 men and as many warrant machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint, not to exceed 20 in any one year.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 19, on page 26.

Mr. HALE. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

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

The SECRETARY. On page 26, after line 19, it is proposed to insert:

Navy-yard, Charleston, S. C.: One clerk, civil engineer's office, \$1,400; one writer, \$1,017.25; one draftsman in charge, \$1,600; one stenographer and typewriter, at \$2.80 per diem, \$876.40; one mail messenger, at \$2 per diem, including Sundays, \$730; one messenger and janitor, at \$1.76 per diem, including Sundays, \$642.40; one rodman and inspector, at \$3.20 per diem, \$1,001.60; one master of tugs, \$1,200; one messenger to commandant, at \$2 per diem, \$628; in all \$9,093.05.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Also on page 26 the total should be changed to include these figures.

The SECRETARY. On page 26, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the words "one hundred and forty-eight thousand seven hundred and ninety dollars and ninety-two cents" and to insert in lieu thereof "one hundred and fifty-seven thousand eight hundred and eighty-four dollars and fifty-seven cents."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 29, line 14, after the word "dollars," to insert "for the erection of barracks, \$200,000," and in line 18, before the word "dollars," to strike out "five hundred and twelve thousand nine hundred and seventy" and insert "seven hundred and twelve thousand nine hundred and seventy;" so as to make the clause read:

Navy-yard, League Island, Pa.: To continue retaining wall about reserve basin, \$80,000; grading and paving, to continue, \$25,000; sewer system, extensions, \$3,500; electric plant, extensions, \$100,000; railroad system, extensions, \$5,000; dredging and filling in Delaware water front, to continue, \$50,000; water system, extension, \$8,000; underground conduit system, \$8,000; fire-protection system, extensions, \$10,000; sea wall extension, \$50,000; one officers' quarters, \$8,000; extension of reserve basin, to continue dredging, \$75,000; locomotive crane track, extension, \$30,000; storehouse for naval supplies, to complete, \$80,470; for the erection of barracks, \$200,000; in all, navy-yard, League Island, \$712,970.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 15, to insert the heading, "Navy-yard, Charleston, S. C."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 2 on page 31.

Mr. HALE. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 30, strike out all after the word "dollars," in line 24, down to the end of line 2 on page 31, and insert:

Quay wall, \$50,000; dredging, \$20,000; locomotive and power house, \$5,000; railroad scale, \$3,000; sewers, \$20,000; telephone system, \$2,000; entrance gate and police station, \$28,000; grading and drainage, \$10,000; storehouse and storekeeper's offices, to extend, \$50,000; latrines, \$3,000; railroad system, extension, \$12,000; railroad equipment, \$5,000; tools and machinery for yard and docks workshop, \$8,000; one officers' quarters, \$8,000; in all, navy-yard, Charleston, S. C., \$880,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 31, line 19, after the word "dollars," to insert "for the erection of barracks, \$200,000;" and in line 22, before the word "dollars," to strike out "nine hundred and fifty-nine thousand" and insert "one million one hundred and fifty-nine thousand;" so as to make the clause read:

Navy-yard, Norfolk, Va.: Purchase of land, \$400,000; * * * improvement to 40-ton locomotive crane, \$1,000; for the erection of barracks, \$200,000; in all, navy-yard, Norfolk, Va., \$1,159,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 11, after the word "dollars," to insert "for improving and enlarging naval prison, \$10,000;" and in line 13, before the word "thousand," to strike out "seven hundred and twenty-five" and insert "seven hundred and thirty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

Naval station, Cavite, P. I.: Floating steel dry dock, to continue, \$725,000; for improving and enlarging naval prison, \$10,000; in all, \$735,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 7 on page 37.

Mr. HALE. What I send to the desk is a substitute for the part that has just been read.

The SECRETARY. On page 36 it is proposed to strike out all after line 18, down to and including line 7 on page 37, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to consolidate the several power plants in any or all of the several navy-yards and stations, in each navy-yard and station, for the generation and distribution of light, heat, and power, for all the purposes of the Navy. To the above end all such individual plants now in existence under the control of the several bureaus may be rearranged or transferred to the control or operation of such bureau or bureaus as may, in the discretion of the Secretary, appear most advisable, having in view the various kinds of power required at navy-yards, the necessity for the most efficient and economical work in connection with repairs to the fleet, and the avoidance of divided responsibility in relation thereto; and all appropriations herein and heretofore made for power houses and power plants for the various bureaus are hereby reappropriated and made available, under the Secretary of the Navy, for the consolidation herein provided for; and to further carry out the purposes of this provision there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$900,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 37, line 17, to increase the total appropriation for public works from \$6,565,571 to \$7,632,071.

Mr. HALE. The total should be changed so as to read "\$7,856,000.71."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 21, after the word "construction," to insert "and furnishing;" so as to make the clause read:

Buildings and grounds, Naval Academy: Toward the construction and furnishing of buildings, and for other necessary improvements, at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., as authorized by the acts of Congress approved June 7, 1900, and March 3, 1903, \$3,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 22, to insert:

Naval training station, Great Lakes: The purchase of land and the establishment of a naval training station on the shore of Lake Michigan, south of latitude 43° 30', \$250,000.

Mr. FORAKER. I have just come into the Chamber. Do I understand that the Secretary is reading at the foot of page 38?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the foot of page 38.

Mr. HALE. There is an amendment at the bottom of the page to which an amendment will be offered. I shall ask that the matter go over until to-morrow.

Mr. FORAKER. May I ask what is the amendment to the amendment?

Mr. HALE. I do not know.

Mr. FORAKER. I am very much interested in it. There has been quite a desire on the part of many people in my State to have this naval training school or station located at Put in Bay, and I see by the language of the amendment that the Secretary of the Navy would have no discretion. Is it intrusted to the Secretary of the Navy? Under this provision it could not be located there.

Mr. HALE. It could not, undoubtedly. All of that will come up in the morning, however, and the Senator can offer any amendment he pleases. Undoubtedly some Senator will move to strike it out of the bill entirely. I do not wish to have it disposed of in this thin Senate.

Mr. FORAKER. The reason I break in now and want to have some understanding about it is that I am engaged in committee in the investigation of the Smoot case and may not be here. We are very much occupied by that case, and I would be very glad to know what is the amendment to the amendment which will be offered?

Mr. HOPKINS. Perhaps the Senator from Wisconsin can enlighten both the Senator from Ohio and myself on that subject.

Mr. QUARLES. I am entirely willing to disclose the amendment which I propose to offer to the amendment.

Mr. FORAKER. Very well. I shall be glad to have it read. Under the circumstances I hope the Senator from Maine—

Mr. HOPKINS. Let it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HALE. Yes; let it be read and printed.

Mr. FORAKER. Yes.

Mr. QUARLES. I offer it as an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin wishes to have read an amendment, which he will propose at the proper time.

The SECRETARY. On page 39, in line 2, after the word "dollars," in committee amendments, it is proposed to insert the following:

The President is hereby authorized and empowered to appoint a board consisting of not less than three members, none of whom shall be a resident of any State adjoining Lake Michigan, whose duty it shall be to select the most available site for such naval training school on the Great Lakes, and having selected such site, to ascertain and report its probable cost and the probable expenditure which will be necessary for improving the same, including lake-shore protection and construction of necessary harbor facilities; and to make a detailed report of their findings and proceedings to the President, to be transmitted by the President to Congress for its final action; and to defray the expenses of said board, the sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. HALE. That is offered as a substitute for the clause?

Mr. QUARLES. It follows the clause; it comes at the end of the clause.

Mr. FORAKER. It would be a substitute for what is in the bill?

Mr. QUARLES. I do not so understand it. It is in addition to what is there.

Mr. FORAKER. Oh! I noticed that it came in after the word "dollars," but I see that the word "dollars" ends the committee amendment.

Mr. QUARLES. It is in the second line on page 39.

Mr. FORAKER. I will say right now that if it comes in there I can not be satisfied with it, because it requires the station to be located on the shore of Lake Michigan.

Mr. SPOONER. But the act which this amendment was intended to carry out referred solely to Lake Michigan. If the Senator wants one on Lake Erie, that is another thing.

Mr. FORAKER. That may be; but we want this naval training station located at Put in Bay, if we can secure it.

Mr. SPOONER. This particular one?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes; this particular one. It is the only one which we expect will be established in the near future, and we want it. At any rate, we do not want its location confined to Lake Michigan. I do not know whether or not we would have any chance to get it there, but we ought to have at least a chance to present that site, which is a very good one. The officials of the Navy Department told me it was the best one they had found

anywhere, measured by the requirements of such a station, and certainly we ought not to be excluded from consideration.

Mr. HALE. Senators will have an opportunity, as the matter is to go over, to offer in the morning amendments to suit their own localities.

Mr. FORAKER. It seems to me it might very well be agreed that this board should have power within its discretion to locate the station anywhere on the lakes.

Mr. HOPKINS. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the fact that a board has been appointed and has investigated this matter, and has made certain recommendations. Put in Bay, I understand, has received entire and adequate consideration, and there are objections to the location which will influence the Senator himself, I think, when he comes to consider it, to abandon his idea.

Mr. HALE. The amendment is going over. Nothing will be done to-night. I wish Senators would let me go on and finish the reading of the bill.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will bear with me a moment further—I understand his impatience, and I do not wish to tax him unduly—because of what the Senator from Illinois says, it seems to me it is not asking any too much that we may be allowed to present the claims of Put in Bay.

The Senator from Illinois says those claims have been presented and have been considered and have been rejected in comparison with others. All we ask is that we shall not be excluded. If a board are to be appointed, they ought to be free to consider all locations that may be offered. It may be that we may have no chance whatever. I know something about Put in Bay. I do not know anything about any of the others. It may be that the others are far preferable.

Mr. HOPKINS. I see no reason for the adoption of the amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin. In my judgment, it would be a very great mistake on the part of the Senate to adopt the amendment, as I shall endeavor to show if the Senators from Wisconsin persist in their efforts to have it adopted as a part of the amendment that is now proposed by the Naval Committee.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Wisconsin does not propose the amendment. He simply asks that it be printed and go over until to-morrow.

Mr. FORAKER. I know, but it will be printed as an amendment which he proposes to offer to the bill at the proper time, and I am taking as much time about it as I do simply because I am afraid I can not be here when the amendment is presented for action.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to state to the Senator from Ohio that in Senate Document No. 45 he will find the full report of the naval board with a consideration of the claims of Put in Bay. I am in hearty accord with the amendment of the Senate Naval Committee and opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

If every Senator from a State bordering on the Great Lakes is coming here with his claims, I shall have to be heard in behalf of the city of Erie; but I am willing to yield the claims of that locality in view of the overwhelming verdict of the naval board appointed by the Secretary of the Navy, who gave this matter careful consideration, and whose findings, in Senate Document No. 45, ought to be acceptable to every Senator.

Mr. SPOONER. We ought to be permitted to support the amendment before it is antagonized by the committee, I think.

Mr. FORAKER. I wish to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, in answer to his remarks, that the reason why I insist upon having the amendment so framed as to give us a chance to be heard is that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin should be adopted there is to be a new board appointed. That board is to take everything into consideration, and it ought to be allowed to act de novo. I will not delay longer, because I recognize the desire of the Senator from Maine to proceed with the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be passed over for the present.

Mr. HALE. Let the reading of the bill be proceeded with.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill. The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 39, line 11, to increase the total appropriation for public works, Bureau of Navigation, from \$41,125 to \$291,125.

Mr. HALE. That is the total. It will go over with the other amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will go over.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 12, to insert:

Naval magazine, New England: For the purchase of land for a site for a naval magazine on or near the New England coast, north of Cape Cod, and toward the erection thereon of the necessary buildings, of inclosing said grounds, of grading and filling in, of building roads and walks, of the improvement of the water front, of the necessary wharves and cranes, of rail-

road tracks and rolling stock for local service, of fire and water service, and of the equipment of the establishment, \$70,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary; and the Secretary of the Navy may employ, and pay out of the appropriation hereby authorized, such additional expert aids, surveyors, architects, superintendents of construction, or draftsmen as may be necessary for the preparation of the plans and specifications and prosecution of the work authorized, to an amount not to exceed \$15,000: *Provided*, That the total cost of the establishment, complete in all respects, shall not exceed the sum of \$500,000: *And provided further*, That should the Secretary of the Navy be unable to purchase the land for the site from the owners thereof at a fair and reasonable valuation, he is hereby authorized and directed to institute proceedings for the condemnation of such part or parts thereof as may be necessary: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to discontinue the magazine now in the city of Chelsea not later than the time when the new magazine for the New England coast is ready to be occupied.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 8, to increase the total appropriation for public works, Bureau of Ordnance, from \$248,900 to \$318,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to page 45, line 2.

Mr. HALE. On page 45, after line 2, I move to insert:

Naval hospital, Canacao, Philippine Islands: Naval hospital at Canacao, Philippine Islands, to complete, \$70,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the subhead "Supplies and accounts," page 45, line 22, after the word "dollars," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That pay department stores may be sold to civilian employees at naval stations beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 24, page 51.

Mr. HALE. I move, on page 51, after line 24, to insert:

To place the frigate Constitution, as near as may be, in the same condition as regards hull and rigging as she was when in actual service, for use as practice, training, or receiving ship, \$400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued. The next amendment was under the subhead "Naval Academy," on page 58, line 2, after the word "Academy," to strike out the following:

One professor as head of department of physics, \$3,000.

One professor as head of department of modern languages, to be appointed with the rank and pay of a professor of mathematics of the rank of commander, and to be carried as an extra number in the list of professors of mathematics in the Navy.

One professor of mathematics, one of chemistry, and one of English, at \$2,500 each; four professors, namely, one of English, one of French and Spanish, one of French, and one of drawing, at \$2,200 each; one assistant professor of Spanish, at \$1,800; ten instructors, at \$1,500 each.

And to insert:

One professor as head of the department of physics, \$3,000.

That the President be authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint a professor of mathematics of the rank of commander, to rank after Aaron Nichols Skinner and to be an extra number in the list of professors of mathematics in the Navy.

One professor of mathematics, one of chemistry, one of English, one of French, and one of Spanish, at \$2,500 each.

Four professors, namely, one of English, one of French, one of drawing, and one of Spanish, at \$2,200 each.

Three instructors, at \$2,000 each.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask the Senator from Maine why this radical change is made in the organization of the academy? I observe that it is a very radical change.

Mr. HALE. Yes; but not so rapid as the increase down there, where we used to have 340 students, and in another year we shall have 900. It becomes essentially necessary. It is a very conservative programme, and it is absolutely necessary by reason of the increase of the academy.

Mr. GORMAN. There is an actual decrease, for instance, in the instructors. There is a reduction from ten to three.

Mr. HALE. I have an amendment from the Department which cures that.

Mr. GORMAN. Very well.

Mr. HALE. I will send the amendment to the amendment to the desk. It is to come in after line 6 on page 59.

The SECRETARY. On page 59, after line 6, insert:

Four instructors, at \$1,800 each; ten instructors, at \$1,500 each.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 19, page 60.

Mr. HALE. The total should be changed. On page 60, line 18, after the word "all," I move to strike out "\$78,922.52" and insert in lieu thereof "\$95,322.52."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 24, page 62, in the items for the Naval Academy.

Mr. HALE. I move to change the total. On page 62, line 22, I move to strike out "\$311,708.46" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$328,108.46."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 24, to insert:

That, subject to the restrictions imposed by existing law, boatswains, gunners, and warrant machinists shall be eligible for appointment to the grade of ensign after two years' service as warrant officers, and boatswains, gunners, carpenters, and sailmakers shall be eligible for appointment as chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief carpenters, and chief sailmakers after six years from date of warrant.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marine Corps," on page 63, line 22, after the word "orders," to strike out "including additional compensation for enlisted men of the Marine Corps regularly detailed as gun pointers, \$8,000, \$1,373,628" and insert "including additional compensation for enlisted men of the Marine Corps regularly detailed as gun pointers, messmen, signalmen, or holding good-conduct medals, pins or bars, \$15,000; \$1,380,628;" so as to make the clause read:

Pay of noncommissioned officers, musicians, and privates, as prescribed by law, and the number of enlisted men shall be exclusive of those undergoing imprisonment with sentence of dishonorable discharge from the service at expiration of such confinement, and for the expenses of clerks of the United States Marine Corps traveling under orders, including additional compensation for enlisted men of the Marine Corps regularly detailed as gun pointers, messmen, signalmen, or holding good-conduct medals, pins, or bars, \$15,000; \$1,380,628.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 23, to increase the appropriation for the salary of one clerk in the assistant quartermaster's office, Philadelphia, Pa., from \$1,400 to \$1,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 1, page 66, in the clause for "pay of civil force."

Mr. HALE. On page 66, line 1, I move to strike out "\$28,711.28" and insert in lieu thereof "\$28,911.28." It is an increase in the total made necessary by the last amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, after line 8, to insert:

That officers of the Marine Corps with creditable records who served during the civil war shall, when retired, be retired in like manner and under the same conditions as provided for officers of the Navy who served during the civil war.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Increase of the Navy," on page 73, line 13, after the word "each," to strike out "But the appropriations provided for said colliers shall not be used unless one of said colliers be built in a navy-yard of the United States" and insert "Said colliers shall be built in navy-yards, one on the Pacific and the other on the Atlantic coast, the same to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy;" so as to make the clause read:

Two colliers, to be capable of accompanying the battle fleet; to carry 5,000 tons of cargo coal, loaded, and to have a trial speed of not less than 16 knots, to cost not exceeding \$1,250,000 each. Said colliers shall be built in navy-yards, one on the Pacific and the other on the Atlantic coast, the same to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. HALE. Let that amendment go over until to-morrow at the request of other Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was continued to page 75, line 15.

Mr. HALE. In line 15, on page 75, before the word "submarine," I move to insert "torpedo or."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 75, line 15, before the word "submarine," it is proposed to insert "torpedo or;" so as to read:

The Secretary of the Navy, who may purchase or contract for subsurface or submarine torpedo boats in a manner that will best advance the interests of the United States in torpedo or submarine warfare.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 75, line 16, after the word "further," to strike out:

That before any subsurface or submarine torpedo boat is purchased or contracted for it shall be accepted by the Navy Department as fulfilling all reasonable requirements for submarine warfare and shall have been fully tested to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy.

And insert:

That before any subsurface or submarine torpedo boat or boats are purchased or accepted by the Navy Department they shall have been fully tested to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy and shall fulfill all reasonable requirements for submarine warfare: *Provided also*, That the boats contracted for under this act shall be constructed in accordance with the plans and specifications of the contractor.

So as to make the proviso read:

And provided further, That before any subsurface or submarine torpedo boat or boats are purchased or accepted by the Navy Department they shall have been fully tested to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy and shall fulfill all reasonable requirements for submarine warfare: *Provided also*, That the boats contracted for under this act shall be constructed in accordance with the plans and specifications of the contractor. To carry out the purpose aforesaid the sum of \$850,000 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; and to make up said sum

of \$250,000 the sum of \$500,000 carried, or such parts thereof as may remain unexpended, and authorized in the naval appropriation act approved March 3, 1903, is hereby reappropriated.

Mr. HALE. In line 24, on page 75, after the word "for," at the end of the line, I move to amend the amendment by inserting the words "torpedo or;" so as to read, "for torpedo or submarine warfare."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I shall ask that the bill be taken up to-morrow morning after the routine morning business. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator withhold that motion for a moment to enable the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the President of the United States?

Mr. HALE. I withdraw the motion for that purpose.

FORT HALL INDIAN RESERVATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate:

In compliance with the resolution of the Senate of the 1st instant (the House of Representatives concurring), I return herewith Senate bill No. 2323, entitled "An act relating to ceded lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation."
THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 1904.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President pro tempore of the Senate in signing the enrolled bill (S. 2323) relating to ceded lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation be rescinded, and that in the reenrollment of the bill the word "thirty-five," in line 13 of the enrolled bill, be stricken out and the word "thirty-four" be substituted therefor, so as to correctly describe the range, inaccurately stated in the bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HALE. I now renew my motion 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 (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, March 4, 1904, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 3, 1904.

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.

MEMBERS OF 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.

William Barclay Parsons, of New York, to be a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

William H. Burr, of New York, to be a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

Benjamin M. Harrod, of Louisiana, to be a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

Carl Ewald Grunsky, of California, to be a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

Frank J. Hecker, of Michigan, to be a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

INDIAN AGENTS.

Lieut. Col. James F. Randlett, United States Army, retired, of California, to be agent for the Indians of the Kiowa Agency, in Oklahoma.

J. Blair Shoenfelt, of Wyoming, to be agent for the Indians of the Union Agency in the Indian Territory.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank M. Foote, of Wyoming, to be receiver of public moneys at Evanston, Wyo.

POSTMASTER.

NEW YORK.

Charles T. Jackson to be postmaster at Goshen, in the county of Orange and State of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, March 3, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

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

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PIPE LINES THROUGH INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following conference report and statement for printing in the RECORD under the rule:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill S. 3317, "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant right of way for pipe lines through Indian lands," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 2 and 3; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 8, after the word "located," insert: "and of all other allottees through whose lands said lateral pipe lines may pass;" and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Add at the end of said amendment the following: "Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior, at the expiration of said twenty years, may extend the right to maintain any pipe line constructed under this act for another period not to exceed twenty years from the expiration of the first right, upon such terms and conditions as he may deem proper;" and the House agree to the same.

CHARLES CURTIS,
JNO. H. STEPHENS,
W. E. BROWN,
Managers on the part of the House.

WM. M. STEWART,
O. H. PLATT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Statement of the managers on the part of the House of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the House to the bill S. 3317, being "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant right of way for pipe lines through Indian lands."

The House conferees submit the following written statement in explanation of the accompanying conference report:

The first amendment of the House provided that only the consent of the allottee, on whose land oil and gas wells were located, should be obtained. The Senate receded from its disagreement to this amendment, with an amendment providing that the consent of all other allottees, through whose lands said lateral pipe lines might pass from the location of the well to the main pipe line, should also be obtained.

Amendment No. 2 limited the period for which a right of way might be granted to twenty years. The Senate receded from its disagreement to this amendment with an amendment which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior at the expiration of said twenty years to extend the right to maintain any pipe line constructed under this act for another period not to exceed twenty years from the expiration of the first right upon such terms and conditions as he may deem proper.

The managers on the part of the House recommend that the report be adopted.

CHARLES CURTIS,
W. E. BROWN,
JNO. H. STEPHENS,
Managers on the part of the House.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union (Mr. LAWRENCE in the chair) and resumed the consideration of 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.

The Clerk, resuming the reading of the bill, read the following:

For special services in connection with the detection of the adulteration of drugs and of foods, including candy and milk, \$100.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I ask the chairman of the District Committee to state what special services are to be performed under this clause of the bill and by whom.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, these services are rendered by what might be called "detectives." In order to get specimens of the foods, candies, etc., that are actually being sold it is necessary to have persons make purchases without it being understood that they are doing so in the public interest. If the ordinary detectives were to undertake that work, they being known as detectives might not be able to ascertain the real facts, and the ends of justice might be defeated. Under this small appropriation private individuals make what purport to be ordinary purchases. This appropriation of \$100 is to furnish the means to make the purchases and to pay the persons making them whatever small fee may be necessary.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter the District of Columbia shall not be required in judicial proceedings to pay fees to the clerk of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, and the said District of Columbia and its Commissioners shall be entitled to institute and prosecute judicial proceedings in said court without the payment of fees.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this paragraph, as being new legislation and a change of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in one sense this is new legislation, but I hope the gentleman from Indiana will reserve his point of order instead of making it now, so that a few words of explanation may be made.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I reserve it.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly this paragraph is subject to a point of order if the gentleman insists upon it, but I trust he will not insist upon it, for this reason: The marshal of the District and the clerk of the court of appeals of the District are subject to this same kind of a provision, and this provision was always in the laws applying to the District until the recent Revised Code struck out that provision, which is simply another illustration of the number of things that the Code did which ought not to have been done. The gentleman whom this provision affects is allowed fees not to exceed \$3,500, but the fees actually received in his office far exceed that sum. Of course, it is always easy for him to employ enough people to use up all the fees beyond the \$3,500. It is felt by the Committee on Appropriations that the District of Columbia ought not to be required to pay these fees, because these fees are not at all necessary to make up the legitimate fees of the office, and the officer and necessary assistants would be well paid without them.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana insist on the point of order?

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph against which this point is raised proposes clearly to enact new legislation—a change of existing law—and is subject to the inhibition of Rule XXI. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent to return to the paragraph last read for the purpose of offering a committee amendment.

There was no objection; and the proposed amendment of Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota was read, as follows:

In lines 14 and 15, on page 52, strike out the words "the act approved January 31, 1899," and insert in lieu thereof the words "existing law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Justices of the peace: For ten justices of the peace, at \$2,000 each, and the further sum of \$250 each for rent, stationery, and other expenses; in all, \$22,500.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question about these justices of the peace. Do they receive fees in addition to these salaries?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. They do not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARK. What becomes of the fees that are charged?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. They are covered into the Treasury.

Mr. PUJO. I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PUJO. Are justices of the peace in the District of Columbia required to be lawyers? Are they qualified lawyers or not?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The law requires that they shall have been admitted to the bar.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTEREST AND SINKING FUND.

For interest and sinking fund on the funded debt, \$975,408.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise for the purpose of answering the remarks made here some days ago in the debate on another section of this bill.

Last Monday morning the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] made the following statement, which I will read from the RECORD:

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.

And we were, Mr. Chairman, interested in what he was about to say.

During the first Administration—

Continued Mr. SCOTT—

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, and 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.]

At three separate and distinct places in this RECORD, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] says that Mr.

Cleveland during his first term invited this negro, whom he calls a very black negro, to dine with him, and states emphatically that the negro did so.

It often happens, Mr. Chairman, that a man in trouble hopes to get out by trying to pull others in, and that seems to have been the predicament of the gentleman from Kansas when he deliberately stated to this House "on his own authority," on his own responsibility, that Mr. Cleveland had invited a negro by the name of C. H. J. Taylor to dine with him, and that the negro accepted the invitation and did dine with him.

As soon as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reached me on the next morning after this debate, containing the gentleman's assertions, I wrote to Mr. Cleveland and asked him if it were true that he had thus dined Taylor, and told him if it were not true I wanted to deny it on the floor of this House. I cut out the part of the RECORD in which Mr. SCOTT's statement appeared and sent it to the distinguished ex-President. This morning I received from him the following letter, written and signed in his own hand:

PRINCETON, March 2, 1904.

Hon. E. Y. WEBB, House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: It is a matter of small concern to me that a Mr. SCOTT has seen fit to use my name in a display of his evil propensities on the floor of the House of Representatives.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

In answer to your inquiry, however, I have to say of his statement that the colored man, C. H. J. Taylor, took lunch with me at the White House that it is a deliberate fabrication out of the whole cloth.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

As far as Mr. Taylor is concerned, I understand, prior to his appointment as register of deeds at Washington, that he had served as an assistant in the office of the city attorney at Kansas City.

Mr. COWHERD. Kansas City, Kans.

Mr. WEBB. Yes, not Missouri. [Reading:]

His nomination as register was confirmed by the Senate, and he served in that place with intelligence and efficiency. He has since died. Some people restrain themselves from abusing the dead.

My inquiries concerning Mr. Taylor before his appointment, my observation of him during his incumbency, and the little I have known of him since satisfy me that his character is very unjustly attacked in the diatribe of Mr. SCOTT.

One charge is made against Mr. Taylor by Mr. SCOTT which he doubly clinches with truth when he declares, "He was a black negro." I am led, however, to doubt his familiarity with his subject when he adds, "as black as you ever saw."

Yours, very truly,

GROVER CLEVELAND.

This is Mr. Cleveland's statement, and I presume it will be accepted as conclusive by the gentleman from Kansas and by every American citizen. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, it does seem that the statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] is a fabrication, not only so far as the dining is concerned, but even as to the color of the negro himself. I understand from the gentleman from Missouri that he was a ginger-cake negro, and that the "black as you ever saw" statement is a fabrication out of the whole cloth also, as the distinguished ex-President writes.

It is said, Mr. Chairman, that a falsehood travels around the earth while truth is pulling on its boots. If that is true, I wish the truth stated in the letter of Mr. Cleveland be put in the same channels, as far as possible, that the falsehood has traveled, in order that it may possibly overtake that falsehood in the minds of some men and eradicate and destroy it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WEBB. I ask for two minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to continue his remarks for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cleveland was a friend of the negro, but not a "fool friend," and that term has a well-defined meaning among people who understand the negro race. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Never by a word or act, so far as I know, did he encourage the dream of social equality in the breast of the black man. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He was a friend of the colored race in America, but he was a friend of the Southern white man as well. He always sympathized with the Southern white man in his race troubles, his race problems, and his race burdens; and that, sir, I regret to say, is more than Mr. Roosevelt seems ever to have done. I am obliged to the committee for this opportunity of correcting the falsehood. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, there never sat in the White House a man whose word, speaking about anything of which he professed to have personal knowledge, I would not at once accept. I therefore accept the statement made by ex-President Cleveland that I was in error when I stated here on the floor the other day that he had entertained at luncheon in the White House a negro from Kansas; and I tender my apology to the ex-President of the United States.

I feel as if it were due myself, however, to say to this House

that until this letter was read I have never heard the fact or the allegation to which I alluded denied.

Mr. THAYER. Did you ever hear it made publicly before?

Mr. SCOTT. I am just going to state what I have heard.

Mr. THAYER. There was no occasion to deny it, when it had never been made.

Mr. SCOTT. I remember distinctly that when Mr. Taylor came back from Washington, preceded by the announcement that he had been appointed to the office of recorder of deeds in the District of Columbia by President Cleveland, his friends met him at the Union Depot, Kansas City, with a carriage to which were attached four white horses. A committee was with the carriage, and he was escorted to a public hall, where a reception was tendered him, and according to the newspaper reports of the event, he there boasted that—

Mr. COCHRAN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SCOTT. Let me finish this sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SCOTT. At the reception he boasted, as reported in the papers, that, notwithstanding the professions of good will to the negro always heretofore made by the Republicans, it remained for a Democratic President to entertain at his table in the White House for the first time a negro. That matter was published very broadly and so generally throughout the State of Kansas that it was impressed upon my memory, and I never, as I have said, heard it denied before.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. What evidence have you that he ever made that boast?

Mr. SCOTT. No evidence but newspaper reports.

Mr. THAYER. Have you got any clippings of newspapers?

Mr. SWANSON. Will the gentleman permit me?

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen desiring to interrupt must address the Chair.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the gentleman be kind enough to get a single paper containing that and produce it here? I suppose they keep files of the papers in Kansas, where that statement was published, and the gentleman can get a copy of such paper and present it to the House.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, that is a matter of twenty years ago. I do not know whether I could obtain one or not, but I am going there shortly and I shall certainly investigate the matter.

Mr. MADDOX. Eighteen hundred and eighty-two.

Mr. SWANSON. If a newspaper statement exists, and if the gentleman wants to be fair and just and accurate, he has every opportunity to examine the records, and if it is true, as asserted, I would like him to bring to this House one paper from Kansas that made that statement.

Mr. SCOTT. I have not had any opportunity thus far. The gentleman from Virginia will admit that I have had no opportunity in the last two minutes to search the records. I am simply giving my recollection about this matter. I have made what I consider an ample apology to Mr. Cleveland for any misrepresentation I may have inadvertently made. And I have done this because I want this House to understand that it is never my intention to make a statement here that I do not believe to be the truth.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SCOTT. I do.

Mr. HARDWICK. I want to say that I do not believe the gentleman from Kansas would willfully misrepresent anything.

Mr. SCOTT. That is kind of you.

Mr. HARDWICK. But does not the gentleman agree that it would be improper and a lack of dignity for the President of the United States or an ex-President to rush into print and deny every newspaper statement that might be put out, and does he not admit in reference to this he had not even made up a prima facie case?

Mr. SCOTT. Why, I was not criticising the former President of the United States for having heretofore made no denial. I was giving him full credit for the denial he now makes. But I wish to say at the same time that the friends of Mr. Cleveland should be very much gratified over this incident, because it has been the occasion of bringing to that gentleman for the first time in four years some applause from the Democratic side of this Chamber. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this whole incident is a telling blow at the abstract theory of the general equality of the featherless biped. It discovers or uncovers the underlying hypocrisy of the contention that all men ought to be polit-

ically or socially equal, regardless of their color, race, traits, and tendencies.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In one moment I will. The other day some gentlemen upon this side charged home as a disgrace, mark you, that a President of the United States had lunched with a negro, and there came from the other side of the House a charge against an ex-President as a disgrace that he had done exactly the same thing, showing that in every man's real heart the contention is deep seated that race traits and tendencies are equally as ineradicable as the colored man's skin and the kink of his hair. [Applause.] I yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. SCOTT. The question I desired to ask was whether the gentleman will not state who had been asserting social equality or making a fight along that line?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Why, Mr. Chairman, I have understood the political theory of your household of political faith for the last twenty years as asserting against the white people South, at any rate, the doctrine that men, regardless of color, race, traits, tendencies, characteristics, capabilities, or what not, ought to be strictly equal politically; and everybody with common sense knows that, political equality having once perfect recognition and practice, social equality must in a measure follow. But that is not all; the head of your party set an example of social equality in the only manner in which it can be set by inviting a black man to a table. Now, understand me—

Mr. SCOTT. One more question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. One moment until I finish that for fear somebody may misunderstand me. Mr. Roosevelt as an individual has the right or the liberty, at any rate, that any other citizen of America has, to eat with whomsoever he pleases—black, red, yellow, white, or what not; educated, ignorant, or what not. I have nothing to do with it. Nobody else has anything to do with it. But when you make it an official question, when your President does that as President of the United States which he might without right of complaint have done as an individual, it was done for one purpose, and for one purpose only, and that was to "carry the light of example" to "the benighted South," that does not believe in social equality between the negro and the white man.

If it was not done for that, then it was done for no purpose at all. It was, in that event, an unconscious exhibition of the magnificent arrogance that teaches men, now and then, the "duty and the mission" to shed "the light of example" upon "the benighted" white population of the South, that never, in their opinion, mounted to the highest rank of civilization and seized hold, in its full measure, of the everlasting truth of the "equality between featherless bipeds."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to inquire whether the gentleman holds as his social equal everybody in this country who is his political equal, reverting to the statement made a while ago?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly not; but I can tell the gentleman this, that when I invite a man to my table I mean by that that he is my social equal or he would never be there.

Mr. SCOTT. That is a very cunning evasion of the question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No; I do not evade the question at all. I beg your pardon, I replied to it that socially I did not think that every man who is my political equal or armed with the statutory privilege of casting a vote was socially my equal; but let me follow that for just one moment. Now, this is a matter of common sense. When men go around as candidates for office, cultivating votes, thereby they necessarily put themselves upon a plane of equality while they are cultivating the votes. Now, it is true, and perfectly true, that while I might invite the gentleman from Kansas to my table because he is socially my equal in every respect, there might be another man politically the statutory equal of both of us whom I would not invite. When negroes rule politically, or hold the balance of power politically, this follows, as we found in carpetbag days, that the white man who eats with negroes, sleeps with negroes, or marries a negro woman gets all the negro votes; the man who does neither gets none, if the other sort of man is a candidate.

But the question of the gentleman from Kansas is an evasion of the question that we are discussing, because this is not a question where because of political equality I have assumed that the President of the United States had recognized social equality. It is a case where all the world knows he recognized and emphasized social equality in and of itself. Nor am I quarreling with him as Mr. Roosevelt, as an individual, nor have I quarreled with him at all. He has a perfect right to invite to his private table whom he chooses, but as far as I know he waited until he was President of

the United States, so that the act could bear an official stamp before he ever did it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order that I may answer the questions of the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCOTT. I understood the gentleman from Mississippi to say that when we insist upon the political equality of certain persons the necessary corollary of that is social equality, and when I asked him if he regarded as his social equal everybody whom he admitted to be his political equal, he answered that he did not. I would like to have him reconcile those statements, which seem contradictory.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. They do not seem contradictory to me, and I have done my best to reconcile them as far as I could. Now, I want to ask the gentleman a question. Why was it, if the gentleman believes in the "featherless-biped-equality" theory—I do not know whether he does or not—but if he does believe in it, why was it that he charged ex-President Cleveland, as a fault, with the fact that he was supposed to have lunched with a colored man?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I did not charge the allegation which I made to Mr. Cleveland as a fault. I pointed to it simply as an illustration of the inconsistency, as it seemed to me, of the Democratic party, which was going into hysterics because one man invited a certain individual of the colored race to his table while making no criticism of another man who had done the same thing. I made no imputation of fault against ex-President Cleveland.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. All right; I am glad to hear that, because I thought the gentleman had a sharp stick and was after my very dear and much-adored old friend Grover Cleveland. [Laughter.] It looked to me so at that time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this question is rather amusing than serious, in some respects. It has disclosed what I wanted to call attention to, and that is that under this entire featherless-biped-equality theory there is very much hypocrisy; and one of the curious things about it is this: You go up to the White House, or go to a Department here, and ask them please not to appoint a man as postmaster down South because he is a "colored man," and they will "swell up" and tell you that they can not make a discrimination "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude!" And yet the present incumbent of the White House would not appoint a Chinaman as postmaster upon the Pacific slope if that Chinaman were as able and well capable of attending to the duties of the office as Li Hung Chang himself; and there are hundreds of them—natural-born citizens of the United States. And why? Simply because he was a Chinaman. Simply because the white people of the Pacific slope do not want a Chinaman to be postmaster on the Pacific slope; because the appointment would be offensive to the white people. He might be a Chinaman infinitely better equipped and smarter than I am; he might be infinitely better equipped and smarter than the occupant of the chair, and a smarter man than the President himself; and yet he would not appoint him; he never would think of doing it.

When New England was settled long years ago, no New Englander ever recognized the political or social equality of the Indian race, although the red man is very far superior to the black man in some respects.

Now, this is not a question of instinct or prejudice. It is not a question of instinct, because little children do not realize it. It is not a question of prejudice, because, until you have thrown two races, the white race and another race, into juxtaposition with one another in sufficient quantities of each race, the feeling is not evident. But wherever you throw the white race in juxtaposition with the Chinaman, with the red man, with the black man in sufficient numbers, so that he has occasion to investigate the race question at all, then this feeling arises. How, then, does it come about if it is neither a prejudice—that is, a prejudice—nor an instinct born in you? It comes about as reason, or a conclusion after experience. It comes about because race traits and contingencies, moral aptitude, merit, and demerit are found by historic experience and legislative experiment to be just as ineradicable as the color of the skin. God made both, and you can not do away with either by legislation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY FUND.

To be expended only in case of emergency, such as riot, pestilence, public insubordinate conditions, calamity by flood or fire, and of like character, and in all cases of emergency not otherwise sufficiently provided for, \$8,000: *Provided*, That in the purchase of all articles provided for in this act no more than the market price shall be paid for any such articles, and all bids for any of such articles above the market price shall be rejected.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last

word. One would assume from the lengthy discourse of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] that there was no controversy among Republicans at all as to the propriety of intercourse in social life on terms of equality between the black man and the white man.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota rose.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, I expect a point of order will be made now. This is about the time to expect it.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. This discussion is not germane to the bill. It would seem that this matter has been discussed enough this morning.

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I object.

Mr. DALZELL. I call for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. It must be clearly understood by Members that after the reading of the bill by paragraph begins all debate must be pertinent to the preceding paragraph.

Mr. COCHRAN. But how can the gentleman arrive at the conclusion that my remarks would not be pertinent. I have not stated what I was going to speak about.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman states that he proposes to confine his remarks to the subject embraced by the paragraph, he may proceed.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will state, Mr. Chairman, that I fully believed when I took the floor that a point of order would be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will resume the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHARITIES AND CORRECTIONS.

Board of charities: For secretary, \$3,000; clerk, \$1,000; stenographer, \$840; messenger, \$600; four inspectors, at \$720 each; traveling expenses, \$400; four drivers, at \$600 each; in all, \$11,120.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire of the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill if this is an increase over the amount appropriated a year ago?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, there has been so much confusion that I do not understand to what paragraph the gentleman refers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the pending paragraph is the paragraph on page 54, beginning with line 15 and ending with line 21.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I will state that in the paragraph referred to there is one additional inspector provided for at \$720 a year.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, we might have anticipated that something additional was provided for.

Now, will the gentleman tell me why this additional inspector is needed?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The gentleman has asked a question that has real point to it, and I am glad to answer it.

These inspectors are for this purpose: This capital city becomes the rendezvous of many people from the several States who are in trouble. Sometimes they come here hoping that their Congressman will be able to help them. Some of them fall sick. Some, brooding over their troubles, become insane. And so they get into the hospitals or into the almshouses or into the insane asylums. Their support is, of course, not a proper charge on this District. We have for several years been endeavoring to limit these improper charges upon this District. In order to do it we need some competent and trustworthy men to go around and make the necessary investigations.

Again, a great many people, bona fide residents of this city, apply for help from the public funds who ought not to have it. It may be a harm to them to receive it. It may not be a proper charge upon the District. When help is applied for from public funds, it should not be given out without investigation. Hence it is found necessary to have inspectors to do this work. In order to give full investigation along this line an additional inspector is required. Hence the increase inquired about.

Mr. COCHRAN. Germane to this discussion is the question as to the manner in which these places are continually made more numerous and more lucrative. Is it true that the Government of the United States in its several Departments and in the District government is conducted upon business principles? Go to one of these Departments and ask the Secretary or the under Secretary why it is that so numerous a clerical force is there employed, and not one will fail to tell you, if he makes answer at all, "We would like to get rid of many of these people, who are notoriously incompetent. We would like to weed out this force and make it more effective for the public service; but we are powerless to do it. If we should omit one of these men from the pay roll, down would come a Congressman or a Senator from the State from which the man came, and he would demand his immediate reinstatement, and down would come an order from above to reinstate him."

It is notorious that when we make appropriations for the maintenance of the different Departments and of the District of Columbia we know we are providing salaries for sinecures, the henchmen and dependents of great statesmen, who regard the securing of employment for these dependents as getting something for their districts.

There is not a Department in this Government where the officials in charge would not gladly weed out the undesirable and superfluous employees but for the fact that Congressmen and Senators are continually place hunting, and then we are compelled to raid the Treasury to pay the salaries of these favorites.

I believe this vice prevails in the District of Columbia to a larger extent than anywhere else. I acquit the gentleman in charge of this bill from responsibility. The wretched system is chargeable not upon the individual but upon the pernicious system followed by the Government's representatives collectively. The people's representatives should not insist upon padding the pay rolls, for by so doing they do not spend public money to the end that the public service may be made better but with the certainty that it will be made infinitely worse. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Clerk read as follows:

CHARITIES AND CORRECTIONS.

Board of charities: For secretary, \$3,000; clerk, \$1,000; stenographer, \$840; messenger, \$600; four inspectors, at \$720 each; traveling expenses, \$400; four drivers, at \$600 each; in all, \$11,120.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to say here something that I have long wanted to say in regard to the charitable appropriations carried in the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

I took occasion once several years ago to make a suggestion along this line. I did not think then that anything would come of it. I have a little more hope now, because the board of charities and corrections, as I find by a report submitted this year, have taken the same position.

We appropriate in this bill nearly \$1,000,000 for different charitable associations in the District of Columbia. I am afraid to say just what per cent, but a very large per cent of that appropriation, in my opinion, is not for the indigent poor, but for the energetic office seeker.

I am not criticizing the Committee on Appropriations nor the subcommittee in charge of this bill. I know too well how difficult it is to get any kind of reform in measures of this character, where a thing has gone on for years, and especially where it comes before a body like this not elected by the particular people whose money is spent, and in the community that spends it, and not responsible to the public opinion of the community where these institutions are located; but, Mr. Chairman, there is provided for in this bill charity after charity for which we appropriate from one thousand to fifty thousand dollars. Now, these appropriations have arisen in this way: Some good people—and they are always good people who originate these charitable institutions—the good ladies of some church, for example, get together and say, "Here is a particular work that needs to be done."

They raise a few thousand dollars in the church or among their friends for the purpose of charity, and they start the work, and that work grows, as charitable work always does, and they say, "It has got to be a burden, and we will go and get help from Congress." The very moment Congress begins to appropriate that moment individual effort ceases, or at least grows less, and year after year private contributions fall off and the public appropriations grow, until in a few years you have an institution owned by private parties, managed by private parties, the Government having no control over it, and yet the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia appropriating practically the entire sum that is spent for it.

Why, Mr. Chairman, in this bill we have institutions here—I notice one for which we appropriate here \$9,000. The total sum raised outside is \$1,000, and with a total fund of \$10,000, \$4,000 of it is spent for salaries. We call that a charitable appropriation. We have here institution after institution for which we make appropriations of \$3,000 or \$4,000, and the good people behind it, the trustees who are managing it, raise \$1,000 or \$2,000 more; and in nearly every instance from 20 to 50 per cent of it goes for salaries.

Now, as I say, the great difficulty in charitable work is the continued desire on the part of the individual to start a new charity—a good purpose behind it always, started from the best impulses; but the result is the duplication and reduplication of this charitable society and that charitable institution and the continued increase of the proportionate part of your charitable money going to pay the salaries of matrons and clerks of each one of these institutions.

Why, one of the Commissioners here, in the hearings before this committee, has suggested in regard to these appropriations:

If we were to undertake to change that, so as to give the Commissioners the control of this public money, we would arouse the greatest opposition.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, if this sentence only could be heard. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has just expired. Mr. COWHERD. I ask unanimous consent to have five minutes more.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I hope that will be granted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that his time may be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COWHERD. If the House will listen to this sentence, I will be content to talk to the RECORD for the rest. Here is what the Commissioner himself said in relation to the proposition as to whether we could do away with this distribution of this fund to all these different charities in small amounts. The Commissioner says:

If we did it, we would arouse the greatest opposition, for the reason that such action would legislate out of office several secretaries and disbursing clerks in these various institutions, all of whom are deriving salaries out of the public money.

Mr. Chairman, it is bad enough to provide for clerks unneeded in any of the Departments of the Government and take the people's money to pay for it; but it is doubly and damnably bad that we do it under the guise of a charitable appropriation. [General applause.] I had no idea of proposing any suggestion to this House other than is carried in the suggestion of the board of charities. And while approving their conclusions I want to criticize those two bodies before I pass from it.

My friend from Missouri has just offered some criticism of this Board of Charities and Children's Guardians. Now, I find here we are carrying for administration purposes of these two boards practically over \$20,000 and approaching nearly \$25,000 in this bill. These boards are made up from the best people of the District of Columbia—give their work without pay; but I have always found it to be true when you have a "high-toned" board that works without pay that they usually require a double amount of clerical work with pay in order to carry on the business. It looks to me as though these boards were following the well-established custom in that particular.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call especial attention to a few of these items of appropriation—

Mr. HEMENWAY. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, I think he is right; but let me suggest to the gentleman that the Committee on the District of Columbia, on which he has the honor to serve, created these "high-toned" boards he speaks of, and that the Committee on Appropriations had nothing to do with the creation of these boards.

Mr. COWHERD. The gentleman is entirely right. They were created there; and I shall not attempt to shield the Committee on the District of Columbia. That committee may be in part responsible for the condition of which I complain. As I have already said, I am not criticising the Committee on Appropriations, though they are even more responsible for the continuation of those conditions. I remember when the bill was before the Committee on the District of Columbia for the creation of this Board of Children's Guardians.

I remember that it was distinctly stated at the time, because we made some inquiry, not fully understanding the work, that this was to be a board of charitable ladies and gentlemen of the District of Columbia, who were asking only the power of visiting the institutions that have intrusted to them these indigent and delinquent children, with the power to examine into them and see that the children were properly treated, and, as I remember, we provided in that bill for a salary list of only twenty-four hundred dollars. Am I not right?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I think the gentleman is right, and the gentleman is right in the other statement, that every time you create a board of that kind it means that clerical help is to be supplied to a greater extent than if you appointed one man to take charge of this, as you could have done in your bill.

Mr. COWHERD. But, Mr. Chairman, that board has not the right to create a single solitary office. The gentleman was right when he said it was the business of the District Committee to create officers, and that committee limited the expense to \$2,400, but the committee of which the distinguished gentleman from Indiana is the chairman has brought in a bill carrying \$10,000 in salaries.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I am sure the gentleman desires to be right.

Mr. COWHERD. Certainly.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. This \$2,400 is for agents only, and that is precisely the sum carried in the bill now for that purpose.

Mr. COWHERD. Here is for administration—

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. You can not administer with agents alone. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. COWHERD. My understanding when that board was created was that the only salaried officials were to be the two agents.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me? Does the gentleman suggest that the business of this board can be carried on without any officers except merely the two agents?

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I will answer that I do not know, but I believe it can be carried on for much less than \$10,000.

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman yield to me for a statement? In the State of Minnesota we have for years had a board of corrections and charities. It has charge of all the jails, all the charitable institutions, and all the paupers and pauperism in the State, and the business has been effectively and diligently conducted by one general agent and two clerks and two traveling assistants for the entire State, and the entire expense of that is \$6,500.

Mr. HEMENWAY. We have a similar board in Indiana. But when the gentleman speaks about his State and my State and the other States, we all know that the business here can not be conducted for the same amount of money as there. Gentlemen can not live here as cheaply as they can in Minneapolis. A man goes to one of the hotels and he pays three times as much for the same quarters he could get in one of the hotels in the different States.

Mr. MADDOX. They would not charge that much to an agent; that is only to you and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield further?

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to yielding to any gentleman if I may be allowed as much time as has been consumed for the conclusion of my remarks.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the gentleman from Indiana that we must pay somebody in the District of Columbia for this class of work more than we pay them in the States. I think if this matter were carefully looked into, it can be done as economically in the District as elsewhere. I was not criticising the committee so much, although I confess it seems to me they are subject to some criticism in not cutting down the salary lists of these charitable associations, but the point I am criticising is the entire system of the Government of the United States going into partnership with all these private charities in the District of Columbia, not only to the great detriment of the Treasury of the United States and of the District, but to the absolute detriment of the administration of the charitable fund itself.

The moment you start in to assist some children's home or some foundling hospital or something else carried on by private means, that moment you take away all the incentive on the part of private individuals to carry on the charitable work and you throw the whole thing on the Treasury of the United States. The Government ought to provide its asylum as the States do. This District ought to have its own almshouse as other cities do, and ought to have its own hospitals—

Mr. LIND. There is an appropriation—

Mr. COWHERD. I know there is. As I was saying, as the cities and States have such eleemosynary institutions, so should the District have them, and then it might help some one individual charity that takes care of emergency cases, of the stranger that is thrown on the street, or the poor man out of employment, who must be carried through a few cold days of winter or of sudden sickness in the family, and such emergency cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, the most of my time was taken up by other gentlemen, and I am going to ask the House to indulge me once more with five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COWHERD. But, as I was saying, aside from the appropriations of that kind, the Government of the United States ought to keep its hands off the private charities, and when the good people get up a "day nursery" or a "children's home" or an "old people's home," let the good people support it, and you will find that the charitable people of this community will do like the charitable people of your community and of mine—they will take care of the institutions of that kind without Government aid, and take care of them better than you will with Government aid and without Government control.

Why, Mr. Chairman, we have appropriated here within the last three years \$750,000 to aid private charities in building hospitals and additions to them. I say "private" because the grounds are not owned by the Government. The buildings that we build are not owned by us. We absolutely can not dictate the admission

of patients to these hospitals nor how they shall be treated after they get in there. We have, of course, the right to examine them by the District Commissioners, and some they have examined and reported adversely upon. But we have not the right to go in and control and regulate the management of some of these great hospitals for which we appropriate \$50,000 per year.

Now, let me call your attention to the extravagances of this system of having half a dozen or a dozen men, excellent people of the District, but people interested in other matters, acting as trustees for these institutions. Here is a Reform School for Boys, and it carries in all an appropriation of nearly \$35,000. Do you know how many boys they have there? As I remember it, they have about 250 or 260 boys.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. That is right.

Mr. COWHERD. A large percentage are colored boys, but you have 40 employees on a salary in that Reform School taking care of 250 boys. Do you suppose for a moment if that was either under private control, where they had to raise the funds out of their pockets, or under Government control, where there would be an official responsible for it, you would have such a salary list for that many boys?

Here is a reform school for girls which carries an appropriation of \$17,000. They have got in that school, as I remember it, an average of seventy girls. Two hundred and fifty dollars per year for every one of them.

Mr. HEMENWAY. What school is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. COWHERD. The Reform School for Girls. I think there are about seventy girls, two or three of them white and the rest colored girls, who have been committed, I suppose, for some minor criminal offense. You have got fourteen employees to take care of them. I admit that schools have got to have teachers, of course, but children are sent there to be taught how to work and earn their own living. In the Reform School for Boys they appropriate here dining-room servants. What are they doing with the boys who ought to be taught that sort of a thing, so that when they come out they can go to work for you or for me?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he refers to the reform school where they are committed for crime?

Mr. COWHERD. Yes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman from Missouri does not undertake to say that a school of that kind can be controlled with the same number of employees as a school of good boys?

Mr. COWHERD. Certainly not.

Mr. HEMENWAY. You have got to have guards and all the surroundings of a prison.

Mr. COWHERD. Oh, no; the modern reform school is not surrounded with guards like a prison; exactly the contrary system is the modern system.

Mr. HEMENWAY. One moment; they do not put them in cells, and that requires more employees to take care of them for that reason.

Mr. COWHERD. I admit that, but I ask the gentleman if he does not believe that forty employees there is excessive?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I believe that in all the departments of the Government, almost, we have more employees than are necessary. But what are you going to do when they come down here and say they can not conduct the institution in a suitable manner unless they have them? You have to take somebody's word for it, and the gentleman's committee reported the bill that created this home.

Mr. COWHERD. And probably very properly reported it.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman's committee suggested that a board should be put in charge of it, and that board comes down here and says, "We can not conduct the institution without this number of employees." Will the gentleman from Missouri say that his judgment and mine, when we can not go out there and investigate it, is better than the judgment of the men who are in charge?

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I would say that the judgment of any man who said that forty salaried employees were needed to take care of a school having 250 boys in it was bad and not to be relied on by the gentleman's committee or any other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COWHERD. Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to say in conclusion again that I am not criticising the committee so much as I am criticising the system.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to continue.

Mr. COWHERD. Oh, no; I thank the gentleman from Indiana, but I do not want to use any more time.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad, indeed, that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] has discussed this question, because any question which he discusses he illuminates. And he has spoken in his usual good spirit.

The gentleman began and concluded with the statement that in what he had to say it was not his purpose to criticise the Appropriations Committee. What he said was largely a confession of work undone by his own committee, because the legislation relating to these things belongs not to us, but to the committee of which the gentleman is a distinguished member.

Mr. COWHERD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. COWHERD. Is it not a fact that this reform school for boys, for which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] says the District Committee provided, has been in operation here in the District of Columbia for many generations, and in fact is an old, old school, that has grown up and has not been legislated up?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The reform school for girls has not.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The reform school for boys is an old institution, but the reform school for girls is one recently created by the gentleman's committee.

Mr. COWHERD. Did that committee provide for any salary list in that school? Does not the growth of that list rest entirely with the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I think that the gentleman is in error as to the number of the employees and teachers in the Boys' Reform School. But why did not the gentleman's committee specify how many employees there should be in the Girls' Reform School, for whose establishment it provided?

Mr. COWHERD. Because it is a matter that can not be specified. Creating the school, there was not needed a single employee until somebody had been sent to the school. The only thing that was necessary was a board of management until the school itself had built up, but as it has built up and the salary list grows, it rests with the Appropriations Committee to say how many.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Has the gentleman any knowledge of anyone employed there who should not be employed?

Mr. COWHERD. Why, Mr. Chairman, how could the gentleman have any knowledge of that fact? When I find so many employees taking care of so few pupils I have sufficient general information to draw an inference that there are too many employees there.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Let me recur to what the gentleman himself was a party to. He created a board to have charge of this institution. Now, if he were a member of the Committee on Appropriations, where would he look for information? Would he undertake to visit all of these institutions and spend his vacations in the city of Washington personally examining these things, or where would he look for information?

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I will say very frankly—I said before that I did not want to criticise the gentleman's committee—but if that committee relies in toto upon recommendations of these boards of management of these charitable institutions, or the Commissioners of the District either, and makes appropriations entirely upon their recommendation without further investigation, then that committee is subject to criticism and I would criticise it.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Well, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has stated a purely hypothetical case, because he knows that the committee does not do any such thing. But it must get its first information from them. It then uses its judgment as to whether the recommendations are well founded.

But that is not what I started out to say. The gentleman has touched a great question when he brings up the question of employing public money for the support of institutions that are largely private in character, and the gentleman is emphatically right in all that he has said in that connection. The committee is gradually becoming stronger in that opinion. We have been studying this question for more than two years. We have encountered difficulties which the gentleman will readily understand; difficulties which arise out of the fact that these institutions are, many of them, of long standing.

They are reputable and useful, and they have their friends in Congress in both Houses. We must be sure we are right before we can go ahead. At present we are simply marking time. We have that subject under consideration, and before much more time has passed we will reach a conclusion. My judgment is that it will be along the line that the gentleman has indicated, and for indicating it so well the committee is grateful to him. It will look to him for valiant and valuable support when the time for action comes.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have not any speech prepared on this subject. I want to say a few things, however, in defense of the subcommittee of which I am a member.

There is a large measure of sound truth in the criticism of my colleague from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] on this budget, but I want to correct just here a wrong impression of his. He takes this Committee of the Whole into his confidence and gives it the benefit

of the recommendation of the board of charities for the gradual abolition of some of these boards. He does the board of charities too much honor. They have not any desire whatever to decrease the number of offices or the amount of the appropriations; they want to abolish a few of these little concerns, so they may take charge of all of them and have the control of them themselves in other institutions now in their charge. That is the cold-blooded truth about the board of charities. They are a very eminent set of gentlemen, serving without individual pay; but I have never heard, since I have been on this subcommittee, of a member of the board of charities suggesting that the salaries be reduced. On the contrary, each of the budgets presented to us has suggestions for the increase of salaries by this board.

Now, a word in our own defense. My colleague is mistaken when he thinks we do everything that the board of charities or even the Board of Commissioners suggests. If he will look at their recommendations to us and then look at this bill he will find that, large as it is, it is \$2,000,000 less than the recommendations of the Board of Commissioners. It would have been more than \$3,000,000 less except for the necessities of the situation.

As has been stated by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota, more than a million dollars of this large budget that we presented to the House comes from the necessity of finishing the filtration plant and the sewage-disposal system. If somebody on this committee does not make some statement in defense of the committee we are chargeable with the animadversions that may come from any gentleman on the floor.

Take for instance the board of charities created by act of Congress. I do not know, perhaps my colleagues on the committee from Nebraska or from Minnesota did not know, the full necessity for this board of charity; but we took the word of the District of Columbia legislative committee. It was created. They come before the District Appropriation Committee with their recommendations. They make statements presumably correct as they understand the facts, and as far as we are convinced we follow their suggestions. We examine and cross-examine them, sometimes to the point of being disagreeable. After they are gone we exercise our best judgment and keep the appropriations down as low as we think we dare do without being criticised for parsimony.

I am sure in my own mind, though I have not the clear proof of it, that we are paying out several hundred thousand dollars in salaries in the District of Columbia that we might avoid. But I do not know of any way to get at the facts except by the appointment of a commission by and under an act of Congress that will put men upon oath—make them inform us what the actual necessities are—get persons and papers, and then let Congress begin at the bottom and go up again.

Mr. HEPBURN and Mr. COWHERD rose.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] prefers to go on now—

Mr. COWHERD. If the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] will permit, I would like a moment just now to answer the remarks that have been made in regard to the District Committee and to statements of my own.

Mr. HEPBURN. All right.

Mr. COWHERD. I endeavored particularly to state that I was not criticising the committee that brought in this bill for these items, because the system has grown up in the course of years and they seem in the main to be following precedents.

Mr. PLENTON. I so understood; I thought I stated that to my colleague.

Mr. COWHERD. The gentleman from Indiana by his question very plainly suggested that the subcommittee on the District of Columbia appropriation bill was relying upon these boards of managers and trustees, and so if anything I said was in the way of criticism upon them I was entitled to criticise them if they did rely upon those estimates. I do not believe they should take the estimates of these boards of trustees, none of whom are public officials, and rely upon them entirely in making appropriations. The gentleman says he does not do so. Then, if they have any different and better information, they either ought to strike out the surplus employees or they ought to sustain them.

Now, the gentleman criticises the Committee on the District of Columbia. He says they start this business and the Committee on Appropriations simply has to provide the appropriations. Is that committee subject to such criticism?

Let us see what are the facts: Here is the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children. They come here to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ask for authority to incorporate. Would you refuse it? They are not asking for any appropriation, but simply ask the right that all other charitable organizations have; they simply ask an incorporation as an eleemosynary institution. We give them the right to incorporate, with a board of visitors to manage the institution. Then they go to your committee, and you give them

the appropriation that carries here \$9,000 out of the \$10,000 that they receive, with a salary list of \$3,900. Are we to blame for that? We never suggested to your committee any appropriation.

Here is the Newsboys and Children's Aid Society. Why should not that society have articles of incorporation as an eleemosynary institution, a private charitable institution in the District of Columbia? Are we to blame if they go to your committee and get an appropriation and spend it for salaries rather than for charities? And so on all down the list. The Committee on the District of Columbia simply provides the machinery. It does not provide the appropriations, and as to these private institutions it does not know and has no way of knowing how many of them, or whether any of them, will be recognized by the Committee on Appropriations afterward in the way of public funds.

Now, as to the Board of Children's Guardians and the Board of Charities, I have explained, and they are very well understood. They were provided, and the machinery by which they operate was provided, and we limit as far as we can in our committee the number of employees that they shall have; but in a large portion of these charities and in a large portion of the money carried in this bill the Committee on the District of Columbia never had a word to say as to when or where there should be any appropriation.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want in the outstart to disclaim any purpose of criticising either the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on the District of Columbia, but I do want to call attention to this very remarkable fact, that between the general headings "Charities and corrections" and "Militia of the District of Columbia," following the subheads of this first general head "Charities and corrections," there are appropriations aggregating \$869,000 for charities and corrections in the District of Columbia. Two hundred thousand dollars of that, I am frank to admit, consists of appropriations for public buildings, in connection, however, with these charities. I think it is safe to say that that character and amount of appropriation, however, accompanies every bill of this description, so that it is safe to say that this is about an average appropriation, \$869,000 for charities and corrections in a city of a little more than 250,000 people. That is more than equal to \$3 a head for charitable purposes for all of the citizens of the District of Columbia.

I do not know whether there are too many officers or not, but I do know that to my mind there is an extraordinary number. Whether we could dispense with any of them is a question that I am not now prepared to solve. I do know, however, that as compared with expenses of similar character in some of the States—in one, at least—this sum seems to be enormous. In the State of Iowa, for example, for purposes of this character the appropriations are about 50 cents per head. The appropriation to carry on all of the great institutions—three penitentiaries, four hospitals for the insane, and all of the eleemosynary institutions of the State of Iowa—amount to little more than \$1,000,000 for a population of two and a half million people. I am not sure that a just comparison can be made, but it does appear to me that some method ought to be taken of ascertaining, more accurately than the committee in the very nature of things can ascertain, the necessity for these appropriations.

It is a truth, I think, that all gentlemen will recognize, that the chief source of their information, that upon which they must rely under our system, is tainted with interest. While these boards serve, perhaps, without pay, every member of them has an interest in the institution he is helping to fondle. All of the officers charged with the conduct of these establishments have an interest in securing the largest appropriation. Why, you see it in the Book of Estimates. What member of the Committee on Appropriations is willing to be guided by the estimates made by the nine Secretaries? Not one of you. After you have received your estimates and such detailed information as they see fit to give you, you call them before you, you interrogate them, and then you refuse to be guided by their estimates; and in almost every instance the gentleman who has charge of a bill suggests to the House with some measure of proper pride, "We have cut down the estimate so many thousand dollars or so many million dollars."

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. That is true in this instance.

Mr. HEPBURN. I have no doubt about it. I am not criticising the committee. I have not a particle of doubt that they have done the very best they could under the circumstances. I am criticising the system under which we operate in making appropriations of this kind. I do not believe that there is scrutiny enough. I am not here to say that it is the duty of the committee to give more of scrutiny to the subject than they do give. Their time is necessarily limited. They have a great variety of duties. There are no men more hard worked in this body than the mem-

bers of the Committee on Appropriations. I am not criticising them, but I am trying to say something that will find a lodgment in the mind of some man who knows how to suggest the proper remedy. There ought to be a remedy. Three dollars per capita to be spent in charities, so called, or in institutions of correction in this city is, in my judgment, an enormous sum. It would be equal to seven and a half million dollars in the State of Iowa, more than three times the total expenditures of that State, nearly three times the total appropriation of the State for carrying on the government of Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Does the gentleman want more time?

Mr. HEPBURN. No.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, a tax of \$40 per capita is imposed by this bill for the government of the District of Columbia. I do not believe there is a Congressional district in the United States that does not expect its Congressman to go a long way in appropriating money from the public funds for the purpose of beautifying the American capital. I believe it is the consensus of public opinion throughout the country that we ought to have the finest capital city in the world; and whenever an appropriation is brought before this body, reasonable in amount, looking to that purpose, it will not only have my support, but I believe it will have the support of an overwhelming majority of this body.

I do not believe the people of this country expect the appropriations carried in this bill every year shall stand out conspicuously as evidences that a very wretched system of municipal government has been allowed to grow and grow without any effort to prune it; or, worse, that the utter recklessness of place hunters has fastened on the public in the administration of the Government in all its departments an army of sinecures.

I live in a State of near 4,000,000 people. It is a rich State, with a penitentiary, a reform school for girls, a reform school for boys, a university that ranks well with the best institutions in the world, a school of mines, five normal schools, three hospitals for the insane, asylums and schools for the blind and the deaf and dumb, with every possible provision in the way of eleemosynary establishments for the cure of the unfortunates, and yet the appropriations carried in this bill for one year's expense in the District of Columbia is two and one-half times as much as the gross expense of the State of Missouri for the administration of the State government in all its departments.

It is true some part of these appropriations made by this are for public buildings. It is also true that at every session of the legislature of Missouri we make appropriations for public buildings. The public institutions I speak of have been built without going into debt for the money with which the State built them. To institute another comparison: While I have no figures by me, I will venture the assertion that you can not find on the face of the earth a city where the expenses of municipal administration are in any way to be compared with the expenses of this city.

Now, somebody is responsible for this. If the American Congress is to admit that such proceedings afford an exhibition of its capacity for municipal government let the country so understand the matter. We are sitting here to-day as a board of aldermen pure and simple. As individuals we have no private interests at stake; therefore no selfish motive actuates us. We are in a position to enact laws for the government of the city of Washington untrammelled by considerations which probably embarrass city governments generally. We certainly should be able to safeguard the public against a waste of public money and establish a system which will give the taxpayers something for the dollars they expend.

The gentleman from Minnesota tells us the committee has done its best; that it has endeavored to go to the bottom of all questions involved; and yet the result is a bill where out of \$9,000 appropriated for a private eleemosynary institution \$3,500 of the appropriation is devoted to payment of the salaries of those in charge of the expenditure of the money. Think of it! Out of gross receipts of only \$9,000 or \$10,000 for charity all told, nearly \$4,000—40 per cent of it—is devoted to paying the men who expend it! Now, I believe that here we find the key to the whole situation.

I recollect that during the Spanish-American war a report was put in circulation to the effect that an attempt had been made to dynamite some of the public buildings. The result was the appointment of a large number of extra policemen. This was regarded as a temporary increase in the police force. Have they been relieved yet? The Spanish war is over. Everyone connected with the government of the city of Washington tells us that the city can not possibly get on without them—that they are absolutely indispensable. Everybody knows that an unexpected emergency caused the increase in the police force. The emergency soon disappeared, but the policemen called into service by it are still on the pay roll.

Mr. Chairman, when, how, and where are we going to commence pruning these rank growths? Are we to go on obeying the superintendents, secretaries, assistants, and typewriters, who, we are told, would bitterly resent any effort to dispossess them of the places? Is it not true that these typewriters, clerks, and employees have powerful friends at court, who stand in the way of reform, and who, were we to undertake a house cleaning, would surround the heads of the department, each demanding to know why his appointee was let out, why was my constituent discharged?

The result of this pernicious system is seen in this bill, with its indefensible misappropriation of public funds. It is this that compels the employment of men and the retention of officials at manifestly outrageous salaries, and until we make up our minds to destroy this system the Congress will remain powerless to correct the evil. There is only one way to correct it. The Appropriation Committee alone can do it. We should make appropriation ample for carrying on the business of these various public bodies and no more, and under the compulsion of the want of funds compel the abandonment of this extravagant and ridiculous system of municipal control. [Applause.]

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, much that has been said is a valuable contribution to the subject we have been considering. The committee welcomes it and expresses its thanks to the gentlemen who have given us the benefit of this thought.

Several references have been made, however, to the expenses of State governments as compared with those of the District of Columbia. Of course gentlemen, when they stop to think of this, will recollect that this entity we are appropriating for is unique in that in its necessary expenditures it is both a State and a city. It has most of the expenses of a State and all the expenses of a city.

Now, I do not propose to go over the whole subject. I will simply say that the Committee on Appropriations, the subcommittee having charge of this bill, cut down the estimates which were submitted to them something like \$3,000,000. We tried to do that cutting down prudently and sensibly, not just closing our eyes and slashing. We realized that we might do harm in doing such a thing as that. But where we saw an opportunity for saving the public money without doing harm we used that opportunity.

In the case of the board of charities of the District, about which so much has been said, we cut down the appropriation half a million dollars from the estimates which were made. Here are the figures: The estimates of the board amounted to \$1,265,788. The appropriations recommended in this bill amount to \$785,063. It seems to me that is cutting pretty close in proportion to the whole amount estimated. In order to determine what ought to be reached in that reduction, we spent three days with the gentlemen in charge of these charities, they endeavoring squarely to tell us and we endeavoring squarely to ascertain the real situation.

Let me remind the committee of the fact that some years ago the attention of the House was directed to the fact that the charities of the District were costing a great deal of money—costing an unusual and apparently unnecessarily large sum of money. It was believed that charities had been brought into existence and the burdens of them assumed by the Government without wisdom.

In order to correct that condition this House, under the leadership of the committee of which my friend from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] is a distinguished member, the Committee on the District of Columbia provided for what is known as the "Board of Charities." This board was to take into consideration this whole question of the charities of the District.

Let us see who constitute the personnel of that board. I find the list here in the report: George W. Cook, a professor in Howard University, a colored gentleman, but a very distinguished man and very able and very honorable gentleman, as we judge him to be from our impressions as he came before our committee. Then we find Charles P. Neill, a student of social economy and a professor in the Catholic University. Then we find Simon Wolf, a prominent business man of the city. Then we find John Joy Edson, president of the Washington Loan and Trust Company, and S. W. Woodward, the head of the firm of Woodward & Lothrop. It would be very hard, if not impossible to secure a board of higher character or greater professional and business ability.

These gentlemen have devoted a great deal of time and a great deal of intelligent thought to the duties that lay before them, for which they receive no remuneration except that of a good conscience.

These gentlemen have for the last two years made recommendations to us along the line of the speech of my friend from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] and my other friend from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], whom I regard as a friend, notwithstanding the little spat we had a little earlier this morning. Mr. Chairman, those

gentlemen whose names I have given to you are among the most able and public-spirited citizens of this community. They have spent, as I say, weeks of time, every hour of which had a money value to them, in this public service. They impressed us with their sincerity and their desire to put these charities upon a proper basis. It is due to these gentlemen that we say we did not deem the time ripe to follow out in full the recommendations which they made. Their recommendations look toward the gradual elimination of all appropriations for these institutions that are private in character and which are now supported in large part at public expense.

To this general proposition the committee feels strongly disposed; but this House is not committed to it. We have several times made experiments. Last year we recommended some reductions, but the House promptly restored the usual amounts. We do not want to cut off any of them with harsh precipitancy, because that would be like rooting up the tree. But we want to give the various institutions fair warning and fair opportunity to get out gradually from Government aid and acquire the help of individuals. If we should cut out their appropriations wantonly we might destroy good work, and no one wants that done.

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. LIND. To what extent do your public institutions do the same kind of work that is done by the private eleemosynary institutions now? Pretty generally?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The charities of the District are largely of the kind I have described, private institutions that have grown up and gradually got more and more of public help.

Mr. LIND. To what extent have you inaugurated public institutions to do the same kind of work?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. To a very small extent.

Mr. LIND. I notice that the bill carries an appropriation of \$100,000 for an almshouse.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. That is wholly public.

Mr. LIND. Is that new?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. It is to enlarge the present almshouse.

Mr. LIND. Could not that almshouse do a great deal of the work here that is committed to private care?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The almshouse is now in very limited quarters in close conjunction to the jail. With this appropriation which the gentleman refers to we propose to construct a new almshouse in a healthful place in the country, down near Alexandria, within the District, bought for the purpose a short time ago.

We are simply marking time on this problem until we ourselves can get full information on the matter, to the end that we may not do wrong in our effort to do right. We hope to move forward within the next few years along the general lines suggested by the gentleman from Missouri.

And, Mr. Chairman, we hope that when we do move forward we shall have the support of this House, even if we touch upon something that some Member believes ought not to be touched at the time.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I want to submit one observation in answer to what the gentleman has said. He suggested that the management of State institutions afforded no guide in the matter of appropriations for the District of Columbia. I can not conceive that to be possible. I can not understand why the administration of bureaus of like character, like the insurance commissioner's, should cost any more here than in the State of Minnesota. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] said a few moments ago that this is in part a State administration and in part a municipal administration. Granting that, let me call the gentleman's attention to this fact: The entire cost of the State administration of the State of Minnesota, with its nearly 2,000,000 people, the State university with a student body of 4,000, and a great number of normal schools, is, in round numbers, only \$7,000,000.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. LIND. Certainly.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Does that \$7,000,000 include the local institutions—the schools in the various communities?

Mr. LIND. It includes all the State schools, normal schools, and schools for defectives, and in addition we are building a magnificent State capitol. I may give another illustration of city government—the city of Minneapolis, in which I reside, which is very nearly as large as the city of Washington—

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Oh, Mr. Chairman, not even the pride of a Minneapolitan can make that true. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIND. Well, if the gentleman takes exception, I will suggest facts that will put my comparison beyond criticism. I say very nearly as large, and we have not been accused of economy of late. In fact, it has been the common complaint of our citi-

zens that our administration has been extravagant, and we have spent in round numbers only \$3,800,000.

Now, take the city of St. Paul, and my colleague will concede that Minneapolis and St. Paul together are vastly greater and do an immensely larger business than the city of Washington, that they have greater interests every way, and the municipal expense of the city of St. Paul is less than \$2,700,000.

Mr. BURKETT. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. LIND. If the gentleman will wait until I conclude. So that the expense of the administration of the city of Washington is greater than that of the entire State of Minnesota with its capital city added. The gentleman asked me whether the statement I made a moment ago included the expense of the schools throughout the State. The entire amount collected in the State of Minnesota for all purposes—schools and municipal government and expenditures of all kinds—is only \$18,000,000.

This is in excess of the average in the States. For the administration of all of the affairs of the great State of Minnesota—State, municipal, educational, and township—we expend less than \$18,000,000, and here we are appropriating almost \$11,000,000 for the city of Washington. Now, I say that under those circumstances it does not—

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, right here will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. LIND. Yes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. He does not want to be unfair. In his figures he does not include the amount of money expended by the local townships for charities, does he?

Mr. LIND. I do.

Mr. HEMENWAY. In the counties for charities?

Mr. LIND. I do.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Does the gentleman say that \$18,000,000 is the total amount of taxes collected for township, county, State, and city purposes in the State of Minnesota?

Mr. LIND. In the State of Minnesota; yes.

Mr. BURKETT. In the municipal estimate the gentleman does not include the cost of paving?

Mr. LIND. I do.

Mr. BURKETT. That is done by a separate estimate charged against the property, is it not?

Mr. LIND. Yes; it is in a measure. But let me say in that connection—

Mr. BURKETT. They do not build their sidewalks there out of city funds?

Mr. LIND. They do not here; they do not pretend to; but let me call the attention of the gentleman to what your committee has done. You appropriate some \$12,000 for the administration of a sidewalk fund of \$160,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more. It does not take an expert to know that it is ridiculous on its face to appropriate \$12,000 for the administration of a fund of \$160,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIND. Now, when you appropriate \$3,500 for a superintendent of street sweepers and give him, say, eighteen or twenty assistants—that may be more than the bill shows, but it is a large number—and salaries running from twelve to fifteen hundred dollars, I think I am justified in saying that the committee is somewhat extravagant, and that would appear so to a man who has only had experience in Minneapolis, or St. Paul, or Chicago, or any other city, I venture to say.

How can you justify paying the principal of a school, a college graduate, only \$1,500—and that is in harmony with the salaries of teachers all over the country—and then appropriate in the same bill and pay the superintendent of street sweepers \$3,500? How can you justify paying the teacher who teaches your children and my children only \$720 and pay an assistant superintendent of street sweepers \$1,500? I would like to have these anomalies reconciled. I say under these circumstances that the members of the committee ought to be willing to hear a little comment and possibly a little criticism on this bill.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen of the committee are not only willing but anxious to hear all the criticism that is directed toward the public good, and so far as this criticism ministers to the public good the committee will listen to it and heed it and try to act upon it the next time it handles a bill. That is the disposition of the committee, and gentlemen generally ought not to misunderstand it.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, let me call attention to one other

thing. Here you have an excise board. What do excise officers do in this city? Exactly what they do in Minneapolis or St. Paul or Chicago—look after the liquor licenses. We have in Minneapolis one officer who gets, I think, \$1,500 a year. Here you have a chief clerk at \$2,000, one clerk at \$1,200, one clerk at \$1,000, and a messenger at \$600—in all, \$4,800. Just think of that, for looking after the liquor licenses in this city! It is absurd. Then take your office for collecting the personal-property tax here. We have appropriated for a collector \$4,000, a deputy collector \$1,800, and so on—I will not read it all—a total of \$19,400, twice the amount that the administration of the State treasury costs the State of Minnesota.

Mr. DUNWELL. May I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. LIND. Certainly.

Mr. DUNWELL. Does not the gentleman consider that it would be fairer to line up the expenses of a great city like Washington with the expenses of some other great city, rather than the governmental expenses of a State?

Mr. LIND. I did that.

Mr. DUNWELL. The gentleman will allow me to inform him that the city of New York raises every year for the purposes of its government \$100,000,000, while the government of the great State of New York does not cost one-fifth of that sum.

Mr. LIND. New York City is in a class by itself; I concede that. I am not here to discuss New York; but I venture to say to members of this committee that if you take the budget of any city in the country of the size of Washington, or approximately its size, you will find that that other city does not appropriate half the money that this city is spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] has expired.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I should like to ask my colleague just one more question, and then I will yield to him my time for an answer. Does my friend undertake to say that the cost of collecting the State taxes in the State of Minnesota bears any comparison to the expense of such collection in this city?

Mr. LIND. I do mean to say that I have a right to compare the expenses in the city of Minneapolis with the expenses in Washington City, and to say that in the city of Minneapolis we do not spend one-quarter of the amount that is spent here in the same way. In Minneapolis the collections are made by the treasurer and his deputies without any other expense to the city, and the cost there is not one-fourth of what it is here.

You have no treasurer here in the sense that we have in Minneapolis. I realize that perfectly. But take the city comptroller's office of any city in our State—an office which I judge is substantially the same as your auditor's office here—and you will find that the administration of your auditor's office here costs six times as much as the administration of the corresponding office in Minneapolis. It seems to me that such a condition of things is absolutely indefensible.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the last word. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] has been comparing the expenditures for the District of Columbia with the expenditures for the State of Minnesota—a very unfair comparison. The gentleman must understand that in one institution over here which is provided for in this bill there are over 100 people that come from different States of the Union.

Mr. LIND. I understand perfectly well—and I do not want my language to be otherwise construed—that it does cost more in Washington for many of these items of expenditure; and we are all willing that the appropriation shall be liberal, but nevertheless there ought to be a limit even to liberality and generosity.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Yes; but the gentleman comes now with this explanation, when his speech was along the other line—making comparison of expenditures here with expenditures of the State of Minnesota. And, as I started out to say, he forgets in one institution over here there are more than 100 people who come from different States of the Union and who are taken care of upon this bill. All along through this bill you will find not only expenses of the District of Columbia taken care of, but expenses of people that come from the different States who are here, and provision for their care is made in this bill.

The gentleman said a while ago in his explanation that he realizes that it costs more here than in some other places to provide for these different items of expenditure. The gentleman comes here upon a salary of \$5,000. I do not suppose he speculates upon it. Yet if he could have \$5,000 in the city of Minneapolis as a member of the State legislature of Minnesota, it would be a magnificent salary, and he could save out of it considerable money.

Take the whole public service for the District of Columbia and it is necessarily more expensive than that of any other city in the United States. Why? This is the capital city of the United States. We maintain more parks here all over this city than there are in other cities of the Union. For these numerous parks here watchmen must be provided. Do you find this extensive

park system in Minneapolis? How many cities have parks that compare with the parks of Washington?

The parks in other cities are but as a drop in the bucket compared with those of Washington.

Mr. LIND. We have 40 miles of parks in the city of Minneapolis.

Mr. HEMENWAY. All these parks here in the city of Washington must be provided for. All along the line there are marked differences between this city and most other cities. The conditions in a State are wholly different, and it is unfair for any gentleman on this floor to compare the expenses for the District of Columbia with the expenditures for a State, because, as everyone must realize, it must be much more expensive to care for this capital city of the United States, which is being made the most beautiful city of the world, than to pay the expenses of maintaining some other city of the Union.

Now, as to these charities.

The Committee on Appropriations does not legislate. It reports appropriations in compliance with law; and if we place upon this bill a single item that is not authorized by law, any Member of the House may take the provision out of the bill by a point of order. We do not make the law. It was made by Congress at the suggestion of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Now, as to the charities, we all agree that it seems as though there was too much money paid out here for charities. We have been trying to solve the problem. The Committee on the District of Columbia have been trying to solve the problem, and some two or three years ago they worked out this legislation for a board of charities. Upon that board they placed these distinguished gentlemen, George W. Cook, Charles C. Neill, Simon Wolf, John Joy Edson, S. W. Woodward, conceded, I believe, to be some of the most distinguished citizens not only of the District of Columbia, but of the United States, and said to them: "Gentlemen, here is a serious problem. You are paying too much of your money out for charities. Here is the District of Columbia paying one half of this money and the Government of the United States paying the other half by way of a tax upon our great public buildings here. Figure this out and see if you can not save some money for the people."

This board of charities have gone to work. They are men of high character. They say they are working it out, but yet the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD], who helped inaugurate this legislation, comes in and says that the board are not working it out to his satisfaction. They are not working it out to my satisfaction. But naturally we come back—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMENWAY. We come back, naturally, and ask the question, "What are we going to do about it?" The Committee on the District of Columbia has performed. Congress has performed. This board has been created. They say they are doing the best they can. It is easy to criticize. Some one gets up and criticizes and says they are not doing it. Gentlemen, suggest a remedy! Your committee will legislate. Your committee has the power to bring to Congress some bill to remedy this defect. Come along with it. We want it. The subcommittee in charge of this bill for three or four days worked with this board of charities—

Mr. COWHERD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Certainly.

Mr. COWHERD. I think the gentleman is mistaken in saying that I do not approve the report of the board of charities on the question of the Government ceasing to go into partnership with these charities.

Mr. HEMENWAY. But the gentleman says we are spending large sums of money to carry into effect their work. The board of charities recommended the expenditure of every dollar carried in this bill and more. The Committee on Appropriations cut down their recommendation.

Mr. COWHERD. That is a question of the pay roll; but on the question of their recommendation as to the way that the charitable appropriations should be expended I want to say that I do not agree with them; and I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the board of charities recommended striking out these appropriations for a lot of these small charities with which you are in partnership, and you refused to accept their recommendations, but appropriated for them.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Will the gentleman, for instance, move upon the floor to strike from this bill the appropriation of a thousand dollars for the Newsboys' and Children's Aid Society? And does he believe for a minute that if the Committee on Appro-

priations had stricken from this bill this item some Member would not have got up on this floor to move to put it back so quickly that you could not have had time to think about it? And nearly every Member would have been scrambling to his feet to vote to put it back. Take any one of these items, and let the Committee on Appropriations strike it out, as they have tried to do in the past, and see how quickly the Members of this House would get to their feet to vote to put each item back in again. Why, I see sitting all around me Members who, if you touch any one of these little items here, will rally their friends around them and put them back into this bill so quickly you would hardly know what had happened, if the Committee on Appropriations undertook to strike them out.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to his colleague?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think instead of retarding reform it is the duty of the gentleman to promote it.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman will please put his question, if he has one. I have only five minutes, and I can not yield for a speech.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The House has courteously extended the gentleman's time and I will get my own time. How does the gentleman explain the fact that it costs for the support of an inmate of an eleemosynary institution in the city of Washington one-half more than it costs in the State of Indiana? And that is the system that the gentleman is defending.

Mr. HEMENWAY. How can the gentleman explain that it costs twice as much for him to board in a hotel in Washington as it would to board in a hotel in Fort Wayne?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. There is a difference entirely in that.

Mr. HEMENWAY. There is absolutely no difference in the principle. I did not yield to the gentleman to make a speech. How does he explain that he pays at his hotel more than twice as much for his living as he would at Fort Wayne, Ind?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That would have no application.

Mr. HEMENWAY. It necessarily costs more here, and the Committee on Appropriations can not regulate the cost; and it is therefore for this board to regulate the cost. And the distinguished gentlemen I have mentioned as being in charge of this board of charities do that.

The Committee on Appropriations cut down their recommendations until they insist that it would not be possible to properly take care of the charities of the District of Columbia. They come back and say, "You are putting the knife in here so deep that people are going to suffer in this District; that people are going to go without coal or without food when they want it, because the Committee on Appropriations is cutting down our estimates." Yet we have the criticism, and what does it amount to? The gentlemen who criticize do not get up and move to reduce these appropriations. They do not want to take the responsibility that some one who deserves charity shall not get it.

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I am glad to do so.

Mr. LIND. For one who is not on the committee it is not practicable to move amendments. But, for instance, take this provision on page 7, lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, where you appropriate \$6,008 for the sealer of weights and measures.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Yes.

Mr. LIND. It is ridiculous on its face.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Does the gentleman know what his duties are?

Mr. LIND. Yes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman has not investigated to learn what the sealer of weights and measures does, or he can not say that.

Mr. LIND. I know what they do elsewhere.

Mr. HEMENWAY. But the gentleman does not know what they do here. Now, let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LIND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks that his time may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Minnesota and other persons have criticised the appropriations for charities?

Mr. LIND. I have not.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman has compared the appropriation here with the statement of what is done in his own State.

Mr. LIND. Now, Mr. Chairman, I criticised no portion of this appropriation for the schools nor charities, under the circum-

stances. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri and the chairman of the subcommittee that it is a proper subject for reform.

Mr. HEMENWAY. And the gentleman compares the expenditures here with those of his own State, and by that very comparison indicates that extravagant appropriations are made. Now, I want to ask him this question.

Mr. LIND. Well.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The board of charities, composed of these distinguished gentlemen whose names I have given, recommend to the Committee on Appropriations that we appropriate \$1,265,000, in round figures, for charities. The Committee on Appropriations only appropriates \$785,000 for charities, or nearly \$500,000 less than their recommendation. Now, these gentlemen say, "Your cut will result in somebody suffering." Now, will the gentleman suggest that we cut the appropriation?

Mr. LIND. Not at all. The gentleman entirely misapprehended my remarks. These things I would not cut; but it was on the administrative features, where you have too many officers drawing extravagant salaries; it is that portion that I would get at.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Which one of the salaries?

Mr. LIND. I have not studied them in detail.

Mr. HEMENWAY. That is it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LIND. I will mention some.

Mr. HEMENWAY. When we get back to the details of the question they never answer.

Mr. LIND. I will answer.

Mr. HEMENWAY. They make comparisons with the expenditures for the charities of their States and expenditures for charities of the District of Columbia, and when we get back to the merits of the question, and say, "Will you take the responsibility of making the appropriation and cutting the appropriation as you think it should be?" they say "No." Yet the criticism comes by way of comparison.

Mr. LIND. Now, I want to ask the gentleman a question, if he will yield to me.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Certainly.

Mr. LIND. Here you appropriate \$1,600 for superintendent of electric work. He is probably a college man, a man of scientific attainment. Do you think that is too much?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I think not.

Mr. LIND. Do you think it is enough?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do not know whether it is or not. I should think it is.

Mr. LIND. I should think it is.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Is it not a good service?

Mr. LIND. Yes. Now, how can you justify an appropriation of a like amount of salary to the assistant superintendent of street sweepers?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Well, the gentleman hangs onto the street-sweeping business as if it were honey.

Mr. LIND. No.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The city of Washington boasts that it has the cleanest streets—

Mr. LIND. A gentleman here suggests that it is "pie," not "honey."

Mr. HEMENWAY. Well, he hangs onto it as if it were honey on buckwheat cakes.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit me? The salary to which the gentleman from Minnesota refers was fixed in a Democratic Administration, and we have simply repeated it.

Mr. LIND. Does that justify it?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do not say it is justified on that ground. In reply to the criticism the gentleman has made, which I think is made purely to go to the public, I will state that this salary has not only run for years, but the duties of the superintendent of street sweeping is not such an insignificant duty.

Mr. LIND. No; this is the assistant.

Mr. HEMENWAY. He is the man in charge of a whole lot of men. He is a man who must have the ability to see that these men perform their work and perform it properly and keep the streets in good order. Now, you can not find that kind of a man for less than \$1,500 a year.

Mr. LIND. You give him \$2,500.

Mr. HEMENWAY. No; that is the salary of the chief.

Mr. LIND. Yes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Does the gentleman think that a laboring man who is competent to superintend a gang of street sweepers, covering a large section of territory, is too well paid when he gets \$1,500 a year?

Mr. LIND. No; but very few of them get it.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Is the gentleman complaining that labor is being too well paid?

Mr. LIND. Labor is not getting too much; that is the misfortune; it is the superintendents here who are getting too much.

Mr. HEMENWAY. What is the gentleman's criticism, then, if labor is not too well paid? Does the gentleman say that the superintendent does not have to labor; a man who has to move around from one crowd of street sweepers to another, does he not have to labor?

Mr. LIND. Yes; but any laborer would be glad to exchange jobs with him every day in the year, and the laborer is paid \$1.50 per day.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Yes; but, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I want to say that I am tired of these gentlemen dealing in generalities, saying that as compared with the States our charities here are paid too much, yet when you get down to break sticks with them and ask them whether or not they are willing to take the responsibility of making a deeper cut than the Committee on Appropriations made they say "No." Then meet the question fairly. If the Committee on Appropriations does not cut this item enough when they cut off \$500,000, be kind enough to say so, and do not by comparison undertake to state that this committee has been extravagant in its appropriations.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Yes, if I may have a minute or two later, I will yield.

Mr. COWHERD. Does the gentleman believe that his defense here—does the gentleman wish to put the defense for his committee upon the ground that some Member not familiar with the items of the bill ought to offer here on the hasty reading of it a substitute, and that if he does not do that therefore he does not do his duty?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I am not offering a defense; I am asking gentlemen when they attack to say why they attack.

Mr. COWHERD. Does the gentleman not know that no man except the members on the committee who sat at the hearings and heard the evidence is prepared to offer a substitute to these items and say just what clerks should be taken off and what should be left on?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I suggest that any man who does not understand the question he is discussing ought not to attempt to criticize.

Mr. COWHERD. But the gentleman admits the justice of the criticism.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do not admit the justice of the criticism.

Mr. COWHERD. The gentleman in charge of the bill admitted it.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I simply say here that gentlemen who have been trying to criticize these appropriations for charities have not the courage to stand up and say that the Committee on Appropriations did not cut deep enough—and possibly too deep—when they cut these estimates.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in his capacity as watchdog of the Treasury would not be found in this Congress obstructing reform in the interest of the Treasury, which, he stated in a former speech, was threatened with a deficit of forty-two millions; but he complains of criticism not specifying, and seeks to charge on the Members of this House not on the Appropriations Committee the duty incumbent upon the Appropriations Committee of saving us the very fear that he has already referred to in the matter of a deficiency. Now, if the gentleman wants a specific illustration, I will give it to him, and it is with reference to the cost of maintaining the insane at the insane asylum of the District and of the United States, where it cost \$220 per capita—which will be a surprise to Members on this floor to know—when in their own States and in my State it costs less than \$150 per capita, and in the estimate in my State is included improvements of a minor nature.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Let me ask the gentleman if the cost which he mentions of \$220 per capita has not been materially reduced by Republican administration?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman will inject politics into this nonpartisan question of reform and economy, showing the animus that inspires him in criticising us for insisting, in line with his original suggestion that we should have the probe put into the District of Columbia, where he knows the greatest evils prevail. Has he not read the public press? Will he stand up in defense of institutions by private parties coming to the public Treasury for their support, as they have done this morning, and say he is oblivious to the recommendation that these should be cut down? And yet he essays that rôle as chairman of appropriations, charged with economy in the administration of the Government. This bill to-day provides for the support of the department in the District of Columbia that has in one of its offices a \$500 imported rug upon which they wipe their feet when they enter.

The gentleman stands up for this system which charges \$220

per capita for care of the insane when he knows that the State charges less than \$150 for the same support, and he justifies it on the ground that the exorbitant hotel keepers regard Members of Congress as legitimate prey, and he fails to state that we are in the city of Washington but six months in the year and must pay double the price for hotel accommodations. The gentleman from Indiana says that the Republicans of the State of Indiana have done something, and that the criticism of the Appropriations Committee is unjust because some Member not connected with that committee should do this or that to correct these evils and secure reforms. In face of this declaration of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who stands, like Dame Partington, with a mop to keep back the ocean, do you expect the Democratic party to be here, with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee representing the extravagance and evils, to present measures to the Republican side of the House? Are we not justified in relying upon the statement that you are threatened with a deficit of \$42,000,000? Are we justified in asking the Appropriations Committee of the House to perform this duty? No more fertile field has ever been presented in any portion of our country than is here offered—this splendid field for reform which is presented by the District of Columbia—and the gentleman himself knows it. Therefore our presentation of these matters, as we go along, in opposition to the gentleman and his colleagues, who wince under presentation of extravagance, will not be criticised by the country when we come to find the amount of the appropriations at the end of the session. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, when the chairman of the Appropriations Committee attempted to reply to the criticisms leveled at this bill, he carefully shunned details. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] called his attention to the appropriation of \$6,000 for the sealer of weights and measures. Did the chairman of the committee discuss it candidly? No. He turned upon the gentleman from Minnesota and inquired: "Can you tell me what this officer does in the District of Columbia?" He did not take us into his confidence and tell us what showing was made before the Appropriations Committee to warrant this outrageous appropriation. Washington is not a great commercial city. It is a capital city. In point of commerce it is not nearly as important as cities of a hundred or a hundred and fifty thousand inhabitants elsewhere? What does the sealer of weights and measures do in other cities? He verifies the accuracy of the weights and measures used in commerce. Does he do anything else here? If the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations knows that some extraordinary duty devolves upon him, the sealer of weights and measures in the capital city, it would afford us much pleasure for him to rise and state what that duty is. When my colleague from Missouri directed attention to the employment of 40 officials at comfortable salaries for taking care of 250 boys in the Reform School, the gentleman from Minnesota disregarded the question raised and scolded critics who complain of such appropriations.

It is not true that in all respects the expenses of the municipal government in Washington differs in its responsibilities and necessities from municipal governments elsewhere. For instance, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] says that there are a hundred men in public institutions here who came from the States of the Union. Why, if he is informed on this subject—and I doubt not that he is—he knows that this complaint is universal. All other cities suffer the same misfortune. The subject has been discussed by economists in the magazines. Inevitably the unfit drift to the cities. In proportion to the importance of the commercial city this drift is large or small. The result is that in cities like St. Louis and Chicago, and even Kansas City, St. Joseph, St. Paul, and Minneapolis, in the West, this drift of the criminals and degenerates is very large and is constantly increasing. Recently I saw in a newspaper a statement to the effect that in the city of St. Louis over 70 per cent of the persons confined in the different eleemosynary and charitable institutions of that city came from neighboring counties and States.

I know that in my own city they drift in upon us from Iowa, a neighboring State, from Kansas, and from Nebraska, and from the adjacent counties of my own State. Why, if this great city escapes with only 100 nonresident inmates of its charitable and eleemosynary institutions, it is very fortunate, for I will venture the assertion that a similar showing can not be made by any other city on the continent. Furthermore, in proportion to the congestion of the population, in proportion to the hard conditions of human life, in proportion to the insanitary conditions of the people's houses, you will find disease, deterioration, and a failure of self-support prevalent among the weaker classes.

Other cities suffer far more than Washington from these conditions.

Mr. Chairman, it may be said that this is mere cheese paring; that only a few items in this bill are open to these criticisms. These

items are manifestly open to criticism. Their absurdity is disclosed by a mere glance at the bill. What, then, shall we say as to those items not self-explanatory and concerning which information is not forthcoming? Eight hundred thousand dollars for charity in a city like this, every paragraph punctuated with an extravagant salary list, is not a fair appropriation. If so large a sum were needed for charitable purposes, there is not a Member on this floor who would withhold one dollar or one cent essential to the discharge of all the duties of humanity imposed upon us by modern notions of municipal duty. We would vote more than that if it were necessary; but when in every page and every line of it there is manifest extravagance and misappropriation of the money of the taxpayers, it will take something more than the generalization of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to justify its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I think few of the Members of this House are familiar with these organizations in the city of Washington, organizations for the care of the unfortunate people of this city. We have here a cosmopolitan population. Men come here from all over the United States. I have examined this part of the bill pretty carefully, and the only fault that I have to find with the committee is that their appropriations are below what they ought to be. Now, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] a few moments ago opposed some of the appropriations. I want to say to him that what he knows about the institutions of this city which must care for the unfortunate he could put in a pamphlet of two pages, and what he does not know about it would take a book of 400 pages to tell. There are the blind, and there are the paralytic, and there are all classes of unfortunates. Now, what has Congress done to provide for these people in the District? There is not an institution as large as a dog house or a henhouse in which to take care of them. That is true. If the Congress of the United States would appropriate money to put up an asylum for the blind or an asylum for the people who are unfortunate in many other ways, then we could care for them; but there is absolutely not an institution ten feet square wherein we may provide for these unfortunate people.

Now, what is the result? You have got to put them in Catholic institutions, and institutions run by Presbyterians, and by Methodists, and by Lutherans, and by various denominations. There should be no objection made on this ground. I have made careful examinations in this matter, and I say we have 50,000 people in the city of Washington coming from all the States who are here and have got to be cared for by these institutions. Now, the proposition is here that the Secretary of War shall be the custodian of this fund. He makes the contracts with these different institutions to care for these unfortunates.

Mr. LIND. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there are 50,000 people in this city receiving charity?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; that is below the amount. They come from your State; they come from my State—

Mr. LIND. I think not from my State.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, they do; they come from every State in the Union. There are here more than 50,000 of those people, who must be cared for by these private denominational institutions.

Mr. Chairman, in the Fifty-fifth Congress we had a fight here about voting money to sectarian institutions. I took the position on this floor that until Congress provided institutions for the care of these unfortunates we had no right to refuse to make these appropriations. Take the Providence Hospital—a Catholic institution—a magnificent hospital. In that institution there is what is called an alcoholic ward. Over 3,000 men from this city are sent to that institution to be cared for, and their lives saved from destruction by excesses in drink. You have the Presbyterian Hospital; you have the Methodist Hospital; you have all these institutions.

Now, there is no justification for anybody attacking these appropriations. I say they are insufficient. If we want to care for these people outside of sectarian institutions, then let the Congress of the United States make appropriations for an institution for the blind, an institution for paralytics, an institution for infants thrown out upon the world without any fault of their own. We must make appropriations for the care of these people in public institutions, and until we do that there is nothing else to be done except to make contributions to private institutions for the care of these unfortunates.

Mr. Chairman, I undertake to make this declaration—that there is not a city in the United States or a State that cares for its unfortunates as the city of Washington is doing in these private institutions. The expense for the care of these unfortunate people is 35 per cent less than expenses for similar purposes in the States of the Union. I ask the attention of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON], who is opposed to these appropriations, and I say they are not large enough. I know that the Committee on the

District of Columbia have cut down this bill to the last bottom dollar; and what the gentleman knows about the institutions of this city and the care of the poor and unfortunate in these institutions could be put, as I have heretofore said, in a pamphlet of two pages, while what he does not know on this subject would fill a volume as big as Webster's Unabridged Dictionary.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I think the gentleman is mistaken about the per capita cost in the District of Columbia of caring for these people, as compared with the cost in the various States.

Mr. MAHON. No, sir.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I only desire respectfully to call the attention of the gentleman to that point.

Mr. MAHON. Has the gentleman made any investigation on this subject?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have.

Mr. MAHON. Let the gentleman take the State of Pennsylvania or the State of New York or the State of Indiana or the State of Illinois, and other States, and he will find that the percentage there for taking care of these unfortunates is 34 per cent higher than in the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the gentleman mean the percentage for the whole of them?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Take the gentleman's State. What is the expense there for taking care, we will say, of the insane?

Mr. MAHON. It is 40 per cent in my State, and in this District 20 per cent.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The expense per capita for the care of insane persons in this District is \$220.

Mr. MAHON. The asylum for the insane here is an institution owned by the Government of the United States. In this District we have to care for infants born out of wedlock; we have to care for the poor woman who becomes paralyzed or blind, or the unfortunate man who becomes a victim to alcoholic excesses. Fifty thousand of these people are thrown upon this city.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MAHON. I ask an extension of my time for two minutes. There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Now, what are you going to do with these people? Thus far this Congress has put them under the care of private institutions. You have your Providence Hospital, your Presbyterian Hospital, your Home for Children, your Home for Old Women, your Home for Old Men, embracing many people who do not belong to this District, but who come here and through unfortunate circumstances are thrown upon public charity.

Now, I say again (and I am able to back up the statement with figures in my possession) that the cost of caring for these unfortunate people in this District, through these private institutions, is 30 per cent lower here than for similar support in any State of the Union, and this bill, instead of being regarded as excessive in its appropriation, should make appropriation 30 per cent higher than those that are reported. I take it for granted that no Member of Congress would want these poor unfortunate people, who thus become objects of charity, to die absolutely from disease or destitution. They should be cared for with the same benevolent spirit that is shown for the unfortunate in any of the States of the Union.

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, the committee having this matter in charge has very kindly seemed to court suggestions, even though they border on criticism of number and amounts of the appropriations which are proposed in the bill in carrying out a policy of administration in this city which is maintained upon an extravagant basis. Now, I wish to call the attention of the House and the administration of this city to one point. The gentleman having this bill in charge [Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota] and the chairman of the great Appropriations Committee [Mr. HEMENWAY] have seen fit to-day and upon a former occasion to speak in high terms of the cleanliness of this city. I join issue with them on that proposition. I undertake to say that, taking into consideration the conditions, natural and artificial, here in this city, Washington is the dirtiest city that I ever set foot in, and the dirt and filth contribute to disease more than in any city that I know. As authority for that statement I have the physicians of this city.

The most of your great avenues and streets are paved with asphalt. In some places you have cobbles or granite blocks, but most of the pavement is asphalt, making the streets as level and smooth as a billiard table, and hard and impenetrable. Nothing can get into cracks and crevices, joints or apertures. All the filth and increment is left and exposed right on the very top, where it can be taken off as readily as it could be taken off from any smooth, solid surface. All that is required to be done is for the superintendent of the sweeping of the streets, or others hav-

ing the matter in charge, to see to it that the filth is thoroughly and wholly removed—simply a matter of sweeping clean on a smooth surface. You would expect to find a clean street under these conditions; but what condition do we find? A half-swept, bedaubed, and besmeared street or avenue. This winter we have had an epidemic here of what is commonly known as "grip," affecting a far greater proportion of the people of Washington than are affected in any other city in the whole country, according to the population, so I am told. It has been attributed, in large measure, to the impurities of the atmosphere, filled with poisonous germs and bacteria caused by the filth accumulating upon the streets in a dried, pulverized condition, and then being scattered abroad in the form of fine dust, getting into our nostrils and ears and mouths, inoculating the system with millions of poisonous germs and causing sickness. If we had advanced in the science, skill, and facilities in cleaning streets here in Washington as they have in many other places, we would not have the deplorable condition of the streets which we now have. Up in my city of Worcester, with 125,000 inhabitants, we have a car sprinkler, which can do the work of twenty horse sprinkling carts, and it is in use whenever the streets are dry and dusty, summer or winter. I was surprised when I came here and saw nothing of the kind, but that the old-fashioned water carts were used when any sprinkling was done.

My attention was also called to the fact that there was but very little sprinkling of the streets anyway here, either in summer or winter. Whatever filth falls, after a little of the thickest of it on top is scraped off, the rest, which is usually about one-half, is left to be ground and pulverized when it gets dry, so that it is almost as fine as flour, and then in that dry condition the wind takes it and scatters it through the air to a distance of 50 or 100 feet from the surface of the ground, polluting and poisoning and breeding bacteria in its course. In my city of Worcester this car sprinkler does a great deal toward keeping the surface of the pavement moistened, but not sloppy. Pennsylvania avenue is one of the finest avenues in the world, and one of the easiest to be kept respectably clean, and if a car sprinkler was run over it at different times of the day, the dust and filth would be kept down, and then when night came the streets should be swept, not by one of these little white-winged fellows, but with a regular steam sweeper, or a sweeper to which horsepower is attached, that could cleanse the streets between 12 o'clock at night and 6 o'clock in the morning, so that for a little time at least in the forenoon of each day we might have clean streets. Then in the afternoon the hand sweeping could take place, if this sweeping was thoroughly done instead of half done. We see these men who go about with their little hobbyhorses in the form of hand sweepers. They take off only the top surface of some of the filth upon the streets, not getting it all, and spread the remainder over a large surface, where it is left to dry.

The man passes on with his little cart and scraper, taking some of the scrapings, and the rest is left to be pulverized by the teams that go over it. In a little while it is as fine as flour and is scattered about in the air. I have no doubt every Member of the House noticed when he first came here how much more frequently he had to brush his clothes and wash out his ears and nose than he did at home, because of this pulverized dust in the atmosphere, which contains bacteria and which impregnates everything with its poisonous germs. I say that if the superintendent of the sweeping of the streets in this city would get out and see what is being done in other cities and introduce here some of the improvements that we find in the smaller cities of the country, we could make the streets of this city far more cleanly than they are, and, what is of more vital importance, contribute largely to improved health conditions here. If you pass from here to the Treasury Department this afternoon and look along on either side of the street you will find ample evidence of the truth of statements I make; you will find little bunches of poisonous substances waiting for the sun to dry them and germinate the bacteria and for the wind to blow them about before they are gathered up.

[Here the hammer fell.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HENRY of Connecticut 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. 2204. An act granting an increase of pension to Addison B. Stone;
- H. R. 807. An act granting an increase of pension to William F. Benefiel;
- H. R. 4466. An act granting an increase of pension to William R. Burton;
- H. R. 1317. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. McIntire;
- H. R. 2995. An act granting a pension to Mary Korth;

- H. R. 3769. An act granting an increase of pension to Clinton M. Casey;
- H. R. 4391. An act granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Schwemler;
- H. R. 6951. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Corr;
- H. R. 7436. An act granting an increase of pension to James Smith;
- H. R. 10192. An act granting a pension to Martha Mullins;
- H. R. 10991. An act granting an increase of pension to Frances C. McFarland;
- H. R. 1563. An act granting an increase of pension to Ory Warriner;
- H. R. 4674. An act granting an increase of pension to John Thompson;
- H. R. 3936. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Frazier;
- H. R. 6602. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hackett;
- H. R. 1566. An act granting an increase of pension to Ellis T. Pierce;
- H. R. 8284. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel G. Woods;
- H. R. 2470. An act granting an increase of pension to Harriet S. Packard;
- H. R. 4151. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Poland;
- H. R. 4198. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin Lake;
- H. R. 4392. An act granting an increase of pension to Abbie E. Webster;
- H. R. 9125. An act granting an increase of pension to William S. King;
- H. R. 1287. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrus B. Dopp;
- H. R. 4702. An act granting an increase of pension to John T. Collins;
- H. R. 9710. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Frazier;
- H. R. 10682. An act granting an increase of pension to Marion Arnold;
- H. R. 1485. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin Ferguson;
- H. R. 877. An act granting a pension to Ann M. Driggars;
- H. R. 880. An act granting a pension to Caroline S. Winn;
- H. R. 4630. An act granting an increase of pension to Thaddeus S. Collins;
- H. R. 4314. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. Slade;
- H. R. 4750. An act granting a pension to William J. Jackson;
- H. R. 4540. An act granting a pension to Amanda Skinner;
- H. R. 5045. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Elmore;
- H. R. 5149. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Erwin;
- H. R. 2930. An act granting an increase of pension to Lafayette M. Greene;
- H. R. 719. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Willey;
- H. R. 10968. An act granting a pension to Marceline P. Hamilton;
- H. R. 4192. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick A. Slocum;
- H. R. 720. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Gray;
- H. R. 910. An act granting an increase of pension to Freeman York;
- H. R. 1314. An act granting a pension to Denison L. Brown;
- H. R. 4642. An act granting an increase of pension to William L. Wheeler;
- H. R. 4872. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Bradbury;
- H. R. 5750. An act granting an increase of pension to William Cassidy;
- H. R. 4589. An act granting a pension to Henry H. Barrett;
- H. R. 8984. An act granting an increase of pension to John I. Rundberg;
- H. R. 9778. An act granting an increase of pension to Loriston W. Adkins;
- H. R. 4679. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha M. Pierce;
- H. R. 2769. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Armstrong;
- H. R. 2573. An act granting an increase of pension to William G. Cronkite;
- H. R. 4624. An act granting a pension to Isabella Phelps;
- H. R. 4449. An act granting an increase of pension to William Brown;

- H. R. 7368. An act granting a pension to Annie G. Norwood;
H. R. 8370. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Adams;
H. R. 4179. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha C. Kuhn;
H. R. 4180. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Thomas;
H. R. 783. An act granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Reinhart;
H. R. 2001. An act granting an increase of pension to Nora J. Glahn;
H. R. 6879. An act granting a pension to Reuben A. Finnell;
H. R. 4719. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Carter;
H. R. 5006. An act granting a pension to Sarah Ulshafer;
H. R. 4119. An act granting an increase of pension to William Mercer;
H. R. 4326. An act granting an increase of pension to Wilfred C. McCardell;
H. R. 859. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Barr;
H. R. 3909. An act granting an increase of pension to George Hayden;
H. R. 789. An act granting an increase of pension to Eli Lachman;
H. R. 3910. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Hoffman;
H. R. 3402. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Nagle, jr.;
H. R. 1005. An act granting an increase of pension to Marab E. Powell;
H. R. 4964. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Mink;
H. R. 5342. An act granting a pension to Jane E. Sutfin;
H. R. 9060. An act granting an increase of pension to John Connors;
H. R. 7063. An act granting a pension to Ellen F. Lynch;
H. R. 906. An act granting a pension to Nettie A. Buell;
H. R. 4910. An act granting an increase of pension to Prudentia L. D. Nugent;
H. R. 10700. An act granting a pension to Ella D. Madden;
H. R. 2116. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Ivory;
H. R. 941. An act granting an increase of pension to William D. Taylor;
H. R. 10794. An act granting an increase of pension to Moses Hurlbut;
H. R. 5030. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Mount;
H. R. 4605. An act granting an increase of pension to William Herlinger;
H. R. 8922. An act granting a pension to Martha E. Nolen.
H. R. 8924. An act granting a pension to Georgia A. Whitehead;
H. R. 1623. An act granting a pension to John H. Reed;
H. R. 5479. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Anderson;
H. R. 2192. An act granting an increase of pension to William O. Smith;
H. R. 7410. An act granting an increase of pension to Enos D. Hoge;
H. R. 9035. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Branan;
H. R. 6618. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Coffin;
H. R. 5610. An act granting a pension to Annie Dorfner;
H. R. 5999. An act granting an increase of pension to Ann Jennett Whitney;
H. R. 10194. An act granting an increase of pension to Marion Long;
H. R. 7248. An act granting a pension to Robert H. Cooke;
H. R. 11076. An act granting an increase of pension to Elvira Miller;
H. R. 10640. An act granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Wood;
H. R. 9064. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin Tidd;
H. R. 7719. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Cozine;
H. R. 7382. An act granting a pension to Ellen A. Harmon;
H. R. 7659. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Elliott;
H. R. 7814. An act granting an increase of pension to James G. Andrews;
H. R. 7083. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert P. Jackson;
H. R. 9739. An act granting a pension to Lizzie M. Worster;
H. R. 2692. An act granting an increase of pension to Elwood Finley;
H. R. 8203. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Hemphill;
H. R. 9791. An act granting a pension to Abram Claypool;
H. R. 9999. An act granting an increase of pension to William Edgar;
H. R. 9695. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Spears;
H. R. 5603. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. McCormick;
H. R. 5879. An act granting an increase of pension to Bennett Putnam;
H. R. 6038. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin George;
H. R. 6703. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi Remick;
H. R. 7680. An act granting an increase of pension to De Witt C. Folsom;
H. R. 8379. An act granting an increase of pension to Ira B. Wambaugh;
H. R. 8718. An act granting an increase of pension to Caswell P. Ford;
H. R. 8998. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Beach;
H. R. 8811. An act granting an increase of pension to James Dougherty;
H. R. 10741. An act granting a pension to Mary Tate;
H. R. 11345. An act granting a pension to Joseph H. Huie;
H. R. 8733. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. McGraw;
H. R. 6455. An act granting an increase of pension to Abraham W. Cochran;
H. R. 7096. An act granting an increase of pension to Eva A. Burgess;
H. R. 8966. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Fink;
H. R. 7559. An act granting a pension to Caroline Hurley;
H. R. 8124. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hatfield;
H. R. 7444. An act granting an increase of pension to Washington J. Dutcher;
H. R. 9376. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin Renthler;
H. R. 10268. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Keller;
H. R. 11343. An act granting an increase of pension to Matthew S. Priest;
H. R. 9587. An act granting an increase of pension to Bartlett S. Haggard;
H. R. 9753. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Loomis;
H. R. 7737. An act granting an increase of pension to Howard McGuire;
H. R. 9273. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Sackett;
H. R. 9037. An act granting a pension to Alice W. Clarke;
H. R. 10850. An act granting an increase of pension to Adaline L. Power;
H. R. 10706. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred J. West;
H. R. 10694. An act granting an increase of pension to Alderson T. Keen;
H. R. 10748. An act granting an increase of pension to Kate Ridgeway;
H. R. 11413. An act granting an increase of pension to Jasper F. Morton;
H. R. 11319. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Arnold;
H. R. 7311. An act granting an increase of pension to Rachel Large;
H. R. 10068. An act granting an increase of pension to James G. Soims;
H. R. 9421. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Marshall;
H. R. 5155. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Tompkins;
H. R. 8771. An act granting an increase of pension to Walter F. Horner;
H. R. 10046. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Campton;
H. R. 8970. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Hart;
H. R. 11194. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank S. Nickerson;
H. R. 1316. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Day;

H. R. 6869. An act granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Elmer;
 H. R. 11053. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Eaton Livingston;
 H. R. 11113. An act granting an increase of pension to Silas Soules;
 H. R. 5568. An act granting an increase of pension to Emily Chapman;
 H. R. 5749. An act granting a pension to James B. Combs;
 H. R. 6977. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Graves;
 H. R. 10378. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Shell;
 H. R. 9903. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Harlan;
 H. R. 11310. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Swisher;
 H. R. 9024. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Laird;
 H. R. 9436. An act granting an increase of pension to William S. Campbell;
 H. R. 7992. An act granting an increase of pension to Isidore F. Chamberlain;
 H. R. 8231. An act granting an increase of pension to John Gangwisch;
 H. R. 9835. An act granting a pension to Maggie Fitzpatrick;
 H. R. 7999. An act granting an increase of pension to David W. Williamson;
 H. R. 5580. An act granting a pension to Celia C. Owen;
 H. R. 6999. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Jones;
 H. R. 10180. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. McDowell;
 H. R. 5532. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi Vassar;
 H. R. 8173. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna Waters;
 H. R. 8648. An act granting a pension to Shadrach D. Bardin;
 H. R. 7236. An act granting an increase of pension to William R. McCullough;
 H. R. 9938. An act granting an increase of pension to William Ellis;
 H. R. 8849. An act granting a pension to James S. Lauderdale;
 H. R. 5849. An act granting an increase of pension to Catharine R. Brown;
 H. R. 6816. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Ratzel;
 H. R. 6817. An act granting a pension to Rosa Glass;
 H. R. 6335. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Barnes;
 H. R. 6814. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Miller;
 H. R. 9127. An act granting a pension to Moses Schuman;
 H. R. 11556. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Tappen;
 H. R. 10648. An act granting an increase of pension to Agnes Shearer;
 H. R. 7712. An act granting a pension to Emma Crosier;
 H. R. 7805. An act granting an increase of pension to William N. Hall;
 H. R. 7418. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter Minkler;
 H. R. 8185. An act granting a pension to Herman Lemmerman;
 H. R. 8343. An act granting a pension to Annie P. Erving;
 H. R. 8991. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Mattison;
 H. R. 8992. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Davis;
 H. R. 8079. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles La Forest;
 H. R. 8863. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward O'Malley;
 H. R. 9610. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Halling;
 H. R. 9931. An act granting a pension to Virginia Boyd;
 H. R. 9633. An act granting a pension to Henry Austin;
 H. R. 5863. An act granting an increase of pension to William Simmons;
 H. R. 10904. An act granting an increase of pension to Edson H. Crawford; and
 H. R. 8835. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Jackson.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

11287) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3317) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant right of way for pipe lines through Indian lands.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 569. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse B. Nurse;
 S. 556. An act granting an increase of pension to William Stall;
 S. 454. An act granting an increase of pension to Rinaldo M. Griswold;
 S. 450. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. Sutherland;
 S. 447. An act granting an increase of pension to David H. George;
 S. 353. An act granting and increase of pension to Phebe A. Ford;
 S. 336. An act granting an increase of pension to William Lechleider;
 S. 305. An act granting an increase of pension to John R. Evans;
 S. 236. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Jackson Power;
 S. 140. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Bailey;
 S. 106. An act granting an increase of pension to Carrie Wages;
 S. 2857. An act granting an increase of pension to Onne H. Ropka;
 S. 2690. An act granting an increase of pension to James Garry;
 S. 2661. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Klingler;
 S. 2655. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Zellers;
 S. 2348. An act granting an increase of pension to Hamilton S. Gillespie;
 S. 2320. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Legrow;
 S. 2058. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Roof;
 S. 2029. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter P. Dobozy;
 S. 1959. An act granting a pension to Mary Remington;
 S. 1899. An act granting an increase of pension to Thompson Warren;
 S. 1764. An act granting an increase of pension to John Shehan;
 S. 1667. An act granting a pension to Stalnaker Marteny;
 S. 1661. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Riley;
 S. 1436. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Wentworth;
 S. 1423. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Murry;
 S. 1394. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Webster;
 S. 1388. An act granting an increase of pension to Orson H. Sawtelle;
 S. 885. An act granting a pension to Sarah A. Gillham;
 S. 883. An act granting a pension to Ephraim L. Herriott;
 S. 827. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias S. Gibson;
 S. 783. An act granting an increase of pension to William McGee;
 S. 4455. An act granting an increase of pension to Ansel J. Busby;
 S. 4454. An act granting an increase of pension to John Seiler;
 S. 4371. An act granting a pension to Alison Clifton;
 S. 4349. An act granting an increase of pension to Laura Ann Seaton;
 S. 4329. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Nesmith;
 S. 4317. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Augur;
 S. 4285. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Shands;
 S. 4284. An act granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Hankins;
 S. 4254. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Collingwood;
 S. 4246. An act granting an increase of pension to Louis Groverman;
 S. 4237. An act granting a pension to Hannah Small Wiggin;
 S. 4078. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Steele;

- S. 3970. An act granting an increase of pension to Sterling L. Parker;
- S. 3978. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Howard;
- S. 3977. An act granting an increase of pension to Luther S. Baker;
- S. 3946. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse Bright;
- S. 3936. An act granting an increase of pension to Sylvania S. Cheney;
- S. 3919. An act granting a pension to Florence E. Foster;
- S. 3896. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard F. Nugent;
- S. 3879. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Q. Lemmond;
- S. 3878. An act granting an increase of pension to George Coffee;
- S. 3860. An act granting a pension to James Henry Martineau;
- S. 3833. An act granting an increase of pension to George T. Edwards;
- S. 3827. An act granting an increase of pension to Norman B. Davenport;
- S. 3825. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna H. Lyman;
- S. 3810. An act granting an increase of pension to Virginia B. Mullin;
- S. 3774. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Felton;
- S. 3771. An act granting an increase of pension to Virginia C. Spencer;
- S. 3727. An act granting an increase of pension to Eli Headley;
- S. 3690. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Gregory;
- S. 3654. An act granting a pension to Hannah Hall;
- S. 3651. An act granting an increase of pension to Mildred S. Ogden;
- S. 3573. An act granting an increase of pension to Calvin E. Myers;
- S. 3544. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Phillips;
- S. 3535. An act granting an increase of pension to John Walton;
- S. 3523. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Butz;
- S. 3519. An act granting a pension to Ruby A. Stirdivant;
- S. 3500. An act granting an increase of pension to Orrin L. Mann;
- S. 3499. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Lookingbill;
- S. 3491. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Howe;
- S. 3417. An act granting a pension to Garrett V. Chamberlin;
- S. 3457. An act granting an increase of pension to Marcellus M. Parker;
- S. 3394. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Crawford;
- S. 3377. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Tyree;
- S. 3201. An act granting an increase of pension to James I. Shafer;
- S. 3149. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Browning;
- S. 2971. An act granting a pension to Amelia Walsh;
- S. 2960. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Horning;
- S. 2952. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. P. Buck;
- S. 2946. An act granting an increase of pension to Joshua Day;
- S. 2938. An act granting an increase of pension to James L. Ackley;
- S. 2937. An act granting an increase of pension to Julius Bodenstab;
- S. 2894. An act granting a pension to Clara J. Garretson;
- S. 2872. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert Schermerhorn; and
- S. 2871. An act granting an increase of pension to Justin M. Cooper.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 50.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made from the St. Jones River at Dover, Del., to a point on Little River, and thence to Delaware Bay, for the purpose of determining the advisability and cost of constructing a canal between the said rivers and the deepening and widening of Little River, so as to provide a channel suitable for the needs of commerce from Dover, Del., to Delaware Bay.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with

amendments bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

- H. R. 8925. An act granting an increase of pension to John Weaver;
- H. R. 1851. An act granting an increase of pension to David T. Towles;
- H. R. 2947. An act granting an increase of pension to William F. Thompson; and
- H. R. 3011. An act granting an increase of pension to Phillip Duttonhaver.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHILD-CARING INSTITUTIONS.

Board of Children's Guardians: For the Board of Children's Guardians, created under the act approved July 23, 1892, namely: For administrative expenses, including salaries of agents, not to exceed \$2,400, expenses in placing and visiting children, and all office and sundry expenses, \$10,000.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman of the subcommittee for a little information. I notice in line 19, for administrative expenses, sundries, etc., \$10,000; in line 23, for maintenance, etc., \$12,000; for the board and care of children committed, etc., and the total appropriated for this board is \$62,000. Can the gentleman state how many children are cared for in these institutions? I have no information upon that subject, and I should like to know. No doubt they are great institutions and probably the money is well expended, but I should like just a little more information on the subject.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. According to the report of the board having charge of these matters—

On the 1st of December, 1903, the board had 1,042 permanent wards. Of these, 369 were white and 673 were colored; 637 were boys and 345 girls; 200 were in institutions, for whom board was paid; 116 in private homes, for whom board was paid; 670 in free homes, costing nothing except the expense of supervision, which, according to the latest report of the Board of Guardians, was \$11.21 per annum per capita.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That until and including June 30, 1905, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to advance, on the requisition of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, made in the manner now prescribed by law, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary from time to time to meet the general expenses of said District, as authorized by Congress, and to reimburse the Treasury for the portion of said advances payable by the District of Columbia out of the taxes and revenues collected for the support of the government thereof; *Provided*, That all advances made under this act and under the acts of February 11, 1901; June 1, 1902, and March 3, 1903, not reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States on or before June 30, 1905, shall be reimbursed to said Treasury out of the revenues of the District of Columbia from time to time, within five years, beginning July 1, 1905, together with interest thereon at the rate of 2 per cent per annum until so reimbursed; *Provided further*, That the Auditor for the State and other Departments and the auditor of the District of Columbia shall each annually report the amount of such advances, stating the account for each fiscal year separately, and also the reimbursements made under this section, together with the balance remaining, if any, due to the United States; *And provided further*, That nothing contained herein shall be so construed as to require the United States to bear any part of the cost of street extensions, and all advances heretofore or hereafter made for this purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be repaid in full from the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. PERKINS. I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman in charge of the bill. I should like to ask, Mr. Chairman, what is the amount of the advances that have been made by the United States to the District of Columbia?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. It is about \$1,600,000 at this date.

Mr. PERKINS. How much will be made in this bill?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. About \$400,000, in round numbers.

Mr. PERKINS. Not more than that?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I think not.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he sees any reasonable ground to expect that these advances will ever be repaid?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I do, Mr. Chairman. For instance, take the bill we are now considering. Many of the expenditures in this bill are for permanent improvements which will be completed in the very near future. For instance, we spend \$1,600,000 in round numbers this year in completing the water-filtration plant. That will be out of the bill the next year entirely. We expend other large sums for approximate completion of the sewage-disposal system, of which I spoke yesterday. If not next year, the year following we will have that general system completed, and the large appropriation for it will be out of the bill. With such items out, there will be a remainder every year from the regular income of the District out of which we can pay all the interest and make some payment on the principal.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, does the gentleman think that the expenses of the District will be less? Will they not increase in the future as they have in the past?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. We have not increased current expenses very much this year, Mr. Chairman, nor last year. Last year, in answer also in part to what has been said on the other side, I think we put in only two increases of salaries and practically no increases of employment aside from the schools and police force. This year we put in some additions for the schools and for fire protection. So after the regular payment of the expenses of the District there will be left, we believe, a reasonable sum to apply on the principal of the debt.

Mr. PERKINS. Why is it impossible to increase the revenues of the District?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. We have just got through last year making an effort to increase them, and we have materially increased them. We added a tax on personal property which had theretofore not been made, and increased the rate of taxation upon real estate. We framed a bill last year on what seemed to be the judgment of the committee and of the House and of Congress as to what ought to be done in the premises, and it does not seem as though we should open the matter again now. We should leave this new plan of taxation in undisturbed operation for a while at least.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 72, after line 8, insert:
"No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be available for paying expenses of horses and carriages or drivers thereof for the personal use of any officer provided for by this act."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, that amendment—

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order, so as to hear the explanation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have no objection to the gentleman presenting his point of order at this time.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is probably not subject to a point of order, but I would be glad to have the gentleman explain his amendment and its necessity, in view of the fact that we have already covered this same ground in the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk, and which has been read, is the language placed on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill that passed the House, restricting the use of carriages by Government officials. The bill in that form went to the Senate, and I find, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 2459, that the Senator having the bill in charge said:

There has grown up a practice whereby almost every head of a bureau or Assistant Secretary or Assistant Postmaster-General seems to have been able to get a carriage at Government expense. There has been a good deal of talk about it, and almost a scandal, and the committee thought it was desirable to limit it to certain officials, so that there should be no further question as to who is entitled to a carriage at Government expense. We have none ourselves at Government expense, and a good many other people ought not to have them, I think.

The language of that bill also included, in addition to what the amendment now proposes to include, that the heads of Departments and the Secretary to the President should be allowed this privilege, suiting itself to the purposes of that bill. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make it safe. The Senate, however, in their amendment adopted an amendment to the House amendment saying that in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill and in all other acts by Congress no carriages shall be permitted to the various officers.

Now, if the gentleman has in mind the superintendent of schools and the superintendent of waterworks, as to those two I have no objection if he desires to amend by including their right to this privilege. But the act passed by the Senate cuts them all out, excluding those I have mentioned, in all bills. I think there should be a restriction on this right to the use of carriages. And in the interest of orderly legislation I want this bill to say so, as the matter is in the interest of reform and meets a crying evil. Now I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentleman, he says that in a bill which has already passed this House and is pending between the two Houses, the provision appears which he has just sent forward to be added to this bill. Am I correct?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But it also includes this—and the gentleman may not have heard me in making my statement—it includes the Senate amendment, that in no other acts of Congress shall this privilege be allowed.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Now, Mr. Chairman, taking the statement of the gentleman just as he makes it, I would like to ask him what good purpose is to be served by adding to this bill the paragraph which the gentleman himself says is in another bill which will be enacted into law before this bill has passed, a bill which has already passed the House and is now pending between the two Houses, being perfected, and which will become a

law sooner than this bill? What good purpose will be served by putting on this bill the identical paragraph which will become a law before this bill does?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. This House has not passed upon that question. The Senate has passed upon that question, and I desire to support the proposition of the Senate and make this in the interest of orderly legislation, so that this bill may contain that provision which the Senate amendment carries upon it. On that the Senate has acted; this House has not.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Does the gentleman doubt that this House will agree to its own provision as amended, if the amendment is a good one?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. You can not tell when it goes into conference how this House will act upon any proposition before it, unless you resort to the difficult task of voting down the conference report.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. And therefore the gentleman would send with this bill similar language to conference?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would send it to this particular conference, and I would have the House pass upon this salutary provision that met with the unanimous support of the Senate. It is a provision which the gentleman will not deny is a salutary one. And I hope that he will accept the proposition, because it is in the line of the House legislation on that subject in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. It is in this interest and in the same language as the Senate passed unanimously upon that subject. And now let the conference committee on that bill be supported with this provision now passed. What objection is there to it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Then, Mr. Chairman, I rise in my own right. I invite the gentleman's attention and that of the committee to page 12 of this bill, where will be found, in lines 15 and 16, these words:

Provided, That horses and vehicles appropriated for in this act shall be used only for official purposes.

I repeat the language, since the gentleman from Indiana does not seem to have heard it—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes, sir; I did hear the language.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota (reading):

That horses and vehicles appropriated for in this act shall be used only for official purposes.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing new in the amendment introduced by the gentleman, as we had already put into this bill a paragraph having every good effect to be accomplished by the amendment proposed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman's provision, just read, says they may use carriages for official purposes, and my amendment seeks to escape the very language in which the gentleman affirmatively recognizes the use.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Why, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman assuredly will not say—just let me read this again.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It says that they may employ these carriages for official use.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Does the gentleman object to that?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I say they shall not use carriages at all, except if the gentleman desires the superintendent of schools and the superintendent of waterworks to use them. If that is necessary, he can move that the amendment be amended for that purpose.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The gentleman would not allow the chief of the fire department, for example, a horse and carriage to be used in the discharge of his official duties. Is that what the gentleman means?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If that is true now, the Senate has already deprived you of it, if the language of its amendment prevails. I would permit necessary use, and so propose to the gentlemen the amendment to the amendment. If the provision in this act would hold the construction claimed, it would be objectionable to that use. The Senate has already cut you out.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana is willing that his proposed amendment shall be amended, showing that he recognizes that in its present form it is not only faulty, but mischievous.

In this bill we have already, as I have shown, taken the opportunity of forestalling any use of horses and carriages except for official purposes. That has been accomplished in the paragraph which I have already read. We are not going to agree that such officers as the chief of the fire department shall be denied a horse and carriage for his official use; but our provision denies horses and carriages "except for official use," thus accomplishing every good purpose sought.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the gentleman deny that carriages have been used for official purposes unwisely, unjustly, and without warrant of law?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Let me read the language of the provision again:

That the horses and vehicles appropriated for in this act shall be used only for official purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Which is the same purpose that they have been pretending to use them for—official purposes—under this system of abuse.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. How can the gentleman make it any stronger than that makes it? It is a waste of time to consider this amendment, for it is already in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was considered; and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk proceeded and read the last section of the bill, as follows:

Sec. 4. That all laws and parts of laws to the extent that they are inconsistent with this act are repealed.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This bill is about to be reported to the House for final consideration and enactment. In my judgment the most difficult problem that faces us is municipal control. A great many other things demand attention, but no one problem seems to present difficulties so insoluble as that of city government. The expenses of other cities have been mentioned here, and it has been said that they afford no criterion by which to judge of the sufficiency or the insufficiency of the provisions for the expenses of this capital. One statement concerning them may be safely made. Extravagance, wastefulness, and dishonesty is the rule and economy and honesty the exception in the government of our cities. One gentleman said he thought the appropriations carried in this bill ought to be 30 per cent larger. I can well conceive of a bill carrying 30 per cent larger appropriations which would meet my cordial indorsement. Were a bill offered here to-day providing appropriations 30 per cent larger than this bill provides and the object of the appropriation was to beautify and adorn this great capital it would receive my support and the indorsement of the people of Missouri.

But if it provided for a sealer of weights and measures at a salary of \$6,000 a year, and came from a committee whose only answer to a criticism of that provision was to inquire whether the gentleman making it knew the precise duties of that official, I think there is no sane voter in the United States who would not say that it was time to inquire where the money goes that is voted out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the whole country to expend here in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, we are the accredited representatives of the people of the several States. Most of us were sent here because the people of our districts thought that, to the extent of our ability, we would faithfully perform the duties of lawmakers. The duty that devolves upon us to-day is to contribute to the solution of this insoluble problem of municipal control our best offering. Would you invite the city councils of the great cities to inspect this bill as a guide? Would they find in it an example by following which they may sift out wrongful appropriations? The evil of city government most injurious to the public is the spoils system. It is a fact that with a large and frequently transient population it is very difficult to obtain in cities the very best results at the ballot box. It is difficult to place in charge of municipal governments those best able to administer the affairs of a great city.

But here no such difficulty exists. To safeguard Washington against evils unescapable in other cities, you abolished the right of self-government in the District of Columbia, and Congress undertakes to perform duties elsewhere performed by aldermen chosen at popular elections. This bill goes to the country as the highest exemplification of our capacity, sitting as a board of aldermen, for to-day we are charged with the duties of a city council. This bill goes to the country—explained by the subcommittee charged with its preparation, and defended by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations—as the best offering of the most inefficient city council that curses an American municipality. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the reading of the bill is concluded.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I now ask to return to page 22, as was agreed when we were on that page, to offer the following amendment, which I will send to the desk and ask to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 22, after line 15, insert:
"For the repair of the Anacostia Bridge under direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, \$100,000, and the said Commissioners are authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for the repair of said bridge, to be completed within two years from July 1, 1904, at a cost not to exceed \$250,000, to be paid from time to time as appropriations therefor may be made by law:

Provided, however, That before any part of this sum shall be used, the Anacostia and Potomac River Railroad Company shall pay to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia the entire cost of the pavement lying between the exterior rails of the tracks and for a distance of 2 feet from the said exterior rails of said tracks on each side thereof and the entire floor system supporting said pavement, and said collector shall deposit one-half of same in the United States Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia and one-half to the credit of the United States, nor shall said appropriation be available until said railroad company shall agree to assume one-half the cost of maintenance and repair of said new bridge to be collected in the same manner as the cost of laying pavements between the rails and tracks of street railways as provided for in section 5 of 'An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia,' approved June 11, 1878: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available until the Anacostia and Potomac River Railroad Company shall agree that any other railroad company now or hereafter authorized by Congress to use said bridge shall have the right to use the tracks of the Anacostia and Potomac River Railroad Company thereon upon such reciprocal trackage and such compensation as may be mutually agreed upon, and in case of failure to reach such an agreement that the supreme court of the District of Columbia, shall upon petition filed by either party, fix and determine the same."

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order to the substitute offered on the ground that it is not authorized by existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman, if he desires to be heard.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill a question, if he will permit me.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The bill as originally presented to the committee and as read yesterday was apparently for the purpose, at least this section was, of constructing a new bridge. I will ask now if that is still the intention, to construct a new bridge and at the same place?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The language of the provision yesterday was "to reconstruct" the bridge. There is a bridge there now. The purpose of the provision was stated to be "to reconstruct" that bridge.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Did that amount to constructing a new bridge?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. That is a matter for the Commissioners to settle when they finally investigate the matter. How much of the existing bridge can be used I do not know.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I notice that the gentleman has changed the language now to "repair" the bridge.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Is that done simply to avoid the point of order?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. We think this work should be done, and we know that we can "repair" a bridge.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Then the gentleman will say that this is not to construct a new bridge?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. "The gentleman" will say that it is just what it purports to be—to reconstruct a bridge that is now there. How much of the existing structure can be used "the gentleman" does not know; does not pretend to know. He does not believe that anybody knows. That is a matter for investigation when they come to arrange for the repair or reconstruction.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I still insist on the point of order. I should hate to call this a subterfuge; but even if the present amendment truthfully states what it is intended for, still there are other provisions of the bill that I think are subject to the point of order. I desire to read a portion of Rule XXI, section 2:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress.

I do not believe that it will be contended, Mr. Chairman, that this is a work that is already in progress. Therefore I contend that even the fore part of this substitute comes squarely within the operation of Rule XXI, to say nothing about the balance of the new legislation incorporated in the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LAWRENCE). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair will cite a ruling made in the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress to the effect that "the admissibility of an amendment should be judged from the provisions of its face, rather than from the purposes which circumstances may suggest." This amendment states that the appropriation made thereby is for the repairing of a bridge. The Chair will therefore rule that it is an appropriation for a work now in progress; that it is an expenditure previously authorized by law. The amendment provides that the appropriation shall be withheld unless certain conditions are complied with. All the provisos are distinct limitations upon this appropriation. The Chair will overrule the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question having been put on agreeing to the amendment,

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota called for a division. The question being taken, there were—ayes 76, noes 8. So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee now rise and report the bill as amended to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LAWRENCE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration House bill 12833, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments and with the recommendation that the bill with the amendments be passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded upon any of the amendments? [A pause.] In the absence of any demand for a separate vote the question will be taken upon the amendments in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORTS ON PENSION BILLS.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the several conference reports, which will be found in print on pages 2850 and 2851 of the RECORD. They are conference reports on private pension bills.

The SPEAKER. That is a matter of the highest privilege.

The House proceeded to consider, respectively, the reports of committees of conference on bills of the following titles, the reports having been already published on pages 2850 and 2851 of the RECORD:

H. R. 958. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred H. Rogers;

H. R. 3776. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred I. Judy;

H. R. 6022. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Travis;

H. R. 468. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Christy;

H. R. 3903. An act granting an increase of pension to George C. Sherman;

H. R. 892. An act granting an increase of pension to Abram H. Hunt; and

H. R. 5176. An act granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Dutch.

The conference reports as read were respectively adopted, on motion of Mr. GIBSON.

Mr. GIBSON. I move to reconsider the several votes by which these conference reports have been agreed to, and also move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill, and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that the order of business for to-morrow be postponed until Tuesday next, so that when we have begun the consideration of this appropriation bill we may continue it from day to day until it is concluded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] asks unanimous consent that the order of business under the rules for to-morrow be transferred until Tuesday next. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I would like to understand whether the regular order for to-morrow will be the consideration of bills from the Committee on War Claims?

The SPEAKER. No; bills from the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GIBSON. The Committee on War Claims has no objection to this change in the order of business.

Mr. SHERMAN. The War Claims Committee does not object, and at any rate business from the Committee on Claims has preference to-morrow. I consulted the chairman of the Claims Committee before making this request, and he has assented to it.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I will not object. I simply wished to understand the matter.

I understood that to-morrow was war-claims day. I now understand that it has been displaced by claims.

Mr. SHERMAN. To-morrow is private-bill day, with a preference for claims, not war claims.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. And I further understand that claims will be taken up on Tuesday.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. You will lose no time.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. And that no time will be lost.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is right.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Speaker, if this request is granted, will the Private Calendar be in the same situation on Tuesday that it otherwise would occupy to-morrow?

The SPEAKER. Precisely.

Mr. GRAFF. With reference to all bills on the Private Calendar?

The SPEAKER. Precisely. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make some agreement with reference to general debate, if possible.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I would inquire of the gentleman if points of order have been reserved on the bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. Oh, yes; they were reserved long ago. I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to four hours. Is that agreeable?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think five hours will be as little as we could consent to.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to five hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to five hours. Is there objection?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Two hours and a half on a side?

The SPEAKER. Two hours and a half on a side.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should have included in the request that the minority time be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] and the majority time by the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HITT. I ask the gentleman from New York to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. HITT. I desire to call up a conference report that has just come over from the Senate, on the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, and I ask that the conference report itself be omitted and that, instead of reading it, the statement be read.

Mr. SHERMAN. Has it been printed in the RECORD?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask if the conference report has been printed in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. Has the conference report been printed?

Mr. HITT. It has not. It just came in.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Then it must take its usual course and be printed, under the rule.

The SPEAKER. It will be printed in the RECORD, under the rule.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11287) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 43, and 44.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by said amendment, and on page 15 of the bill, between lines 16 and 17, insert as a paragraph the following:

"Lourenço Marquez, Africa."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "four hundred and ninety-six thousand five hundred dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

ROBERT B. HITT,
ROBT. ADAMS, JR.,
HUGH A. DINSMORE,

Managers on the part of the House.

EUGENE HALE,
S. M. CULLOM,
H. M. TELLER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

Statement of the managers on the part of the House to accompany the conference report upon the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill (H. R. 11287).

The managers on the part of the House of Representatives make the following statement of the result of the conference with the managers on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11287) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906:

The amount appropriated by the bill as it passed the House was \$1,935,800.69. The increases added by the Senate amounted to \$77,300, so that the bill as it passed the Senate appropriated \$2,073,100.69.

The Senate receded from its amendments providing \$30,000 for legation

buildings at Seoul, Korea; \$2,000 for the cost of cablegrams, etc., for consular reports, and \$36,000 to provide for thirty clerks at the principal consulates.

The House receded from its disagreement to the provision for \$1,000 additional salary for the minister to Roumania, Servia, and Greece; \$5,000 additional for the chargés d'affaires ad interim; for the secretaries of legation at Denmark and Portugal, at \$1,800 each; for an increase of \$1,000 to the consul at Lourenço Marquez, Africa; to the creation of consulates at Chungking and Hangchow, China, at \$3,000 each; to increases of \$500 each in the consul's salary at Odessa, Russia; Budapest, Austria-Hungary; Ciudad Porfirio Diaz, Mexico, and Rouen, France; to the provision fixing a salary of \$1,500 instead of fees (about the same amount) at the consulates at Moncton, New Brunswick; Port au Prince, Haiti, and Turks Island, West India.

The clerk-hire allowance at Monterey, Mexico, was increased \$600. The titles of the consular posts at Lourenço Marquez, Tientsin, Chefoo, Fuchau, and Hankow were made "consuls," instead of "consuls-general," as provided by the Senate amendments.

The net decrease in conference from the bill as it passed the Senate is \$83,000, making the amount of the bill as now reported \$2,020,100.69.

R. R. HITT,
R. ADAMS, JR.,
Managers on the part of the House.

DIPLOMATIC, 1905.

Amount of House bill	\$1,995,800.69
Increase by Senate	77,300.00
Amount as passed Senate	2,073,100.69
Decrease in conference, namely:	
Legation buildings at Seoul, Korea	30,000.00
Cost of cablegrams, etc., consular reports	2,000.00
Consuls-general (transferred to consuls schedule)	16,000.00
Clerks (30) at principal consulates	86,000.00
Total decrease	84,000.00
Increase in conference, namely:	
Consuls restored (made consuls-general by Senate)	16,000.00
Clerks at consulates	15,000.00
Total increase	31,000.00
Net decrease in conference	53,000.00
Amount as agreed to in conference	2,020,100.69

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion.

On motion of Mr. SHERMAN, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12684) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes, with Mr. BOUTELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall occupy but a very brief portion of the time of the committee in stating the amounts appropriated by this bill and for what purposes and referring very briefly to the legislative matters contained in the bill.

In total there was estimated this year in the original estimates nearly a million dollars less than was carried in last year's appropriation bill. The bill as now presented to the House carries some \$200,000 more than the amount found in the Book of Estimates; but save one or two items there is no appropriation in the bill that is not recommended by the Department or by the Bureau, either in the Book of Estimates or in some subsequent communication.

The total carried by the bill is \$7,610,000. The total carried by the Book of Estimates was \$7,400,000 and some odd. The amount appropriated last year was \$8,500,000.

The general policy of the Government in reference to the Indians has not materially changed in the last three or four years. It has been extended, particularly in reference to doing away with rations and using the treaty moneys, especially for the Sioux, that it is provided we shall expend for them, in paying the Indians for their labor. In other words, they have enforced labor rather than feed them in idleness. That policy began some years ago, and pursued year by year has brought about a very much better condition of civilization and morality among the Indian tribes than had heretofore existed.

I have prepared here a statement, somewhat voluminous, taken from the reports of Commissioners of former years and taking extracts from reports of various agencies upon this general subject of employing Indian labor, which I will not detain this committee to read, but will insert in the RECORD. To my mind it is entertaining, and it is exceedingly gratifying to those who are interested in the uplifting and civilization of the Indian tribes.

The appropriation for schools is somewhat larger than it was last year, and somewhat larger than originally estimated for in the Book of Estimates.

I think it is known that the entire Indian population now is, in

round numbers, 270,000, of which the New York Indians and the Indians of the Territory number some 70,000 or 80,000; so that there are, in round figures, 200,000 Indians in the United States exclusive of Alaska. During the past year there was enrolled in the various Indian schools, reservation and nonreservation—I am using entirely round figures—25,000 Indian children of both sexes, and an average attendance of some two or three thousand less than the enrollment in Government schools. The progress made in the schools, as appears by the report of the superintendent of schools, and of the head of the educational division of the department, and of the Commissioner, is gratifying.

I think I hardly need to elaborate before this Committee of the Whole the different kinds of schools and what is attempted to be accomplished thereby. I think it is pretty well known here. I think that is all I need to say in reference to schools.

I desire to call the attention of the committee to the report, which is No. 1022, in which this year, for the first time, we have set out in full the various treaty stipulations under which all the treaty provisions are made in the bill. I think the members of the committee and of the House will find that, not only in considering the bill at the present time but in future years, a ready pamphlet of reference.

There are a number of provisions in the bill, Mr. Chairman, which you will readily see are entirely out of order, obnoxious to the rule, and I shall not contend if any gentleman sees fit to make the point of order against them after hearing the explanations as we reach those provisions of the need and the requirement for them. If any gentleman raises a point of order at the time, they must go out.

There is no provision in the bill of a legislative nature that has not had the approval of the Committee on Indian Affairs as well as the approval of the Department. The Committee on Indian Affairs has given to the bill this year exhaustive consideration and examination. We have consumed all the time in at least a dozen or fifteen meetings in going over with great care each particular item of the bill; and they have been wonderfully unanimous in the conclusion reached in reference to all these items, whether they carry appropriations or are purely legislative provisions.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that is all I care to say at the present time. When we reach the reading of the bill it will give me, or give other members of the committee better versed in reference to certain provisions of it, pleasure to answer any inquiry that is made by any gentleman on the floor, giving them the fullest possible information that is to be obtained with reference to the items.

APPENDIX.

LABOR IN LIEU OF RATIONS.

Prior to 1902 rations were issued to all the Indians of a tribe without regard to their worldly condition, the well off as well as the poor. In that year, after consultation with the President, the order was given to drop all of the self-supporting from the ration roll.

After further consideration of the subject it was decided not to issue rations to any of the able-bodied at all, but to give them a chance to earn their own living; and an order to that effect was also given.

The steps that led up to that are described in the following pages.

PRECEPT AND PRACTICE.

Cutting off rations.—In previous reports some space was given to the discussion of the Indian's progress and the difficulties to be overcome on his way to civilization. It was pointed out that among the obstacles to his self-support the first and perhaps the principal one was the then prevailing ration system, which was justly condemned as encouraging idleness with its attendant vices and as foreign in its results to the very purpose for which it was designed. At the same time, while an evil, it was admitted to be a necessary evil, to be endured only while the Indian was learning the art of self-support, or at least put in a way where, by the exercise of ordinary industry, he could support himself. The continuance, however, of the practice of the indiscriminate issue of rations to all alike, without regard to their worldly condition, was earnestly opposed, and it was laid down as a correct rule of action that only the old and helpless should be supported, while the able-bodied, if not already self-supporting, should be given the opportunity to work and should then be required to take care of themselves.

Faith without works is dead. Realizing this, the Office set to work to show by its acts the sincerity of its belief.

And here it is proper to say that this change in the manner of dealing with the Indians was not a hasty conception on the part of the Office. Indeed, it was not new at all. It has been the hope and desire of enlightened men for many years. But inasmuch as it has been the subject of some harsh criticism and severe condemnation, and as the Indian Office has been freely charged with ignorance and blunders, it is simply fair that the motives which governed it and the principles which actuated it should be known and understood in order that the public may form an intelligent judgment on the matters involved. For this purpose it is necessary to go over some familiar ground and give it a somewhat extended notice.

The present movement began some two years ago, and arose out of a communication from chiefs and headmen of the Sioux Indians of the Rosebud Agency. About October, 1900, they addressed a letter to the President representing that they were the headmen of the Sioux Indians of Rosebud Agency and represented the tribe; that under the "Black Hills treaty" of 1876 they were to be given certain rations; that these rations had been cut down from time to time until they were getting much less than the amount stated in that agreement; that they were hungry much of the time, especially the old and crippled, and that before the winter was over they would suffer very much; that in former years they could make some money by freighting, but as their annuity goods had been taken away, a large part of their freighting had fallen off; that in years past they got the hides from the beef cattle killed for issue, which were a great help in procuring things to eat; that they would

obtain more benefit from the hides if issued to them direct than if they were sold and the money paid to them once a year; that they needed the hides to make moccasins and covering for their beds, etc.; that as they got little freighting and no beef hides, and were unable to raise much on their land, they had to depend on the rations issued by the Great Father; that while they wanted to obey his orders, yet they could not sit down and see their people starve; that they had talked many times with their agent, who was powerless to do anything without the authority of his superiors, and that they would like to have some assurance that something would be done for their relief. They therefore asked the President to answer them through their agent and tell them if he could help their people.

Recognizing that the tone of that letter was probably symptomatic of the feeling then pervading the Sioux people generally, and that the conditions at Rosebud were similar to those existing at the other Sioux agencies, and, further, that the action taken with regard to the Sioux would have an important bearing upon other tribes similarly situated, the office, with a view of contributing to the better understanding of the matters referred to, submitted to the Department, along with the Indians' letter to go to the President, a communication treating of the Sioux Nation as a whole. That communication, after reciting the substance of the Indians' letter, took up the consideration of the Black Hills treaty, the true intent and meaning of which has been the subject of so much contention, and quoted the articles of that agreement relating to the matters under discussion, as follows:

"ART. 4. The Government of the United States and the said Indians, being mutually desirous that the latter shall be located in a country where they may eventually become self-supporting and acquire the arts of civilized life, it is therefore agreed that the said Indians shall select a delegation of five or more chiefs and principal men from each band, who shall, without delay, visit the Indian Territory, under the guidance and protection of suitable persons, to be appointed for that purpose by the Department of the Interior, with a view to selecting therein a permanent home for the said Indians.

"If such delegation shall make a selection which shall be satisfactory to themselves, the people whom they represent, and to the United States, then the said Indians agree that they will remove to the country so selected within one year from this date.

"And the said Indians do further agree that in all things to submit themselves to such beneficent plans as the Government may provide for them in the selection of a country suitable for a permanent home, where they may live like white men.

"ART. 5. In consideration of the foregoing cession of territory and rights, and upon full compliance with each and every obligation assumed by the said Indians, the United States does agree to provide all necessary aid to assist the said Indians in the work of civilization; to furnish them schools and instruction in mechanical and agricultural arts, as provided for by the treaty of 1868.

"Also to provide the said Indians with subsistence consisting of a ration for each individual of a pound and a half of beef (or in lieu thereof, one-half pound of bacon), one-half pound of flour, and one-half pound of corn; and for every one hundred rations 4 pounds of coffee, 8 pounds of sugar, and 3 pounds of beans, or in lieu of said articles the equivalent thereof, in the discretion of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

"Such rations, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be continued until the Indians are able to support themselves.

"Rations shall, in all cases, be issued to the head of each separate family; and whenever schools shall have been provided by the Government for said Indians, no rations shall be issued for children between the ages of 6 and 14 years (the sick and infirm excepted) unless such children shall regularly attend school.

"Whenever the said Indians shall be located upon lands which are suitable for cultivation, rations shall be issued only to the persons and families of those persons who labor (the aged, sick, and infirm excepted); and as an incentive to industrious habits the Commissioner of Indian Affairs may provide that such persons be furnished in payment for their labor such other necessary articles as are requisite for civilized life.

"The Government will aid said Indians as far as possible in finding a market for their surplus productions and in finding employment, and will purchase such surplus, as far as may be required for supplying food to those Indians, parties to this agreement, who are unable to sustain themselves; and will also employ Indians, so far as practicable, in the performance of Government work upon their reservations."

It was then shown that the rations provided for the Sioux at the time were sufficient, unless the Indians were improvident, to prevent want. The letter then went on to say that the Sioux rations, as well as the rations for all other tribes, had been gradually reduced; that this was in accordance with the policy of this office and the spirit of the Sioux agreement of 1877, and that the true intent and meaning of that agreement was forcibly expressed by a former Commissioner of Indian Affairs nearly ten years before. In writing to the Secretary of the Interior at that time in relation to the subsistence supplies issued to the Sioux, Commissioner Morgan quoted articles 4 and 5 of the agreement as they have already been given here, and then said:

"This agreement is still in force, and the questions now raised are questions as to how far the Government has kept its obligations.

"It is worthy of special note that the end aimed at in the agreement was the civilization of the Indians. They were to settle down permanently; their children were to be educated; they were to live like white men, and the rations issued to them, or so much as might be necessary, were to be continued until the Indians are able to support themselves. It is clearly evident that the Government never intended that the Indians should look to it for continuous support; that no promises of this kind were ever made, and that the Indians themselves did not expect it, and apparently did not desire it. The object of the rations was not that the Indians might be fed by the Government, but simply that they might be assisted and kept from want during the period of their probation while they were learning the art of self-support.

"No one will question the wisdom of this policy. No intelligent man will doubt that the welfare of the Indian demands that just as soon as possible he shall be rendered self-supporting, and that any help in the way of food or other supplies furnished him by the Government in excess of his absolute needs so as to remove from him the spur and stimulus to labor is not a kindness, but an injury.

"The only serious question which can be raised in this connection is, how long a time are these rations to be continued and under what circumstances the Government shall reduce or discontinue them.

"It should be noted that the agreement expressly stipulates that—

"Whenever the said Indians shall be located upon lands which are suitable for cultivation, rations shall be issued only to the persons and families of those persons who labor (the aged, sick, and infirm excepted); and as an incentive to industrious habits the Commissioner of Indian Affairs may provide that such persons be furnished in payment for their labor such other necessary articles as are requisite for civilized life."

"It certainly will be accepted as a truism that the Government had a right to demand of the Indians that they put forth for self-support whatever efforts might reasonably be demanded of them, considering their nature and surroundings. It will also be admitted that, considering the end in view, it would be a humane act on the part of the Government to decrease the ra-

tions, even though such decrease should bring temporary hardship, provided such hardship should serve as a stimulus to labor and self-help. Of course no one would urge that the Indians should be starved. In fact, all that can be demanded, either in fulfillment of treaty obligation or as an act of justice or humanity, is this, that the Indians shall put forth all proper exertion in the way of gaining a livelihood by their own labor, as other men are forced to do, and that in connection with such effort on their part food supplies shall be issued to them in such quantities (not exceeding the amounts named in the agreement) and for such length of time as a sincere regard for the highest welfare of the Indians shall dictate."

The remainder of the letter was devoted to showing that the Sioux Indians, aside from rations, had received annually during the thirty years previous a suit of clothing or material to make it; that they had also received a large number of beneficial articles, such as agricultural implements, fence wire, building material, etc., for which \$5,480,300 had been appropriated during the thirty years the treaty was alive; that they received the proceeds of the sale of hides derived from beef cattle; that they got more benefit from them this way than the other; that they were receiving 5 per cent annually on \$3,000,000 in the Treasury, one-half in education and one-half in cash; that they had received since 1860, 20,000 cows and 900 bulls; that at the time of that writing they possessed over 88,000 head of cattle; that they were able to sell that year probably 5,850 head to the Government to be issued back. In passing it may be interesting to observe that within the last thirty-three years there has been appropriated for the benefit of the Sioux nearly \$30,000,000 for the purposes named.

This was forwarded to the President by the Secretary of the Interior in a letter dated November 28, 1900, which is referred to and partially quoted in his last annual report, the conclusion of which was that the time had come for Indians either to support themselves or at least to furnish a part of their own support; and this conclusion was heartily approved by the President.

It then being winter, it was not considered judicious to make any immediate change in the prevailing policy, and so the issue of rations was continued as usual the remainder of that fiscal year. Before the next fiscal year opened, however, steps were taken to carry out the views expressed. On June 20, 1901, a letter was addressed to the Sioux agents, which, as it is the first enunciation of the future policy to be pursued, is given in full:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
"OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
"Washington, June 20, 1901.

"SIR: As the next fiscal year is approaching, when new arrangements will go into effect for the support and civilization of your Indians, it is a proper time to address you on the subject of the issuance of rations to the Indians on the Sioux reservations.

"As you are doubtless aware, this subject has had the earnest attention of those who are actively engaged in the Indian Service as well as those who, though not connected with it in an official capacity, sympathize in the work, and the almost universal opinion is that the indiscriminate issue of rations is a hindrance rather than a help to the Indians.

"The fact is recognized that a majority of your Indians, perhaps a large majority, are unable to support themselves, even if they would, except only partially, and therefore must be subsisted wholly or in part as contemplated by the agreement of 1877. On the other hand, it is a well-known fact that a large number of persons classed as Indians have profited by the assistance they have received from the Government and are now not only beyond want, but, in many instances, are prosperous and often affluent. How many of these there are is not known to this office, but it is certain that, having reached the stage of self-support, they are no longer entitled to the ration prescribed by the agreement referred to.

"In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the meaning of this, the earnest attention of your Indians is invited to a correspondence that took place last fall. In October, 1900, the office received a letter signed by Sioux Indians of the Rosebud Agency, addressed to the President, relative to their condition, their projects, and their needs. They referred to the Black Hills agreement of 1877, the reduction that had been made in the ration prescribed thereby, the loss of income by reduced freighting, their inability to raise much upon their land, and asked the President to answer them through their agent and tell them if he could help their people.

"This letter was forwarded to the honorable Secretary of the Interior, with a brief report as to the number of the Sioux, the benefits and meaning of the so-called Black Hills treaty, the rations provided for the current year, the disposition of hides, the income from their trust fund, the number of cattle they were able to sell the Government to be issued back again, and other particulars relating to their welfare.

"The Secretary of the Interior transmitted the Indians' letter to the President, and after referring briefly to the several items of that report, referring to the Rosebud Indians in particular, became more general and said:

"Article 5 of the treaty of 1876, known as the Black Hills treaty with the Great Sioux Nation (of which the Rosebud Indians are a part), which was ratified by the act of Congress approved February 28, 1877 (19 Stat., 254), provides for assistance for the said Indians in the work of civilization; to furnish them schools and instruction in mechanical and agricultural pursuits; also a certain prescribed ration, which ration, 'or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be continued until the Indians are able to support themselves.'"

"From the representations made by the writers of the communication referred to it does not seem that they or the other Indians of the Rosebud Agency are any nearer the goal of self-support than they were twenty-four years ago, when the treaty was made. Regardless of the provisions in the treaty looking to the reduction in the ration as they become able partly, if not wholly, to sustain themselves, which they appear to be able to do, and notwithstanding the facts stated by the Commissioner that individual Indians of this band own nearly 20,000 head of cattle, and that more than 1,500 head were purchased from them last year, at a cost to the Government of more than \$50,000, which cattle were afterwards issued to and eaten up by the band, they still claim full benefits under the treaty named."

"He concluded his letter by saying—and this is commended to the serious consideration of your Indians:

"From the facts stated it does seem that the time has come when individual Indians who are so well qualified to at least furnish a part of their own support as some of these Indians seem to be should be required to take upon themselves a portion of the burden of their own care. The Government has faithfully and well fulfilled its obligations to them, and as the treaty of 1876 is mutual in its provisions, I respectfully recommend that such individuals as are known to be able to do so be required to furnish their own support, or at least to contribute toward it, so that the Government may be relieved of their care, and the spirit of the treaty of 1876, in that respect, carried into effect by them as well as by the Government, and that answer to this effect be communicated to them through their agent, as requested."

"It is understood that this matter received the earnest attention of the President and that he gave the Secretary's letter just quoted his unqualified approval.

"In the face of this the indiscriminate issue of rations to all alike must stop.

"It therefore becomes your first duty to go over the ration rolls of your agency and erase therefrom all those who are wholly self-supporting. Your next duty will be to regulate the ration issued to the necessities of the recipients. As now practiced, it is understood that rations are issued to all alike—that is, they are distributed equally among the Indians of your reservation without regard to their worldly possessions. This should not be continued longer. Many families are, perhaps, partially self-supporting, but in different degrees. In such cases the rations should be issued according to the particular needs.

"In determining who shall receive rations one important consideration must not be overlooked. Rations must not be issued to those who have no disposition to attempt to support themselves. The law and regulations to this effect are old, but in many cases seem to have been honored more in the breach than in the observance. Nevertheless, they are good, and should be enforced so far as conditions will allow.

"The Office is unable to lay down any particular rule for the guidance of agents in arriving at correct conclusions in these matters. Indeed, an arbitrary rule would not work satisfactorily. In some cases it will not be a difficult task to determine who is self-supporting, in others it undoubtedly will. Neither will it be easy at all times to determine just to what extent a family or an individual should be assisted. In all cases it will be a matter of judgment in which that of the agent will or should largely predominate.

"The duty herein prescribed is an onerous one, and affecting as it does so deeply the present and future welfare of those under your charge, you will recognize the propriety of bringing to its discharge the most impartial, conscientious care. If the assistance of this Office is needed, it will be given for the asking.

"It is possible that some of those who are able to support themselves may voluntarily withdraw from the ration roll, and thus contribute to the cause by their example. To the knowledge of this Office there have been instances of this, and doubtless if the object to be obtained were properly presented there would be others.

"It is admitted that perhaps progress will be slow, but the time to begin it is here, and the object of this letter is to bring the Indians to a realizing sense of the attitude of the Government.

"At the proper time it is proposed to send you, as was done last year, a statement of the quantities of subsistence purchased for your Indians for the next fiscal year. They are believed to be ample for the needs of all who should receive rations if the spirit of this letter is observed.

"There is another class of Indians to whom the issue of rations would seem to be uncalled for. I refer to those drawing a salary from the Government. The number of these is large, many of them holding desirable positions, with very liberal salaries. A hasty examination of the salary list of the Sioux agencies shows that over 150 of the agency employees alone are Indians receiving salaries from \$840 per annum down to \$120, very few, however, of the latter. The majority of these earn as much as, if not more, year in and year out, than the average laborer of the country. There is no question in the mind of this Office that the issue of rations to these should stop.

"There are also a large number employed in the schools with salaries from \$900 down, besides quarters and other conveniences. The impression prevails here that many of these, if not all, draw rations. If so, the Office can see no reason for the continuance of the practice.

"These two classes, therefore, should be eliminated from the ration roll. The Indian police are excepted from this ruling, as their salaries are very small and their duties are peculiar. There may be other exceptions to the rule. If so, the Office will consider them on their merits.

"It is the desire of this Office to have this new departure go into effect as soon after the beginning of the new fiscal year as possible.

"This letter has been addressed to the agents in charge of the Sioux of different tribes, except Santee."

Later on, in September, 1901, a similar letter was sent to all other ration agencies on the ground that what was good for the Sioux was good for all, so that by the fall of 1901 all of the ration agencies were on the same basis with respect to the self-supporting.

While this was a step in the right direction, it did not remove the great evil to be overcome, which was the support of Indians in idleness. The extent and demoralizing effects of this evil were generally recognized and universally condemned, except, perhaps, by a mistaken philanthropy, which, ignoring the natural law that man must earn his living by the sweat of his brow, would exempt the Indian from labor and carry him upward on flowery beds of ease. Much had been said about this evil, and sporadic attempts had been made to check it, but with little avail. For years the Indians had been fed and clothed and allowed to spend their time in the devil's workshop.

It was felt that it was time for a change. Heretofore the dealing had been with the tribe; it would now be with the individual. He would no longer be looked upon simply as one of a dependent community to be dealt with as a whole, but would be considered independently and treated as one capable of developing those qualities which would lift him above the level of a pauper and fit him to become a useful member of society. His manhood would be appealed to. An attempt would be made to teach him self-reliance and self-respect. He would be induced to acquire habits of industry and to forsake the ways of idleness. Necessity, and necessity alone, would do this. He must want before he would work; he must come to the bitter realization that idleness and hunger go hand in hand, and understand that he must put his hand to the plow if he would live. His rations would therefore be stopped and he would be offered work instead, work that he could do; not aimless work, but work with an object; not made to dig a hole one day and fill it up the next simply for the sake of doing so, that would deprive labor of the very essence of its work—a definite purpose. He would be put at something which would give him not only a present living, but which he could see would bring him benefit in the future. He would be paid fairly and promptly for his work, and then left to provide for himself.

Accordingly in the early part of January of the present year agents were advised that rations would no longer be issued to the able-bodied, but that the money thus saved would be used to pay them in cash for labor in building roads, dams, or reservoirs for storage of water, or any other work that would give them profitable occupation for the present and lead to their self-support in the future. Men were to be paid \$1.25 a day of eight hours, and men with teams \$2.50. Not only were the agents to employ the Indians to the fullest extent themselves, but they were to use all of their influence in finding employment for them in the surrounding country, and it was suggested to them that they should devote the greater part of their time to the civilization of their Indians, leaving the minor details of administration to subordinates, and that an Indian agency should be a bureau for employment of Indians rather than a center for the gratuitous distribution of supplies.

As this has been the subject of considerable animadversion and been stigmatized as a plan for the encouragement of contract labor, it is proper that some particular notice should be taken of these strictures, and the false charges refuted. As to the assertion that the plan is to hire out adult male Indians as contract laborers, nothing can be further from the truth. In all the correspondence there is not even a hint of such a thing. It was simply suggested to agents that they should circulate the information in the surrounding country that laborers could be obtained at their agencies, if such were the fact. If they could not give the Indians work themselves, they were to

find it for them if they could. And that was their plain duty. If reference is made to the Black Hills treaty, already quoted, it will be seen that the Government obligates itself to aid the Sioux Indians in finding employment.

The agents, therefore, in publishing the fact that there were Indians willing to work, were simply carrying out both the letter and spirit of that agreement. In all of this there was not the slightest suggestion of hiring the Indian out under contract. That implies coercion. There was not a thought of such a thing. He was to be given an opportunity to work; that was all. If the Government did not have it, it was to find it for him. He could work or not, as he chose. He was as much a free agent with respect to this as anyone else, only if he were given the opportunity to work and refused he was not to expect to be supported by the Government.

The new policy was received with much discontent in some quarters and passive, if not open, opposition in others. There were a few mutterings and a good deal of talk about vested rights, some sympathetic expressions over the hard luck of poor Lo, and here and there a prophecy of an "uprising." Interested parties endeavored to create a sentiment against it, while self-constituted conservators of the Indian either cast aspersions upon its authors or damned it with faint praise.

In spite of these and other adverse influences the office persevered with its policy and is now in a position to form an intelligent idea of its effect. Everywhere the results have been favorable even beyond expectation. Misgiving in some quarters has given place to confidence, and while, perhaps, the experimental stage has not been passed, there is every reason to believe that the final success of the plan, if carried out judiciously, is assured.

As a first result over 12,000 have been dropped from the ration roll, being wholly self-supporting. As a second result a large number of Indians have been put to work, or work has been found for them. As to the effect of this let others speak.

One agent writes:

"The Indians are eager for work, even some of the older ones, classed by the physicians as physically unable to work, insisting on having work. * * * These Indians are working as faithfully and intelligently as could be expected of people who have never had occasion to work for their support, and there can be no question as to the wisdom of the new policy and its good effect on these people."

Another says:

"The results so far are very gratifying. * * * As soon as the fact that work could be secured was known by the tribe, applications came faster than they could be employed. One man, over 50 years of age, when drawing his pay for a few days' work, acknowledged it was the first money he ever earned, and seemed pleased that it was possible to secure money without waiting for annuity or lease payments. * * * There is no question but that the time was ripe for the adoption of the present policy."

Another:

"I think this new policy has had a very desirable and stimulating effect upon these Indians to look for employment, while a great many of them are always ready to work when they can see that they are to be compensated for it; yet they seem now to be more anxious for work than ever before."

Another:

"We have succeeded beyond our most sanguine expectations. Over 300 have been secured employment outside of the Government work. They are employed on the railroad, by ranchmen, in cutting wood, shearing sheep, and other minor occupations. They are paid by the railroad \$1.50 per day; by ranchmen \$30 per month and board; for chopping wood, \$1 per cord; shearing sheep, 7 cents per head, and other labor in proportion. * * * The result of all this is that the Indians have lived better than ever before. * * * No one has suffered by the reduction of rations, but, on the other hand, there has been less discontent and complaint than I have ever before known. * * * In conclusion, I beg to recommend that the present policy of handling the Indians at this agency be continued."

And still another:

"I could have secured employment for practically all the able-bodied Indians in this agency if they would have accepted it. * * * Some of these pretended friends of the Indians, instead of encouraging them to accept this work, even at small wages, have been assiduously trying to discourage them from going. * * * Concerning those who did go to work off the reservation, I would say that they gave perfect satisfaction to their employers, who have informed me that they would rather have them than white laborers. * * * The general effect on the Indians of the work done on the reservation has been a very good one. It has been very satisfactory from all standpoints."

An inspector says:

"Above all else I believe the best lesson an able-bodied Indian can have is to convince him that he must work or starve. If he complains that there is no work to do, the Government should be prepared for him with labor on roads, irrigating ditches, coal fields, lumber camps, etc. For such work let him be paid a moderate sum in cash. To pay in rations or to pay more than the Indian earns are both errors which experience has proven should not be repeated. But if the Indian says he is hungry, let him be shown the 'Government wood pile' and be compelled to work his way through it."

A superintendent of thirty years' experience writes:

"Your letters * * * point toward the fact that the Indian Office expects in the near future to discontinue the gratuitous issue of rations. Any time during the last twenty years I would have hailed this step as a boon to these Indians. * * * The policy of the Government in issuing so much to them gratuitously has dwarfed their energies, cultivated their dependence, and encouraged their extravagance.

"After over thirty years of issuing gratuitous rations, after distributing many carloads of farming implements, wire for fencing, and wagons and harness, after receiving two cash annuity payments, * * * these Indians to-day farm less than they have at any time for the last fifteen years, and are less willing to do a day's work for the money than at any time for many years. There are very few who are not in debt. There is more drunkenness than at any time since I knew them. The gratuitous issues, along with their cash annuities and the lease money derived from leasing their allotments and renting their houses built for them by the Government, made their resources so large that they were not compelled to work for a living, and as they were not obliged to work they did not do so for recreation, and as they were idle they naturally fell into the habit of gambling and drinking as a pastime. * * * I heartily indorse the policy proposed by the Indian Office of giving them an opportunity to earn their own living and in furnishing them plenty of work to do."

These extracts could be multiplied, but those given are sufficient to show the trend of sentiment of those having an experimental knowledge of the situation.

But it may be said that these are in the service and their reports are colored from interested motives. Let us therefore see how it looks to outsiders. Here is a graphic article taken from the New York Sun of last summer:

"SIOUX HAVE LEARNED TO WORK.

"ROSEBUD INDIAN AGENCY, S. DAK., June 23.

"On July 1 the order of the Interior Department requiring the Sioux to go to work becomes effective on this reservation. But the Sioux, he who forty

years ago inspired terror in the Northwest with tomahawk and rifle, has already gone to work. In this fact is found the most important step toward civilization in the history of the Sioux. Not only has the Department succeeded in making the fiercest Indian tribe self-dependent, but a sacred tradition of the Sioux has been given up.

"With it will go the blanket, the feathers, the long hair. The spectacle of the Indian in blouse and overalls plowing and harvesting side by side with the white in blouse and overalls—which might have seemed a dream a quarter of a century ago—may be witnessed to-day by any visitor at the Rosebud Reservation.

"When Commissioner Jones announced that the Indian must give up his locks, and, more, must go out into the fields and toil, predictions of trouble came out of the agencies, for the Sioux granted disapproval.

"*Paleface, he make treaty,*" said the grizzled chieftains. "He make treaty and give us meat and clothe us, and now paleface won't do it. The Great White Father said it, and now paleface make us work."

"The wrinkled tribes men were right and they resented this apparent bad faith. The Sioux nation was the most powerful in the Northwest. It cost thousands of lives to subdue it and the Government was glad to make a liberal treaty. The 1868 treaty provided that the Indians should confine themselves to certain territorial limits and in return should be supplied with food and raiment and stock for thirty years.

"In 1878 gold was found in the Black Hills. There was a white invasion. The whites wanted the cession of the hills from the Indians. The Sioux wanted \$7,000,000. The commissioners laughed at the demand, and the Indians left the council furiously. Red Cloud interceded, and the Indians agreed to give up the hills if the Government would agree to keep them in food and clothing for an indefinite period after the thirty years stipulated in the 1868 treaty until they should become self-supporting.

"The 1868 treaty cost the Government many millions. When it expired, in 1898, the Interior Department was not disposed to prolong the paternal system, and determined to put the redskins at work.

"The Sioux remembered the treaty and grumbled, and agents sent word to Washington that the order could never be enforced. Then the Sioux ran out of money. Provisions were running low under the curtailed orders. Agricultural tools had been sent from the Department that the Indians might go to work on July 1. It became noised about the reservation that all who would work would be paid at the rate of \$1.25 a day. The Indians thought long over their pipes.

"To labor," grumbled White Crow, "is demeaning."

"To work," added Red Feather, "may also mean things to eat and stuff to drink."

"Let's go and ask the white boss to give us work then, and give us money," concluded Big Moon.

"The three Indians went to the agent with their request. The agent had told the Department that he didn't think it of any use, and the hoes and rakes and plows and picks and shovels would be likely to rust away. To be asked voluntarily for work by the Indians, therefore, made the official speechless with astonishment.

"Recovering, he offered to show them how. The three Indians trotted along behind him. He was puzzled how to initiate them, but he set up a grading plow and showed the redskins how it was used. The dirt soon began to fly, and the new road that had been surveyed so long that it had become a joke was being made.

"Other Indians came to look on. They said nothing, but when at night Big Moon, Red Feather, and White Crow told them they had each made \$1.25 that day, they, too, went to the agency and wanted work.

"The squaws were in a state of bewilderment. When they saw the young Indians approaching with picks and shovels they imagined that their hard lot as tillers of the field, hewers of wood, and drawers of water was to be made harder by these cumbersome tools. When the Indians went out into the fields and began working the squaws came out and looked on in astonishment. They glanced at one another and tapped their heads significantly. It soon became evident that the Sioux had been changed. He had entered a new era. Hereafter he will no longer be a ward; to all intents and purposes he will become a citizen.

"But not all the young Indians are so progressive. There are many who want to escape work. They found that those in ill health would be excused, and they flocked to the agency physician, inventing and vividly acting the most astonishing ailments. But the physician has not been fooled, and few have obtained certificates of ill health.

"The Indians are chiefly engaged in building roads and fences, bridges and reservoirs, while some are improving their allotted lands. While, in Indian minds, work is associated with the semislavery of the squaw, the redskin has also come to realize the value of the dollar. The same avarice that appealed to the Sioux attracted the Pine Ridge Indians. They heard of the Sioux and the big dollars and swooped down on the agency clamoring for work. They were told it was only for the Sioux, and they went away grumbling. The paradox of an Indian discontented because he can not work may yet make trouble for the Pine Ridge agent.

"Congress appropriated \$22,000 for an effort to make the Rosebud Reservation self-supporting. Success in the venture is now foreseen, and the additional \$10,000 promised will be expected. The Sioux will wake up some morning and find himself self-supporting. With this change will disappear the last vestige of barbaric raiment, and the Indian will have become as civilized as he may be."

Some of this may be imaginary; there are some inaccuracies, and doubtless the characters are fictitious, but as a whole it presents a true picture of the situation and is suggestive of the change that is going on. The ration system and the reservation system are doomed. Let them go. Take away the incentive to idleness and obliterate the boundary between ancient prejudice and modern progress. Break down the barriers, open the way for civilization, build the roads that it may march in and settle around the Indian homes. When that is done the dream of the celebrated peace commission of 1868 will come true. Mechanics and artisans will enter, trade will spring up, and the nucleus of a civilized community will be formed.

While the prospect is hopeful, it will not do to be too sanguine and relax effort. A beginning only has been made. Much is yet to be done. It will only be by patient, laborious work that the end in view can be accomplished.

The foregoing was written late in 1902. Since then other reports have come in showing how the new policy is working.

The agent at the Colorado River Agency, Ariz., wrote in June, 1903:

"Discontinuance of rations.—My chief effort during the past twenty months, with reference to issuing rations, has been to eliminate from the ration roll all, or nearly all, the strong, able-bodied men, and to assist them in obtaining work, and I am pleased to say that this system has worked well, although vigorously opposed were these same big, lusty, lazy fellows. Two years ago 875 Indians were drawing rations. One year ago but 200 were drawing rations at this agency, while at this time and for several months past the average has been but 80, and these, being old and infirm, and from other causes being unable to work, draw but small rations of flour, beef, and salt. The results and progress made in this direction have been highly satisfactory."

In October, 1903, the Crow agent, Montana, wrote:

"July 1, 1902, we cut from the ration rolls 1,000 Indians, and at the beginning of this fiscal year we intend to take one-half as many more from the rolls. Our Indians are well informed as to the intention of taking from them the Government support as fast as possible, and they take to it kindly and are putting forth their best efforts to make a living."

The Fort Belknap agent, Montana, wrote, in September, 1903:

"Rations.—Subsistence has been cut off to the very lowest point. While at the outset it entailed a good deal of grumbling and made many a "sore-head," and, for a short time, many an empty stomach, the people, with commendable spirit, took up the new order of things and began to cast around for means of subsistence. Some found it working on the irrigation system, others on the outside of the reservation, and others in the cultivation of the soil. However, during the winter aid will have to be given to quite a number who are earning their own living at the present time."

The Fort Peck agent, Montana, said, in August, 1903:

"New Indian policy.—The new Indian policy as inaugurated over a year ago has been very successful on this reservation. On May 1, 1901, over half the Indians were stricken from the ration roll and a number have been dropped since that time. No able-bodied Indian receives any support from the agency so long as work can be obtained for him, either on or off the reservation. If an able-bodied Indian comes to us asking for bread, we give him a shovel; if he won't use the shovel, we give him the guardhouse, and we have had very few cases where work was provided and the Indian would refuse to do it to support himself. A very large number of the Indians do not bother the agency at all for work; they seek it from outside sources, or work for themselves. Quite a number of them have engaged in contracting in the surrounding country, doing such work as plowing by the acre, or making ditches by the yard, etc. Of course, in the dead of winter little work can be obtained, either on or off the reservation, and at times it becomes necessary to feed some of the able-bodied. At least 95 per cent of the money earned by the Indians is spent for food and clothing."

In August, 1903, the Jicarilla agent (New Mexico) wrote this:

"When I assumed charge of this agency every member of the tribe was allowed to participate in the rations distributed. Agency employees (Indian) who were receiving salaries of \$50 per month were allowed the same share as those unable to work. This practice was discontinued, and the number allowed rations gradually decreased, until at present the ration roll carries 300 persons.

"That the issuing of rations to the whole tribe is neither necessary nor prudent is evidenced by the fact that a conservative estimate of money earned by the tribe will show \$15,000 during the past year. This money was derived from the following sources: Paid by the Government for work on reservoirs, ditches, and roads, \$10,000; earned by labor on neighboring ranches, \$2,000; proceeds of sales of baskets, beadwork, etc., \$3,000.

"If the present policy of paying for labor in lieu of issuing rations is continued for a few years, I feel assured that the Jicarilla Apaches can be placed in such a position that they will no longer be dependent on the bounty of the Government. The money being spent, as now, in the building of storage reservoirs, will enable the tribe to have an assured means of support through the tilling of the soil."

From Standing Rock Agency, N. Dak., August, 1903:

"Roads and roadmaking.—About \$20,000 has been expended during the past year in the employment of Indians, in lieu of rations, in the construction of roads, reservoirs, and general improvements to the reservation. The beneficial effects of this plan are very evident even to the casual observer. The tendency toward a feeling of greater self-reliance and independence among the Indians is very marked. It is my intention so far as practicable to afford means of self-support from this source to all able-bodied Indians of the agency. A large number of the older Indians will, of course, have to be more or less supported by ration issues, but this number is steadily growing less, and the number of those capable by education and opportunity of self-support is steadily increasing. It is very gratifying to note the increasing number of voluntary applicants for this work."

From Cheyenne and Arapaho Agency, Okla., September, 1903:

"Condition.—It affords me no little pleasure to state that there is absolutely no doubt but what these Indians are, as a whole, in better condition than at any time since I have known them. Throughout the year they have shown a contented and comparatively happy state, and many who have heretofore been placed in the category of loafers are trying to do something for themselves and families. Seeing the benefits to be derived from such action on their part, there is no doubt but what a continuance may be expected and gradually the desired results obtained. As a consequence of these improved habits, old customs and obnoxious tribal practices are rapidly passing away, and the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indian is becoming entirely competent to take his place as a citizen and to hold his own against even the most unscrupulous white neighbor."

The superintendent in charge of the Seger colony of Cheyenne and Arapaho, in Oklahoma, who has lived among them for thirty years, writes in August, 1903:

"In regard to the industries carried on by the Indians in this agency I can not speak too highly of the plan of employing Indians to labor in lieu of issuing rations to them. It gives the able-bodied an opportunity to work for their own maintenance under competent instruction, and in a way that the result of their labors will contribute to the immediate improvement of the public highways and Government property. It leads them to perform a diversity of industries which gives them needed experience and opportunity to acquire skill in the work they are engaged in. It can be seen that the wages they receive, and which contribute to their immediate necessity, is not the only benefit derived by them. They like and appreciate the change from receiving rations gratuitously to the opportunity of working for them, and they say themselves that they are healthier since they began to work for their support. They now have to look ahead a little while, at least to provide for their families. Under the ration system they only had to wait for ration day to come around. It will be seen by this report that the Indians of this agency as a whole have added to their support to no small extent by the crops raised on their farms."

From the Cheyenne River Agent (South Dakota), August, 1903:

"Rations.—The contraction of the ration policy and expansion of the labor policy is doing more for the civilization of these people in a practical way than any plan with this object in view that has ever been inaugurated among them. It has brought them to the realization that their labor is worth something, and that only a few days' labor will buy more supplies, of greater variety, than the rations heretofore furnished them by the Government. It is surprising and commendable, indeed, to see the avidity with which they look for and take hold of the work, and reflects a passing remark made by a recent visitor at this agency, while watching a gang of Indians doing some grade work on a road, "Why, I don't see but what they do just as well as the same number of white men would do at the same work."

"While the present policy gives them an idea of the value of their labor it also teaches them the value of the money earned with their own labor, and can not help but imbue them with a feeling of independence and self-reliance, when they can go, after receiving their money thus earned, and spend it where and as they please. The contrast between this way of dealing with

the Indian and thus providing a means of earning his own subsistence as compared with the old way of former years, in taking his ration sack to the warehouse on ration days, month after month and year after year, and there taking the rations allowed him, marks a new era in the history of the civilization of the Indian."

From Crow Creek Agency, S. Dak., August, 1903:

"Rations.—Rations are being issued only to those who are over 50 years of age and those who are not able-bodied. Out of 1,006 Indians enrolled at this agency there are 540 self-supporting; that is to say, they are supporting themselves under the labor policy inaugurated by the Department last year, and which is a step in the right direction for the future welfare of these people."

From Pine Ridge Agency, S. Dak., August, 1903:

"Under the new working system and during the fiscal year 1903 about \$55,000 was disbursed for labor performed by our able-bodied Indians in lieu of all issues of rations. The work was done in making and repairing roads, building dams for reservoir sites, irrigation ditches, fences, corrals, etc. The work was done under the immediate supervision of Mr. Willis, a competent engineer, and in a good substantial manner. Thirty-eight dams for reservoir sites were constructed at different points on the reservation. In the construction of these dams some 150,000 cubic yards of earth were removed. Twenty-five good, substantial bridges were built on the various streams throughout the reservation. Corrals at agency and substations were repaired, and 20 miles of wire fence was constructed to complete our north line fence and connect same with Rosebud north line fence. The greater part of our work laid out for this summer will be in constructing irrigation ditches. Water will be diverted from all streams, some small and some large, where there is water sufficient to irrigate with, even though it may in some cases be on a small scale. The dams that are being put in on the streams to divert the water are built to last. We had our mechanics build a pile driver, and it is now being used in driving piles for all the dams."

"About 400 Indians are working, and as ample funds are available, work will be furnished them the balance of the summer. From amount of funds authorized for purchase of gross beef, flour, hay, and other supplies for this agency for the fiscal year 1903, a saving of about \$30,000 was made."

"The new system is meeting with a fair degree of success on this reservation. The younger element of Indians are taking kindly to work, and it is noticeable that they are taking better care of their money earned this year than they did last. The larger part of their earnings are spent for provisions for themselves and their families. Their earnings, however, enable them to eat three times a day. Under the ration system, if they were economic, and saving with rations given them, it would afford them not more than one meal a day."

From the Rosebud Agency, S. Dak., August, 1903:

"With the exception of the winter months, the able-bodied Indians have been at work during the fiscal year building and repairing fences, making and repairing roads, building dams and reservoirs, and other work of a permanent nature in the improvement of the reservation, all of which work the Government has provided, and for which it pays the Indian in cash \$1.25 per day, or \$2.50 a day with team, in lieu of all issues of rations. Some of the Indians find employment off the reserve, but by far the greater number accept the work and pay here provided for them, and have done quite well, not only in the amount of work performed, but also in subsisting themselves and families."

"It can not be expected that these Indians can yet successfully compete with white labor, but in course of time they will be able to, and many of them must do so, for it may be that the Government will not continue to provide employment for them any great number of years to come, although I believe it would be well to continue the work along present lines for an indefinite time."

From Yankton Agency, S. Dak., August, 1903:

"There is no longer any doubt as to the wisdom of cutting off rations. About 20 per cent of the tribe is now borne on the ration roll. Those cut off during the last year and a half are living as comfortably as before, and have the knowledge that they are existing by their own efforts."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman think it an inopportune time for me to ask him about the policy which may be considered or outlined by the committee or embodied in this bill with reference to the abolition of or the continuation of the Dawes Commission in the Indian Territory?

Mr. SHERMAN. The bill in terms limits the life of the Dawes Commission to the end of the next fiscal year. In other words, it provides specifically that the work of this Commission shall be completed and the Commission cease to exist on the 1st of July, 1905.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Has the gentleman or the committee any information that that work can be accomplished by the Commission in that time?

Mr. SHERMAN. It has, if Congress does not impose upon that Commission added duties. In my judgment the work of that Commission would have been completed before now, and it was prognosticated here two or three years ago that it would have been completed ere this. If Congress had not imposed additional duties and work on the Commission, the work would have been completed. But I believe, spurred on with this declaration that the Commission must cease to exist on July 1, 1905, that all the work that is now imposed upon the Commission can be completed prior to that date.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I do not want to impose upon the gentleman's judgment, but there is a bill that has been recently introduced here which seems to have the sanction of the Secretary of the Interior, and is it not his judgment that that would impose great duties upon the Dawes Commission and lead to its indefinite life?

Mr. SHERMAN. The bill that the gentleman refers to is a bill introduced by my colleague [Mr. CURTIS], who for some years has been chairman of the subcommittee having in charge the matters especially relating to the Indian Territory, and that gentleman [Mr. CURTIS] advises me that this does not impose duties upon the Dawes Commission which would necessitate the continuance of their existence longer than the date I have mentioned.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Has the gentleman in the appro-

priation here gone to the end that the policy of the Government shall be a discontinuation of that Commission?

Mr. SHERMAN. That certainly is our declaration just as distinct as it is possible to make it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And you think Congress will be able to accomplish that result with the language of the gentleman's bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. There is no question in my mind about accomplishing it with the language. The language is, "And said Commission shall conclude its work and terminate on or before the 1st day of July, 1905, and said Commission shall cease to exist on July 1, 1905."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If the gentleman will permit me, I consider that the Dawes Commission is in its operation a self-perpetuating body, and that in delay they have accomplished more evil than they have accomplished good, and is it that a desire to accomplish good to the country and Indian Territory has been submerged in the desire to serve themselves? Now, they started out in 1892 with the matter of the enrollment and have constantly taken 70,000 practically uncontested cases and minutely and elaborately heard evidence and gotten up their written decisions where they should have considered the 10,000 contested cases, and in that way they added to their life tenure almost, and I hope the gentleman and his committee will see a termination of that condition, so that we may find that the people of the Indian Territory are not suffering any more in the deplorable conditions aggravated and accentuated by reason of the entangling system of the Dawes Commission.

Mr. SHERMAN. The gentleman has declared what his belief is. He has not asked me what mine is.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would like very much to have it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I disagree with the gentleman in a large part of his sweeping criticism of the Dawes Commission. I think that Commission has done wonderful work. It has brought about the betterment of conditions down there to an extent that ten years ago no one would have believed was possible. Possibly they have taken more time than another commission would have taken. In my judgment, as I stated a moment or two ago, they would have completed their work long ere this had not Congress in its wisdom constantly added other duties; and I believe now that the termination of this work is in sight, and I shall be surprised if we find it necessary next year to ask that this Commission be continued beyond July 1.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman tell us about how much of the annual appropriation is for the machinery of this Commission?

Mr. SHERMAN. The appropriations, all told, are something under a million and a half dollars. My colleague tells me \$1,400,000, all told, from the creation of the Commission down to the present time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. What would the gentleman say toward cutting down the appropriations, so that we would have only one commissioner instead of the entire body of the Commission?

Mr. SHERMAN. That suggestion was quite fully discussed by the committee. We had two members of the Commission before us, and it seemed at this stage of the work unwise to make this change. We have been crossing a river. We have reached almost to the far bank, where we are taking hold of the grass or stubble and pulling our boat to the shore, and therefore it seemed unwarranted at this time to change our policy. If the Commission were cut from four to one, it would be necessary to employ certain high-salaried clerks at least to perform the duties that other members of the Commission now perform, so that in money there would not be a total saving. It would only be a partial saving at most. I think it would be bad policy, in my judgment, at present to change the Commission.

Mr. PERKINS. What are the duties of this Commission? Will the gentleman state them briefly?

Mr. SHERMAN. The duties are defined in the various acts which have been passed. To cover it in one or two sentences, they were originally to enter into an agreement with the five tribes known as the "Five Civilized Tribes," and then to carry out all the provisions—that is, the several agreements, making up the rolls of citizenship, allotting land, setting aside town sites, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman yield to me for five minutes?

Mr. SHERMAN. I give to the gentleman from Iowa five minutes.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel willing to allow the attack on the Dawes Commission to go by unchallenged. The Dawes Commission has been a very useful organization.

So far as I am concerned, I do not think it ought to be finally discharged until the new State comes into the Union, by which some additional local government can be established over that region. The Dawes Commission has served as a controlling body

between the white people on the one hand and the Indians on the other. They have served the purpose of molding the heterogeneous and complex conditions into a more simple form in that Territory.

We found ourselves in the preparation of the Curtis law, for instance, confronted with Indian customs, Indian laws enacted by Indian legislatures, Indian treaties, complex situations between the different tribes transferred from the different parts of the country in that Territory. The Dawes Commission having the confidence of the Indians and having been headed by a man that they looked upon all their lives as their tried and true friend, Senator Dawes, yielded their judgment to the views of that Commission. It has been a conciliatory organization and has enabled the Government to enforce and carry into operation the wise measures involved in the Curtis Act.

It is hardly possible to listen with patience to the assault that has been made on these gentlemen. The Commission has wisely managed the affairs of the Territory. There is a Territory without any organized government at all, without any general system such as is known to the other Territories, and this Commission has taken the place of the Government, in some sense at least, and has enabled the Federal Government to bridge over the difficulties with which it found itself confronted.

This Dawes Commission has done a good service. When the history of that Territory is written the names of these commissioners, and the eminent gentleman whose name is associated with the Commission, will receive the honor they deserve. If my friend from the Committee on Territories [Mr. ROBINSON] is able to aid in bringing in a bill that will transfer that Territory to a condition of statehood in the new State, provide legislative control there to take the place of this arbitration control, or the board of conciliation, as you might call it, the Dawes Commission, he will do well, and if they will frame a bill putting the Indian Territory into a new State of Oklahoma, they will do well to recognize the good work that the Dawes Commission has performed in the last ten years in getting that country ready for statehood.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I do not care to speak further, but I did not want these criticisms to go by uncontradicted, without some protest on the part of the Committee on Indian Affairs, who certainly know that the distinguished men have done a wise and useful work in the years that have passed.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. FINLEY. I have heard it stated—I do not know with how much truth—with reference to the Dawes Commission, that the members of that Commission, or some of them, were interested in land speculations and corporations making investments in the Indian Territory. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any knowledge of that?

Mr. LACEY. That matter has been investigated by Mr. Bonaparte, and the report will be published probably soon giving details. My understanding is that some of the Dawes Commission have owned stock in banks there.

Mr. FINLEY. And land companies?

Mr. LACEY. No; not in land companies, but in trust companies, investment companies, and banks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. FINLEY. I wish to ask the gentleman if he thinks that it is prudent, and for the best interests of the Indian Territory, for the members of the Dawes Commission to be interested in investment companies and trust companies?

Mr. LACEY. I think it is wise for a man to shun even the appearance of evil; but my understanding is that investigation has shown no wrongdoing on the part of any member of the Dawes Commission. My own judgment is that if the time of the life of the Dawes Commission expires under the bill before the Territory is admitted into the Union, that time ought to be extended by further legislation. I do not know whether the balance of the committee will agree with me, but I do believe that this Commission ought not to go out until the State comes in, and the State ought to come in in time to take up the work where the Dawes Commission leaves it off.

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

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. THAYER. I know the gentleman from Iowa is as conversant as any man in the House with the status of the Indian, and is as good a friend as the Indian has in the House. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he thinks the people of that Territory—Indians, full bloods and half bloods—having had no government except tribal government, are now fitted for the dignity and duties of statehood as we recognize them here in the rest of the Union?

Mr. LACEY. That involves entirely another question.

Mr. THAYER. I notice that the gentleman said "until they were admitted."

Mr. LACEY. If they are not qualified, the necessity of continuing the existence of the Commission to which they can look as an intermediary between it and Congress, between them and the executive department, is all the more necessary. The Indian Territory is not made up of Indians, but a very large proportion is white.

Mr. THAYER. Is it not true that the Indian lands constitute a great majority of the whole Territory—some sixty-eight seventieths—and that the population of whites are in the towns and villages, possibly in cities, huddled together?

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, that will be solved by the completion of the allotments, by leases, and by sales to the whites. It is true that the white people have settled there in cities of ten or twelve thousand inhabitants, some of which, I am satisfied, in five years from now will have only three or four thousand inhabitants, because the men in the cities will scatter into the country and occupy the farms; and the Indians are proposing to lease their lands to these people.

There has never yet been an Indian reservation of valuable land that the white population has not beaten like a surf along its shore, ready to go in and occupy the land as soon as it could be opened up, and the Indian Territory is not being approached in that particular way, but in the towns. The people are settled in the towns and are waiting to get possession of the farms of the country as soon as they can arrange with the Indian allottees.

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, are there not treaties now existing between the United States and the Indian Territory which exempt from taxation a good share of their property for a number of years?

Mr. LACEY. That is undoubtedly one of the problems that will confront the new State when it comes in. It burdens the Territory now, as does the question of public schools, as the land is untaxed and untaxable, and it is that very complex situation that the Dawes Commission has been working on for all these years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] would proceed now. I will ask the Chair how much of my time has been consumed.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-two minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration carries an appropriation of over \$6,000,000. This appropriation has been greatly decreased by the policy of allotting lands in Indian reservations to individual Indians, thus breaking up their tribal relations and making them self-supporting. This policy should be pursued until all Indian reservations are broken up and all of their lands allotted.

All Indians should be put on their individual responsibility and compelled to live by their own labor and exertions. It is an injustice to the white race to be taxed to support the red man in idleness. Aside from this injustice to the white man, it would be better in every way that the red man should be taught that he must comply with the biblical injunction and live by the sweat of his face.

The average Indian will remain a vagabond and pauper just as long as the Government will support him while idling away his time on reservations.

I think Congress should give statehood to all of the Territories, and thus comply honestly with the platform pledges of the two great political parties. Congress should also at once allot to the Indians their lands, break up their tribal relations, and make the Indians self-supporting citizens of the United States. The jurisdiction of the United States over the Indians and of their property should then cease, and the State in which they live should take charge of them.

The State legislature where the Indians reside knows much better how to legislate and care for the Indians within its borders than Congress can possibly do. I believe, moreover, in local self-government and that each State should control the people in its borders.

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. THAYER. I would like to ask the gentleman if both political parties in their national platforms did not pledge themselves to give separate statehood to each of these three Territories and not join Oklahoma and the Indian Territory?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will answer the gentleman by stating that there was, as I remember, nothing said whatever about the Indian Territory; and, looking at that question from a nonpartisan standpoint, it would be better for the Indians and the white people of the Indian Territory, as well as the people of Oklahoma, that they should have but one State. As to New

Mexico and Arizona, those two Territories are separated by the Rocky Mountains, which mountains form a natural barrier between these two Territories. They are two very large Territories; either is twice as large as the Indian Territory and Oklahoma combined.

There is a natural barrier between them, as I have stated—the Rocky Mountain Range, which separates those two Territories. They have two systems of civilization there. The one on the Pacific coast, Arizona, has the Anglo-Saxon civilization, but in New Mexico you find largely a Mexican element, which belongs to the Mexican or Spanish civilization. These two Territories have a different nucleus around which the settlements have been formed; they have separate and distinct railroad and business centers; they have separate capitals; and it is not right, it is not just, it is not the policy of either party in this Government, or should not be if we take the party platforms to mean what they say, to make these two Territories into one State, and I hope that no such measure as that will receive the favorable attention of this Congress.

There are many Indian reservations known to contain valuable mineral deposits. I would open these lands for mining purposes under the United States mining laws and pay the money to the Indians arising from its sale to miners. The Indians will never work their mines; and if the mines were opened and worked by white men, employment would be furnished the Indians at their homes, and they would become civilized and industrious by being brought into contact with the white miners and furnished with work by them. They could then be induced to cut off their long hair, give up their tepees and wickedness, build comfortable homes, throw aside their blanket covering and eagle feathers, and adopt the white man's clothing, manners, and customs.

We often hear the complaint made by persons living in the East, who know nothing of Indians, their habits, or character, except what they have learned by reading Cooper's novels, that the people of the United States have always robbed and mistreated its Indian wards. This libel on the white American people has been so often repeated that it is generally supposed to be true.

The truth is that from the year 1789 to 1903, inclusive, we have paid the Indians for their support and education the enormous sum of \$402,217,528. Our expenditure on account of Indians in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, was \$12,935,168. There are about 270,000 Indians in the United States. These figures show that in that year we have paid them about \$47 per capita. Does this look like robbery? I must confess that it does, but it is the white man that is being robbed to support the red man in idleness. The white citizens have been taxed and paid during that year for the support of the Government, including Indians, \$707,837,004, or a tax of about \$10 per capita, no part of which has been paid by the Indians, but on the other hand they have received \$47 per capita out of that fund, hence I fail to see any just ground of complaint for our treatment of our Indian wards. I desire now to call the attention of this House and the country to the reckless expenditure of public money in the Indian Territory by the Secretary of the Interior and the Dawes Commission. This Commission has been in existence about ten years, and, including the present appropriation, has spent in round numbers the enormous sum of about \$1,500,000, amounting to \$20 per capita to each Indian enrolled.

According to the last report of the Commissioner on Indian Affairs, on page 91, the Department has approved the enrollment of 72,517 Indians, including the negro citizens of this Territory. According to the recent statement of its chairman, Mr. Bixby, before the House Committee on Indian Affairs only one-third of the Choctaws and Chickasaws and one-fourth of the Cherokees have been allotted lands, and it has cost this Government up to this date at least the sum of \$40 to enroll and allot land to one Indian.

On page 93 of the last report of the Commissioner on Indian Affairs we find that 4,175 applications for Indian citizenship (as heads of families) have been made to the Dawes Commission; that Commission has only transmitted 3,272 of these applications to the Interior Department for its action, leaving 903 Indian families asking for enrollment whose names have not been forwarded to the Interior Department for the Secretary's approval. Some of these have been held up for three years. I inquired into the reason for this delay on the part of the Dawes Commission and find that the Secretary of the Interior is largely to blame.

The same page of the Commissioner's report above alluded to shows that the applications of 1,301 of these Indian families are now pending in the Interior Department and have not been acted upon. Three hundred and ninety-four of these are before Secretary Hitchcock and 907 before the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, but I am reliably informed that the Secretary has ordered the Commissioner to hold them without action. An analysis of this official report shows that 4,175 of these Indian families have filed applications for citizenship, and 2,204 of these have been held up

by the order of Secretary Hitchcock. Mr. Bixby, chairman of the Dawes Commission, on January 28, 1904, on pages 6 and 7 of his printed hearings before our Indian Committee, stated that his Commission wanted \$259,000, in round numbers, to carry on the work of his Commission for another year, which amount the committee allowed, and it is part of the bill now under consideration by this House.

I asked Mr. Bixby this question:

Mr. STEPHENS. In 1900 [the Fifty-sixth Congress, I believe] you stated that with \$350,000 you could get through [meaning with the work of the Dawes Commission] in eighteen months?

Mr. BIXBY. Yes; I believe so.

Mr. STEPHENS. I advocated giving you this amount?

Mr. BIXBY. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS. Since that time four years have elapsed and still we are making these [meaning annual] appropriations?

Mr. BIXBY. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of the Interior, by a good many rulings, has prevented your work from being effective? For instance, in the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, are they [meaning the Interior Department] holding up hundreds of claims that you [meaning the Dawes Commission] have approved and passed upon? Are not those claims [meaning now] held up by the Secretary of the Interior?

The CHAIRMAN. I think it hardly fair to ask Mr. Bixby, who is a subordinate of the Secretary of the Interior, to criticize his actions.

Mr. STEPHENS (addressing Mr. Bixby). And is it not a fact that you had a telegram recently requesting you not to send [meaning the Secretary of the Interior] any more of those applications up that were favorable to the citizens?

Mr. BIXBY. It seems to me perhaps you might excuse me from answering questions of this kind. The telegram I alluded to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 10.

TO DAWES COMMISSION, Muskogee, Ind. T.:

Suspend action on letter November 18, I. T. D. 7131, etc., relative to persons admitted to citizenship Choctaw or Chickasaw nations by nations' authorities. Letter follows.

THOS. RYAN, Acting Secretary.

It clearly appears from these facts that Mr. Bixby desires to shield Secretary Hitchcock, who, in my judgment, is responsible for these great delays and enormous expenditure of money, and these delays and waste of public funds are brought about by his utter disregard of the acts of Congress, his vacillating course, contradictory rulings, and incapacity to fill the public office he now holds.

I have recently received a letter from a very intelligent and respected citizen of Muskogee, Ind. T., which fully and accurately states the effect of the Secretary's rulings and actions. It is as follows:

MUSKOGEE, IND. T., February 12, 1904.

HON. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: From the questions you propounded to Hon. Tams Bixby, chairman of the Dawes Commission, when he appeared before the House Committee on Indian Affairs, and from the resolution introduced by you in the House of Representatives, it seems that you are the first Congressman to understand conditions in the Indian Territory.

The delays in the Dawes Commission work are almost entirely due to the Secretary of the Interior or the Interior Department, and the Department, by delaying the work of the Commission, virtually throws the Commission appropriation away. The Department is without a rule of decision and without any settled policy in Territory affairs. Its decisions and policy with reference to this country are as changeable as the wind. The Department's work in the Territory is a botch. The Department, or the present departmental system for the Territory, is not able to handle the work, and so far it has proven itself absolutely incompetent.

In this connection I desire to call your attention to the following cases:

The Curtis bill contains this provision:

"No person shall be enrolled who has not heretofore removed to and in good faith settled in the nation in which he claims citizenship."

The Dawes Commission passed upon the first case in which a construction of this provision was necessary in April or May, 1901. The opinion of the Commission was forwarded to the Interior Department and approved. The Commission then decided several hundred cases involving this question, and all the decisions were approved by the Department. In the latter part of 1902 the Department, in passing on the Yeargain Cherokee citizenship case, reversed its former decision and made it necessary for the Commission to do all its work in this class of cases over again.

In 1901 the Dawes Commission, construing provisions in the Creek agreement, held that no land contest could be maintained in the Creek Nation after ninety days from the ratification of said agreement. This decision of the Commission was submitted to the Department in the case of McNac v. Wadsworth, No. 397, and the Department overruled the Commission. (Letter of December 12, 1901, Ind. T. Decisions, p. 5338, 1901.) Following the decision of the Department the Commission allowed contests to be filed, heard and decided the same, and many of the cases were taken to the Department on appeal and decided by the Department. The records of the Commission were changed to conform to the Department's decisions. Then, after two years, the Department discovered the provision in the agreement and held that no land contest could be filed in the Creek Nation after ninety days from the ratification of the Creek agreement—the Commission's original holding. (Major v. Thompson, No. 730, Letter of October 13, 1903, Ind. T. Decisions, p. 6752, 1903.) On October 24, 1903, it seems the Department discovered it had rendered conflicting opinions and wrote the Commission to take no further action in Creek contests until instructed by the Department. (Letter of October 24, 1903, Ind. T. Decisions, pp. 5338, 1901, and 6757, 1903.) The Commission is still waiting for instructions and the litigants in contest cases clamoring for trial.

In the Creek citizenship case of Mary L. Harwell the Department has rendered a decision denying her children enrollment (September 12, 1901) and another decision enrolling her children (May 13, 1903). Since the last decision the Department has notified the Commission to hold the matter up and return the papers so that it can be considered further (June 6, 1903). This was nine months ago, and the applicants still wait for a decision.

In the Choctaw and Chickasaw enrollment work the attorneys for the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations requested the Secretary to not pass on certain classes of cases at that time. The Secretary refused the request and the

Commission prepared parts of the Choctaw and Chickasaw rolls, which were approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commission proceeded to make allotments on said roll. On January 28 the Secretary ordered the Commission to hold up the class of persons he had heretofore refused to hold up. Over 600 of this class are on the approved rolls and have received allotments. You can readily see how this disorganizes and blocks the Commission's work. The Choctaw and Chickasaw land offices accomplish nothing, owing to conflicting orders, and the money spent in maintaining the same is practically wasted.

In the sale of Creek land the Secretary of the Interior promulgated rules and regulations governing the same. In about one month the rules were abolished. In another month a new set of rules and regulations were promulgated, and in two months were abolished. On July 10, 1903, the third set of rules and regulations on this subject were given to the public. Except for a few changes and amendments they still stand. Under the present rules and regulations it is practically impossible for an actual settler to buy land. It takes too long; too much red tape, and too much expense. The land is sold to speculators and not to actual settlers. The Dawes Commission has nothing to do with the sale of land.

Everything done by the Dawes Commission is subject to departmental approval. I am unable to see how the Commission can accomplish anything with the present Secretary of the Interior over it. As soon as the Commission has made some headway on certain work, the Secretary changes his rulings, and the work has to be done over again. Under the administration of Secretary Bliss the approval of the Secretary was considered, to a large extent, a matter of form, as the commissioners were high-salaried men, and presumed to be competent. I believe the end of the work is further away to-day than when Secretary Bliss retired from the Cabinet. It seems very hard and unjust to we people who live in this country that the Government's money should be thrown away as it has been. It is time to abolish the Commission, or take it from under the control of the Secretary.

The cases cited in this letter are not isolated cases, but the rule. I can furnish you with many others.

Very truly,

J. H. HILL.

Mr. Chairman, to further show how Indians desiring to secure their allotments in the Indian Territory are now being treated by Mr. Hitchcock, I will submit three letters from Indian citizens for your consideration. Doctor Fortson is the editor of a paper. I have known him for many years, and know him to be a truthful, honest, and upright man. The other gentlemen are excellent men in every respect. These letters are as follows:

KIOWA, IND. T., February 22, 1904.

Hon. J. H. STEPHENS, United States Congress.

DEAR SIR AND OLD ACQUAINTANCE, if you are the Stephens of Stephens & Matlock, of Montague County, town of Montague, Tex.: Sir, I received a notice from the Dawes Commission stating that they were advised to notify me that there would be no more allotments made to me until further notice from the Secretary.

Now, when I received this notice, I had already filed upon all the land allotted me; the last filed on was at Tishomingo. I filed on my homestead at Atoka. My homestead is near Kiowa, Choctaw Nation. I wish to know whether the Choctaw lawyers can legally go back on their decision. Mine is not a court claim. I was passed upon by the Dawes Commission, and their decision was ratified by the Secretary of Interior and placed on the roll, and filed on all the land I was entitled to. * * *

Hoping that you will condescend to take notice of this and head off the grafters who are determined to litigate the lands of Indianola, by which means they make millions at our expense.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration.

J. R. FORTSON, M. D.

Mr. Askew writes me as follows:

MARIETTA, IND. T., February 26, 1904.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 22d instant to hand, and in reply will say that I was more than glad to have a letter from you and to know that you were determined to investigate matters in this country, and I will gladly give you all of the information that I possibly can.

I am in receipt of a letter from the Dawes Commission, which I will hand you herewith for your information, a duplicate copy, which reads as follows:

"Receipt is hereby acknowledged of your letter February 15, asking if you will receive a certificate for your homestead allotment after the expiration of nine months from the date of selection.

"In reply to your letter, you are advised that it appears from our records that at the Chickasaw land office of the Commission, on May 19, 1904, you selected as your homestead the east half of the southeast quarter of section 6, township 7 south, range 4 east, Chickasaw Nation, containing 80 acres.

"You are informed, however, that on January 28, 1904, the Commission was instructed by the Secretary of the Interior to take no further steps looking to the enrollment or allotment of persons who were admitted to citizenship in the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations by acts of the Choctaw council or the Chickasaw legislature or by the United States Indian agent on appeal from adverse decisions of the Choctaw council.

"It appearing from our records that you were admitted to citizenship in the Choctaw Nation by the United States Indian agent, February 5, 1895, under the instructions of the Secretary of Interior, above referred to, the Commission is stopped from taking any further action relative to your allotment or to the issuance of allotment certificate in your name at this time.

* * * Respectfully,

"T. B. NEEDLES,
Commissioner in Charge."

I trust from the above letter you can see just what is going on down here, and you will be able to do away with such doings.

If you should want the original letter from the Commission, I will gladly forward it to you.

There are several people here who have been refused to file by the Commission on account of the Secretary's orders.

Trusting you can see the condition of this country and people,

I am, yours, truly,

SHELTON S. ASKEW.

Box 136, MARIETTA, IND. T.

McGEE, IND. T., February 15, 1904.

Hon. JOHN STEPHENS, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND FRIEND: We write you in regard to the present status of affairs now existing in this country respecting the recent action of the honorable Secretary of the Interior, in which he has by his ruling stopped the filing of hundreds of Chickasaws and Choctaws, who are recognized and have valuable improvements, and is doing great injustice to them.

In the first place, what is the object in the honorable Secretary in so doing? It seems to us if he has a right to do this he has a right to be retroactive and take from those who have already filed their holdings. This ruling is perplexing and doing our people great injury. Knowing your kindly feeling to the people of the Indian Territory, we fully believe that you will recognize our people's interest in this measure.

Now, Mr. STEPHENS, if any Congressional action is to be had for our relief, we ask you only to remember us on lines of justice and right. You understand the situation far better than we do. We understand that you have always championed our cause, and write you only to get your understanding of this matter. When do you think this order will be raised so as to allow filing to proceed, or do you think legislation will have to be had to get relief? Please excuse this lengthy letter and let us hear from you.

Hoping to hear from you soon we are,

Very truly, your friends,

JOSEPH A. EDWARDS.
WHIT W. HYDEN.

Mr. Chairman, these men are highly respected and reputable citizens of the Chickasaw Nation, and their statements are entitled to full faith and credit, and the injustice done them should be at once corrected by Congress.

On May 21, 1903, an opinion was rendered in the Wiley Adams case by the Interior Department, which holds that the act of Congress of June 10, 1896, conferred on the Dawes Commission no right or power to strike from the rolls persons placed thereon by the action and the consent of the tribe. This ruling is openly, wilfully, and clearly violated in the Fortson and Askew and hundreds of other similar cases. The Wiley Adams opinion is as follows, viz:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 21, 1903.

The COMMISSION TO THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES,
Muscooge, Ind. T.

GENTLEMEN: I have considered the proceedings of your Commission upon the application of Wiley Adams for enrollment as a citizen of the Choctaw Nation. The facts as found by your Commission are that Adams appeared before the Commission in the year 1899, under the act of June 10, 1896 (29 Stats., 321); that he is a white man, and about 1877 married a Creek, the widow of a Chickasaw citizen, and by a special act of the Choctaw council, approved November 6, 1884, admitted to citizenship of the Choctaw Nation, and has ever since been recognized as a citizen of that nation, and permitted to vote at their elections. His application was denied by the Commission, and no appeal was taken to the courts.

He was borne upon the Choctaw census roll of 1896 as an intermarried citizen. The act of June 10, 1896 (29 Stats., 321, 339), provided:

* * * "That in determining all such applications such commission shall respect all laws of the several nations and tribes, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States, and all treaties with either of said nations or tribes, and shall give due force and effect to the rolls, usages, and customs of each of said nations or tribes: And provided further, That the rolls of citizenship of the several tribes as now existing are hereby confirmed, and any person who shall claim to be entitled to be added to said rolls as a citizen of either of said tribes and whose rights thereto have either been denied or not acted upon, or any citizen who may within three months from and after the passage of this act desire such citizenship, may apply to the legally constituted court or committee designated by the several tribes for such citizenship, and such court or committee shall determine such an application within thirty days from the date thereof."

Your Commission was of opinion that:

"Under this act the rolls of citizenship of the several tribes, as then existing, were conformed, and the Commission under said act had the power only to admit to citizenship and to add to said rolls the names of those persons who applied to them for citizenship, and no authority existed giving the Commission, at that time, power to eliminate from the tribal rolls the name of anyone thereon."

* * * His (the applicant's) name appeared upon Choctaw census roll of 1896, page 380, No. 14255, which is the latest roll in the possession of this Commission. The act of Congress of June 28, 1898 (30 Stats., 495) provides:

"Said Commission is authorized and directed to make correct rolls of the citizens of blood of all the other tribes (except Cherokees), eliminating from the tribal rolls such names as may have been placed thereon by fraud or without authority of law, enrolling such only as may have lawful right thereto, and their descendants born since such rolls were made, with such intermarried white persons as may be entitled to Choctaw and Chickasaw citizenship under the treaties and the laws of said tribes."

Not until this act became a law did the Commission have any authority to deal with the applicant's name, and under this act the only power the Commission has is to strike his name from the rolls, provided it is made to appear that it was placed there by fraud or without authority of law. No charge of fraud is suggested in the record, and it is conceded that the national council of the Choctaw Nation in 1884 had the authority to admit this applicant to citizenship in said nation.

It is therefore the opinion of the Commission that its action upon the petition of the applicant for citizenship under the act of Congress of June 10, 1896, was without authority of law and of no force and effect upon the status of this applicant as a citizen of the Choctaw Nation, and also that Wiley Adams is a citizen of the Choctaw tribe of Indians in the Territory, and that his application therefore should be granted, and it is so ordered.

A special action of the nation's council is no less a law of the tribe than is a general one. It has been one of the well-known usages and customs of the several Indian tribes to adopt persons of other races. Naturalization by one nation of persons of other races or nations is so general as to be almost a universal practice. The act of June 10, 1896, supra, conferred upon the Commission no power to strike from the rolls persons borne thereon by the act and with the full consent of the tribe. The action of your Commission is therefore approved.

Very respectfully,

THOS. RYAN, Acting Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, this opinion in the Wiley Adams case conclusively shows that the Choctaw and Chickasaw councils had the right under existing laws to enroll their citizens; and when so enrolled by their respective tribes they were entitled to have their names approved by the Dawes Commission and the Secretary of the Interior. But the Secretary has openly and wilfully violated this ruling and repudiated the law, even after enrollment and allotment had been made, as in the Fortson and Askew cases.

These outrages on our helpless Indian wards are due to the Secretary's utter disregard of the rights of others, and to the further fact that he seems to be a tool in the hands of Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish, who desire to earn as the attorneys of these Indians a great contingent fee by preventing the enrollment of hundreds of Indians, and thus leaving more money and lands to be divided among the remaining members of these tribes. It is an open secret that this firm of lawyers have a contract with these nations for a contingent fee of 10 per cent of the value of each Indian's property that they prevent from being enrolled.

Mr. Mansfield, one of these attorneys, in an oral argument before Judge Campbell, assistant attorney-general of the Interior Department, in January, 1904, stated that each estate in question is worth from \$6,000 to \$8,000. He was contesting a question which involves the rights of about 4,000 Indians to their share of the tribal property. Taking \$7,000 as an average value, we have as a total value \$28,000,000. If these attorneys have a contract with the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations whereby they are to get 10 per cent of the value of each estate that they save to said nations by getting an individual off of the tribal rolls—and this contract, I am informed, they admit, and everyone, including the Dawes Commission, is said to be aware of—then I submit that this fee would be, if they cut from the rolls 4,000 names, the enormous sum of \$2,800,000.

Many of the Indians whom these attorneys propose to disinherit are now on the tribal rolls, placed there by the Indians themselves, and many of their names have been approved by the Dawes Commission. Some of them have had their land allotted to them, and deeds made conveying the lands to them. The Secretary of the Interior now is arbitrarily endeavoring, in violation of a plain act of Congress, to prevent these deeds from being recorded by the recorders of the district where the land is situated.

I present for your consideration a letter from Commissioner Jones, dated October 5, 1903, which fully exposes the purpose of these attorneys to disinherit and pauperize hundreds of poor people who are now on the Indian citizenship rolls and have lived in that Territory all of their lives and have their homes and all of their property there. Commissioner Jones decides against these attorneys, and on November 18, 1903, Thomas Ryan, Acting Secretary of the Interior, affirmed the opinion of Commissioner Jones.

Strange to relate, on January 28, 1904, Secretary Hitchcock, for some unknown reasons, or, rather, for no reason, reversed these opinions and decided in favor of the contention of Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish. This letter exposes the schemes of these lawyers and is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, October 5, 1903.

The Hon. SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

SIR: I am in receipt of your communication dated August 25, 1903, forwarding for consideration and report a communication from Messrs. Mansfield, McMurray, and Cornish, dated August 15, 1903, asking that the Dawes Commission be directed to withhold action on enrollments and allotments to that class of citizens of the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations whose rights will be adjudicated before the citizenship courts.

With said letter of Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish there is transmitted a copy of another letter from them dated July 8, 1903, and addressed to the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, in which they call the attention of the Commission to the fact that various persons have applied to it for enrollment as citizens of the Choctaw Nation and been listed as such who rely, as a basis of their citizenship, upon acts of admission to citizenship by the general council of the Choctaw Nation, or by the decision of the United States Indian agent overruling adverse action by the council.

Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish then call the attention of the Commission to the cases now pending before the Choctaw and Chickasaw citizenship court, wherein the court will decide the rights of persons whose status, ancestry, and family relationship are identical with those persons who rely upon acts of council and decisions of the United States Indian agent, as above stated.

It is the contention of Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish that if said citizenship court decides that such persons are entitled to admission as citizens of said nations, then those persons occupying the same status and having the same ancestry, and who have heretofore been admitted by act of council or by a decision of the United States Indian agent, should also remain admitted and enrolled as citizens of said nation, but that in the event said citizenship court should decide that such persons are not entitled to be enrolled as citizens of said nations that such persons as have heretofore been admitted by act of council or by the decision of the Indian agent, and whose status and ancestry are the same as those persons whom said citizenship court find are not entitled to admission, the names of such persons should be stricken from the rolls of citizenship of said nations.

A list of such persons as rely upon acts of the general council of the Choctaw Nation and the decision of the United States Indian agent upon appeal from said council is submitted by said Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish, and it is claimed by them that persons with the identical status, ancestry, and family relationship as those so admitted by the council and the United States Indian agent are now having their cases passed upon by the Choctaw and Chickasaw citizenship court.

Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish then advise the Commission that the purpose of their communication is to ask that no further action be taken with reference to the enrollment of or allotment to persons relying upon said acts of the council or said decisions of the Indian agent, and that final action in such cases be postponed until the final determination by the Choctaw and Chickasaw citizenship court of the cases involving the status of persons relying upon the identical ancestry and family relationship.

The Commission, replying to said letter on August 6, 1903, states that it has heretofore enrolled as citizens of the Choctaw Nation a number of persons

whose rights are dependent upon acts of the Choctaw council and decisions of the United States Indian agent; that the names of such persons have been placed upon a schedule of citizens of said nation prepared for forwarding to the Secretary of the Interior, and that their allotment has been approved, and that they are now, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 1, 1902, as provided by section 11 thereof, entitled to selection of allotments.

The said letter from the Commission is signed by T. B. Needles, commissioner in charge, and appears to have been written by him, for he states that "in these cases I do not feel warranted in the absence of the other members of the Commission in issuing any order to the Choctaw and Chickasaw land offices, prohibiting the allotments of land to any person whose enrollment has thus been approved by the Secretary of the Interior." He further states that in those cases where the Commission has not yet rendered a decision and where the rights of persons are dependent upon the acts of the Choctaw national council and the decisions of the United States Indian agents, he has instructed the Choctaw-Chickasaw enrollment division to take no further action with respect to the enrollment of such persons as citizens of the Choctaw Nation until otherwise advised.

The letter from Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish, dated August 15, 1903, and transmitted by the Department for consideration and report, seems to be the outgrowth of this correspondence between these attorneys and the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, and the purpose of the said letter appears to be, as stated by them, that the Department direct the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes to withhold further action either in the matter of enrollment or allotment to persons falling within the class referred to in their letter of July 8, 1903, to the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, and that no further action relative to them be taken until the Choctaw and Chickasaw citizenship court passes upon and finally adjudicates the rights of persons who are applicants before it, having an identical status with the persons falling within the class referred to.

The office is unable to see wherein this request of the attorneys for the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations can, under the law, be complied with. The citizenship court, of which it speaks, is created by section 33 of the supplemental Choctaw and Chickasaw agreement, approved July 1, 1902. The purpose of the establishment of the said court is set out in section 31 of said supplemental agreement, as follows:

"It being claimed and insisted by the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations that the United States courts in the Indian Territory, acting under the act of Congress approved June 10, 1896, having admitted persons to citizenship or to enrollment as such citizens in the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, respectively, without notice of the proceedings in such court being given to each of said nations; and it being insisted by said nations that in such proceedings notice to each of said nations was indispensable, and it being claimed and insisted by said nations that the proceedings in the United States courts in the Indian Territory under the act of June 10, 1896, should have been confined to a review of the action of the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes upon the papers and evidence submitted to such Commission, and should not have extended to a trial de novo of the question of citizenship; and it being desirable to finally determine these questions, etc."

Section 32 of said supplemental agreement defines the appellate jurisdiction of said courts, but I do not find in said supplemental agreement where this citizenship court has any jurisdiction whatever over such cases as those referred to by the attorneys for said nations, for from that part of section 31 above quoted it clearly appears that said citizenship court is now constituted for the sole purpose of determining whether or not the irregularities complained of, to wit, the failure to give notice to the nations of such proceedings as were had, and the failure to review the action of the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes upon the papers and evidence submitted to the Commission, instead of having a trial de novo are sufficient to annul or vacate the judgments of the United States court acting under the act of Congress approved June 10, 1896, and if such judgments are annulled by said citizenship court, then it is given authority upon the proper application to conduct such further proceedings therein as ought to have been had in the court in which the same was taken on appeal from the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, and as if no judgment or decision had been rendered therein.

The office can not see wherein the action of this citizenship court can in any way affect the rights of those persons who have been admitted to citizenship in the Choctaw Nation by an act of the Choctaw council, or who have been admitted by the United States Indian agent upon appeal from the action of the national council. At the time that these parties were so admitted by the national council and the decision of the United States Indian agent, both the council and the agent had jurisdiction, and there is nothing in said supplemental agreement giving said citizenship court any jurisdiction to retry or rehear such cases.

The office does not consider that the attorneys for said nations are correct in contending that if the citizenship court denies the right of citizenship to some applicant whose ancestry and family relationship is identical with some person who has heretofore been admitted by the national council, then such person so admitted by the national council should also be denied the right of citizenship. The office knows of no authority for canceling the acts of these nations, nor for denying citizenship to those invested with it by the act of the national council. The nations themselves are certainly powerless at this time to repudiate their acts of the council and deny citizenship to those upon whom it has lawfully bestowed the same.

The reasons assigned for the creation of said citizenship court are (1) because the nations did not have notice when the cases of the applicants for citizenship therein were originally had, and (2) for the reason that on appeal from the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes additional evidence was taken by the appellate court and a new hearing had. Neither of these reasons is applicable to the case submitted by the attorneys for said nations, since the nations not only had notice of their application for citizenship, but acted thereon through their national council.

The office does not consider that the status of these persons referred to by said attorneys can now be disturbed, notwithstanding that said citizenship court may determine that persons of the same ancestry and same relationship are not entitled to citizenship in said nations, and it is respectfully recommended that the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes be advised to continue to enroll the names of and allot land to such persons as have been admitted by an act of the national council or the decision of the Indian agent on appeal therefrom without regard to such decisions as may be hereafter rendered by said citizenship court.

Very respectfully,

W. A. JONES, Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, November 18, 1903.

COMMISSION TO THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES,
Muskegee, Ind. T.

GENTLEMEN: October 5, 1903, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs reported relative to a communication of the Department by the attorneys for the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations of August 15, 1903, submitting a copy of their letter to you of July 8, 1903, in reference to persons enrolled as citizens of the

Choctaw Nation who were admitted to citizenship by acts of the council of the nation or by decision of the United States Indian agent overruling adverse action by the nation's council.

The attorneys state that there are pending before the Choctaw and Chickasaw citizenship court cases wherein the court will decide the rights of persons whose status, ancestry, and family relationship are identical with persons who rely upon acts of the council and decisions of the Indian agent referred to. To illustrate: By act of the general council of the Choctaw Nation approved November 5, 1888, W. F. Foster and many other persons were admitted to Choctaw citizenship. The contention of these people was, and the proof tended to show, that they were descendants of one James Foster, who was a Choctaw Indian in the old Choctaw Nation east of the Mississippi River, who lived and died in the State of Mississippi and who was enrolled by the Government of the United States and received benefits under the treaty of 1830.

"In the case of James A. McLellan et al. v. The Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, now pending before the Choctaw and Chickasaw citizenship court, the applicants also claim descent from this James Foster, and rely for the adjudication of their rights upon his status as a Choctaw Indian."

It is contended that if the citizenship court determines, in the matter of the application in the case of James A. McLellan et al., that James Foster was not a Choctaw Indian by blood and such a Choctaw Indian by blood as under the treaties and laws would enable his descendants to be admitted to citizenship, then the claimants, relying upon the acts of council, are likewise not entitled and should not be enrolled.

Seven cases are mentioned in which the acts of the council of the Choctaw Nation or the decisions of the United States Indian agent are relied upon by the applicants for their citizenship, where such identical status, ancestry, and family relationship exists that will be judiciously passed upon by the citizenship court.

It was asked of your Commission that no further action be taken with reference to the enrollment of or allotments to persons relying upon the sources set out, and that final action in such cases be postponed until the determination by said court of the cases involving the status of persons relying upon "the identical ancestry and family relationship."

It was stated by said attorneys that if the action of the citizenship court should be adverse to the claimants in the cases mentioned before it, it would be asked that the enrollment of the persons relying upon the acts of council and decisions of the United States Indian agent be denied and that in support of this request there would be filed certified copies of the proceedings had and decisions rendered by the court, together with the views of the attorneys as to the power and duty of your Commission and the Department.

In reply to this communication, in letter of Commissioner Needles of August 6, 1903, it was stated that the Commission had enrolled as citizens of the Choctaw Nation a number of persons whose rights are dependent upon acts of the Choctaw council and decisions of the United States Indian agent; that the enrollment of such persons had been approved by the Department, and that they are now, under the provisions of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat., 641), entitled to selection of allotments.

The Commissioner also informed said attorneys that he did not feel warranted, in the absence of the other members of the Commission, in issuing any order prohibiting the allotment of land to any person whose enrollment has thus been approved; that, however, where the Commission has not rendered a decision, and where the rights of the persons are dependent upon the acts of the Choctaw council and the decisions of the United States Indian agent referred to, he had given instructions to the Choctaw and Chickasaw enrollment division to take no further action relative to the enrollment of such persons until otherwise advised, and that at the next regular meeting of the Commission he would bring this matter to its attention.

If any further action has been had in the matter the Department has not been advised.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs enters at considerable length into this question, and states that he can not see wherein the request of said attorneys can be complied with. Referring to the portion of the act of July 1, 1902, creating said citizenship court, he states that he does not find that such court has any jurisdiction whatever over such cases as those referred to by the attorneys for the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, where parties had been admitted by act of council or by decision of the United States Indian agent.

As to that the Department does not understand that the attorneys for the nations make any such contention. It agrees, however, with the statement of the Commissioner that the action of the citizenship court can not in any way affect the rights of those persons who have been duly admitted to citizenship in the Choctaw Nation. It also agrees with his statement that there appears no authority for "canceling" the acts of the Choctaw Nation, nor for denying citizenship to those invested with it by the act of the national council. He concludes, therefore, that the status of these persons referred to by said attorneys can not be disturbed, notwithstanding that the citizenship court may determine that persons of the same ancestry and same relationship are not entitled to citizenship in said nation.

While the act of June 28, 1898 (30 Stat., 495), directs your Commission to make correct rolls of the citizens by blood of the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, and to eliminate from the tribal rolls such names as may have been placed thereon without authority of law, there is no provision made for any investigation in regard to the rights of persons admitted by the legislative bodies of either nation. In fact the act of May 31, 1900 (31 Stat., 221), recognizes the right to enrollment of persons admitted to citizenship, when it directs your Commission not to receive, consider, or make any record of any application of any person for enrollment as a member of any tribe in Indian Territory who has not been a recognized member thereof and duly and lawfully enrolled or admitted as such.

You are accordingly directed, as recommended by the Commissioner, to enroll the names of and allot lands to such persons as have been duly admitted to citizenship in the Choctaw Nation, without regard to such decision as may hereafter be rendered by the citizenship court.

Advise the attorneys hereof. A copy of the Commissioner's letter is inclosed.

Respectfully,

THOS. RYAN, Acting Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Interior has reversed these rulings, and thereby many hundreds of Indian citizens will be robbed by his infamous order issued on the 28th day of January, 1904, to the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, which order commands them not to enroll or allot lands to any persons who base their rights to membership in the Choctaw or Chickasaw nations upon an act of the Choctaw or Chickasaw council or the Dawes Commission or the United States court. This order is the most unwarranted assault upon the members of these nations ever perpetrated, and came at a time when most all of such citizens had already filed upon their lands.

Following the instructions, the Commission commenced on the same day to check off all members of the two nations who had been admitted by either council or were descendants of persons

who had been admitted; also those who had been admitted by the Commission and those admitted by the courts.

This order affects at least one-half of the total number of the citizens of both nations, and among the old-time citizens affected are, I am informed, such families as Capt. James S. Standley and family, including the editor of the Indian Citizen, who has fought so hard against all other citizens. This family came to the Territory in 1872 and by an act of the Choctaw council of 1874 were admitted. Captain Standley served as national agent and national delegate of the Choctaws for many years, and was chairman of the Choctaw and Chickasaw delegates or commissioners who made the famous Atoka treaty. No question was ever entertained against his rights, and the fire that his daughter was fanning in her columns in the Citizen were never suspected by her to be the death of her own birthrights. Captain Standley is well known in Washington City and has many close personal friends there. It was not generally known that his rights were based upon an act of the Choctaw council, as the act had been passed so many years ago. His family consists of four daughters, and B. S. Smiser, the present town-site commissioner for the Choctaw Nation, is the husband of the Captain's oldest daughter. As the law regulating the qualification of the town-site commissioner requires that he shall be a member of the Choctaw Nation, the question is now being agitated for his removal from office.

All the freedmen of the Choctaw Nation were adopted by an act of the Choctaw council in 1888, and the order as written would affect every one of them.

As early as the year 1847 the Choctaw national council passed an act conferring rights upon the newcomers, and as most of the present generation of citizens either came here since then or are descendants of such it is almost impossible to know just what persons are to be thus arbitrarily robbed of all they have.

This infamous order was procured from the Secretary by the attorneys who have been employed by the two nations to represent them in certain matters. They found that the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes were about to wind up the citizenship business and the affairs of the Choctaw Nation, and thus shorten their lease on the national treasury of each nation, and in order to avoid the seeming end they have labored hard with the Secretary to "tie them up."

The action of the Secretary is not only unwarranted, but either shows that he knows but little of affairs here or wants to keep this country under his iron heel of oppression, and at the same time have a political pie counter, where deserving politicians may be dumped.

There is being an effort put forth to keep the news of this order from the citizens, and all manner of excuses will be made about it, but the fact remains that there is in the office of the Commission in Muscogee the order and the names of such persons "checked off." It is generally known that one of the attorneys for these tribes is a noted Washington lobbyist, and he expects to slip a scheme through Congress, perhaps as a Senate amendment to the Indian appropriation bill, setting aside the citizenship rolls made by the Indians themselves in their councils. The Members of Congress will be told that the law, if passed, will affect but few persons and that those few secured their admission from the councils by fraud, and the matter will be made to look very plausible; but when Congress passes the law it will then be used to disfranchise Indians by the wholesale.

The scheme is to have all these citizenship cases held up until legislation can be secured requiring all such persons to submit their claims to the Choctaw and Chickasaw court, which court was created in a deal between the United States and the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, in what is known as the "Supplementary agreement," for the purpose of "knocking out" all persons who had been admitted by the United States courts.

In that event the burden of proof will be upon these people, and as that court holds that the citizens must prove facts that took place in 1830, it is readily seen that but very few persons can make the proof.

It is stated, on what seems to be good authority, that these attorneys have by some means secured a contract whereby they are to receive the sum of \$250,000 and a conditional fee of \$500 per head for all persons they can deprive of their rights as Indian citizens. Considerable alarm is felt along that line because of the fact that on the 3d of last March these attorneys secured a clause to be inserted in the Indian appropriation bill providing that this citizenship court should allow them a fee to be fixed by the court. The law creating that court was so carefully guarded by the friends of these attorneys that an appeal was not allowed, and that was absolutely necessary, for the very questions to be submitted to that court had already been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, and in favor of the citizens. An appeal from this citizenship court means reversal. The citizenship court by one stroke attempted to deprive every person formerly admitted by the United States courts of their rights, and if the judgment of that court stands the test then these citizens are

down and out and have lost their last dollar, as all their property is located upon their farms in the Choctaw or Chickasaw nations.

If we are asked, "Who is a bona fide citizen of these nations?" we can only answer that a man is a citizen because he has so been recognized by these nations.

The theory advanced by the attorneys trying to deprive these people of their rights is that the councils had no authority to admit persons without the concurrence of the other nation, as they claim a property right in the lands was involved, and both nations were interested in the lands. The contention is a new one, or, rather, has so little in it that the nations and the United States Government have always recognized the rights of these nations to decide, each for itself, who were citizens. And that was so well understood and recognized that the two nations, in the Atoka treaty of 1898 and the supplementary treaty of 1902, agreed that all such citizens should be enrolled and have allotted to them lands. The nations themselves are not asking any such legislation, and the effort of the attorneys in this matter are not backed by the people. The people have voted by an overwhelming majority for the ratification of these treaties. These Indians have protested against this legislation, as shown by House Document No. 575, this Congress.

In the last treaty it was provided that all should be enrolled, except those whose cases were being contested either in original proceedings or appellate proceedings, and none of the class stabbed by this order were being contested. As before stated, many of these people have already been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and have filed upon their lands, and certificates of allotments have been issued to them. It is stated by the best legal talent in the nations that those who have been approved by the Secretary can not now be affected, as the law provides that the Secretary's approval shall be final.

The important question with these people is: Will Congress be duped into passing a law that will rob them of their rights and property? I say rob them of their rights and property, because all the property these people have is what they have on the lands in these nations, and if now forced to again prove their rights, they can not do it because the witnesses are dead, and many of them almost forgotten. These people know that Congress would not rob them knowingly, but fear that the usual schemes will be resorted to, a strong lobby employed, and all kinds of misrepresentations made to the various Members of Congress. So many of our Congressmen have so much to look after that they have no time to inform themselves on Indian Territory affairs; they take the word of a friend or some person who ought to know, and unsuspectingly vote for a measure that when understood shows to be a deep-laid scheme.

There is no necessity for the legislation, for it has already been held that if persons were admitted by the councils through fraud, the Commission could strike their names off.

If there ever was a time when Congress should watch schemes for despoiling a helpless people and forever brand them it is now. Millions of dollars would be lost and thousands of persons of Indian blood made paupers and driven from the homes where they were born and have grown to be gray-headed. The man who urges the passage of such a bill by Congress should at once be given a searching investigation and his connection therewith fully developed. His should be a stormy reception, and the lash of outraged resentment should be applied so vigorously that he will forever hide his face in shame. There are many more reasons why this scheme should be thwarted and such a bill defeated. Congress should not lend a helping hand to those seeking to perpetrate a wrong on our helpless Indian wards. This bill against which I so vigorously protest is House bill No. 12764, and was introduced February 22, 1904, and is now pending before the Indian Committee of this House, where it should forever sleep.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Interior, not satisfied by annulling and setting aside his own rulings and holding up indefinitely the Dawes Commission and setting aside its work and canceling the rolls of citizenship made by the Indians, has gone in his recent rulings (at the request of attorneys Mansfield & Co.) a step further, and is endeavoring to cancel the deeds to lands made under his own directions to the Indians who have already had their lands allotted to them by the Dawes Commission. He has gone so far as to set aside an act of Congress providing for the registration of deeds in that Territory and ordered the recorder of deeds not to record the deeds made to the Indians for their lands. The following letter from the president of a bank in the Territory explains the matter fully:

CHOCTAW NATIONAL BANK OF CADDO,
Caddo, Ind. T., February 20, 1904.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, of the Indian Territory, having no representative in Congress, are obliged occasionally to impose upon Representatives from our native States about matters in which we have an interest, and I desire to call your attention to an order issued out of the office of the Attorney-General and directed to the clerks of the central and southern judicial districts of the Indian Territory, who are ex-officio recorders, a copy of which follows.

NOVEMBER 7, 1903.

Mr. C. M. CAMPBELL,
Clerk District Court, Ardmore, Ind. T.

SIR: I send you herewith a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, dated the 4th instant, requesting that clerks of the central and southern judicial districts of the Indian Territory be instructed to refuse to record deeds to allotments in the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations executed in violation of the law.

I also inclose for your information a copy of a letter addressed by this Department on September 30, 1903, to the clerk for the district court for the western district of the Indian Territory, advising him to refuse to record deeds to allotments in the Creek Nation requiring approval by the Secretary of the Interior unless so approved.

Although the legislation upon the subject of alienation of allotments in the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations differs from that in the Creek Nation, considered in my letter above mentioned, it seems that it would be safe to follow the same advice in regard to refusing to record deeds, the execution of which is prohibited by sections 12, 13, 15, and 16 of the act of July 1, 1903 (32 Stat., 772).

Respectfully,

ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

The copies referred to in the order go to show that the order was issued at the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior.

You will understand of course that conveyances of land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, when they can be lawfully made, are not required to be approved by the honorable Secretary of the Interior. However, in this order the recorder is advised not to record deeds "execution of which is prohibited by sections 12, 13, 15, and 16 of the act of July 1, 1903 (32 Stat., 772)." The effect of this order is to put upon these recorders the responsibility of determining whether or not the given conveyance or deed is prohibited by any of the sections referred to, and these clerks of course avoid the responsibility by declining to record any deed whatever. The effect of this order will be to greatly hamper and hinder legitimate business in this country, already suffering under rules and regulations enough.

Of course the opinion is that an appeal to the courts for a writ of mandamus would bring relief, but we think that if the honorable Attorney-General's attention was called to the fact that this order put rather too much authority in the deputy clerks some action would follow.

The recording of a void deed adds nothing to its validity, and it seems to us that this order should be withdrawn and the clerks directed to record whatever instruments are offered them, for whether the lands are alienable now or not some of them will under existing provisions of law soon become so, and here will be this order in the way of purchaser having his deed recorded.

We are troubled with lots of things down here in this country, but will try to trouble you with as little of it as possible. Will be glad to know if you think you can help us in this matter.

We are led to address you for the reason that we have heretofore found you willing to heed our appeals and notice that you are taking quite an interest in Indian legislation, being a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Very respectfully,

H. M. DUNLAP.

Mr. Chairman, it clearly appears from this letter that the recording of deeds in the Indian Territory has been stopped, and that this unjust ruling of the Secretary has not been annulled.

Mr. BURKE. Will my friend permit a question at this point? Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE. Are the recorders in the Indian Territory under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior? Does he have jurisdiction to say what will be recorded and what shall not be?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state to the gentleman that they are not. They are under the Department of Justice; but the Secretary of the Interior has gone beyond his legitimate duty, and asked the Department of Justice to have these recorders to stop the recording of deeds. The letter just read states the facts, and shows that the Secretary is not only running his own office, but is endeavoring to run the Department of Justice as a side show, I presume.

Mr. Chairman, I now desire to call the attention of this House to the status of what is known as the "court-made citizens" of the Indian Territory. A legislative and judicial outrage has been perpetrated on about 2,500 citizens of this Territory, who hold judgments of the United States courts decreeing their rights to citizenship. A court, known as the "citizenship court," recently created in that Territory, on a mere technicality of law has dis-inherited all of these citizens. I have introduced a bill in this Congress providing for an appeal from this court to the Supreme Court of the United States, in order to test the validity of this sweeping and unjust decision.

Mr. Chairman, I will read a letter from a reputable firm of lawyers in that Territory, showing the necessity for the passage of my bill.

SOUTH McALESTER, IND. T., February 20, 1904.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since writing you I have received a copy of your bill, and as I understood it, it embodies the suggestion that I made in the letter addressed to you a day or two ago—that is to say, that an appeal should be granted in each case on both the law and the facts of the case, all these appeals to be embodied in one case, all of the court claimants who have lost out in the citizenship court appearing in said case, appellants, and the nations as appellees, and allowing to the nations a cross appeal in all cases where the applicant has recovered a judgment in his favor before the Choctaw and Chickasaw citizenship court.

This would entail but little work on the United States Supreme Court, and especially so if the facts were found by the Court of Claims or some other independent tribunal. If the appeal should be granted and the case referred to some tribunal other than the Supreme Court for a finding of fact, great care should be taken to select such tribunal as was without prejudice against the court claimants, and which would not begin the investigation believing that all these applicants are perjurers and thieves, and are trying to rob the nations; and I want to say, before I go any further, that I have been actively engaged in the practice of law for about fourteen years, and, in my humble judgment, justice has miscarried in the general course of litigation in the same number of cases fully as often as in these citizenship cases.

These court claimants in the majority of cases are among the best citizens

of this Territory and have done more to advance the Territory and elevate its citizenship and build up the country than any other one class of people. The Choctaw and Chickasaw citizenship court has so far refused to pass upon the questions of law affecting applicants by blood, but contents itself by holding that the evidence is not sufficient to establish the fact of Indian blood, and this has been the holding of the court in every case where the application for enrollment was by blood except the one single case I wrote you about in my former letter, and a number of cases have been decided. Four or five were decided this morning and all denied, and in all these cases the United States court has held the evidence sufficient, and in nearly all the Dawes Commission has held the evidence sufficient.

One of our cases was decided this morning in which the applicant was A. F. Cowling, and the evidence showed that he had been in the Territory since about the year 1877, and that his father made application to the Choctaw council for enrollment, but that they were told by the Choctaw authorities that it was useless, that all knew they were Indians, and the matter was not pressed further before the council. That applicant has since at all times been recognized by the authorities and everyone else as an Indian, has been deputy sheriff, was offered the office of county court clerk, has purchased farm after farm at the Indian sheriffs' sales, and has paid more than 500 permits for his renters, and the evidence of five or six witnesses was introduced showing without question his Indian blood, and not a witness was introduced by the nations, not a syllable of evidence was introduced to the contrary, and the evidence further showed that applicant was one of the most substantial citizens of this Territory, a strict member of the church, a member of the Masonic order in good standing. He had a judgment in his favor of both the Dawes Commission and the United States court, and yet the Choctaw and Chickasaw citizenship court held that the evidence was insufficient to show that he was an Indian.

Under the above circumstances he had spent the best part of his life here, had married and raised his family here and had provided himself with a comfortable home here for his old and declining years; everything he has is here, and it is all swept away by onestroke of the pen. This is just one case, and I do not believe that more than 1 per cent of the applicants by blood, if that, will be successful in this court. If in the above case the execution of the applicant upon the gallows had depended upon the question whether he was a Choctaw Indian, no jury in the performance of its duty would have hesitated for a moment to promptly render a verdict of guilty.

I am always slow to criticize a court—some one must lose, and in many instances your experience as a lawyer no doubt has taught you that we are too apt to criticize the court just because we have lost—and I do not want to be understood now as criticizing the court or that I am sore because it has decided cases against me. I am simply stating facts, as will be borne out and substantiated by every lawyer who has had experience in this class of litigation. Personally, I like the court. It has invariably treated me with great respect. It has exercised great liberality toward all parties in the introduction of evidence. It has been patient in its hearings and all that, but still this does not change the absolute importance of the right of appeal being granted.

The court has even gone so far as to refuse the appellant the right to come into court and dismiss his appeal, something that I have never before heard of except where there was a cross appeal. There is too much involved, the magnitude of this litigation is too great, the setting aside of the solemn judgments of courts of competent jurisdiction is fraught with too much importance to be treated lightly and to be closed against these applicants without giving to them the right of appeal, the right to have their cases heard and determined in the highest court of their country. * * *

With much respect, * * *

Mr. Chairman, a bill should be passed by this Congress providing for the appeal of one case from this citizenship court of the Indian Territory to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Congress of the United States, by act of June 10, 1896, authorized the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians to make, upon certain conditions, a roll for the Chickasaw and Choctaw Nations; and this act of Congress, following all former acts of the same nature, did not provide for any notice to be given to either of said tribes of any application for enrollment; and this act of Congress required the Commission to have due regard for the laws, usages, and customs of all the tribes.

The Chickasaw Nation, by virtue of an act of its legislature approved September 10, 1874, and the Choctaw legislature, by an act approved October 19, 1876, provided each a local and separate committee to pass on questions of citizenship in each tribe and had not provided for notice to any tribe of the filing of any application for citizenship.

The Chickasaw Nation, by virtue of its constitution adopted in 1867, provided for citizenship by marriage, adoption, and otherwise; and the treaty of 1866 between the United States Government and the two tribes of Indians had also provided for such citizenship.

The Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, acting under the law of Congress of June 10, 1896, undertook to make such rolls as therein provided and prescribed certain rules for the applicant for citizenship to comply with, under which it was required that notice of the application be served upon the tribe in which citizenship was sought. A very large number of applications was made under the said law and according to such rules, many of whom were admitted as citizens, but many more rejected.

It was provided by the act of June 10, 1896, that either party dissatisfied with the decision of such Commission might appeal to one of the United States courts for the Indian Territory, which cause should there be decided and which decision should be final. Many appeals were taken to such courts and many of the applicants admitted to citizenship and others rejected; and these judgments remained in force about four years, under which successful applicants acted relying upon such judgments.

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by sections 31, 32, and 33 of an act approved July 1, 1902, provided for a citizenship court before which a test suit should be brought by said nations in order to test the question as to whether or not notice to both

of the said nations was a prerequisite under the act of June 10, 1896, to the right to enrollment, and whether or not the trial of said cause de novo before the United States courts as therein provided rendered such judgments a nullity, regardless of the fact that the nation in which citizenship was sought by the applicant had appeared in the original cause, had itself taken new testimony therein and tried its cases de novo without objection, it being claimed that the main object of the proceeding was to prevent fraud or wrong against the Indians.

The two nations, acting under the act of July 1, 1902, did bring a test suit before the citizenship court at South McAlester, Ind. T., styled, "The Choctaw and Chickasaw nations or tribes of Indians, plaintiffs, v. J. T. Riddle and others, defendants;" and the court rendered an opinion in said causes in which it holds that all of said judgments were a nullity because of the failure to give notice to both tribes of the application for citizenship before the said Commission under the act of June 10, 1896, and because that on appeal to the said United States courts of the Indian Territory the said causes were tried de novo.

Much of the testimony taken before the Dawes Commission upon the original applications has been destroyed, most of it was taken by ex parte affidavits, many of the records and papers have been destroyed, a large number of witnesses have died or removed from the country, and in many cases practically no testimony was taken until after appeal of the cause, and it is now claimed that the result of this decision is of very great detriment and hardship upon some four or five thousand applicants for citizenship, and in many instances, if not all, is absolutely destructive of their rights. These applicants desire to bring this test suit before the Supreme Court of the United States on appeal, that the two questions therein involved may be finally and permanently determined before a court whose special duty it is to construe the Constitution and the laws of Congress, it being claimed that the decision of the citizenship court is in conflict with the decision of the said Supreme Court of the United States on the same general question.

It is also claimed that while technically the two tribes may hold their lands in common, yet that an application for enrollment is only an application to fix a status and not for property, and that if notice to any tribe was necessary at all that it was sufficient to notify the tribe in which citizenship was claimed, that being the rule heretofore adopted by each of said nations, who operated under different laws, different constitutions, and with separate governments, and who have not in any wise at any time considered that one nation or tribe had any right to question an application for citizenship in the other.

Mr. Chairman, to more fully illustrate the unfortunate condition of these court-made Indian citizens, I will read two letters received by me from reputable attorneys of that Territory, which letters show the true status of these unfortunate people; and I hope to arouse such an interest in their behalf that this Congress will pass a bill granting them the right to appeal one test case to the Supreme Court of the United States.

PURCELL, IND. T., January 6, 1904.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS, M. C., Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I wish you would kindly send me by return mail several copies of the bill that I am advised you introduced in Congress providing for an appeal from the Chickasaw and Choctaw citizenship court to the Supreme Court of the United States.

I am greatly interested in this question, both as a practicing attorney and as one who wants to see fair play and justice done. I feel that no greater outrage could be perpetrated upon the hundreds of deserving citizens of the Chickasaw and Choctaw nations than to deny them of the right of an appeal from the judgment of the so-called citizenship court. The right of an appeal, it occurs to me, is a constitutional one, and to say that thousands of people should be denied this right in cases such as the one under consideration, wherein millions of dollars' worth of property is involved, is simply outrageous.

Many of these applicants for citizenship have for many years prior to the passage of the act of June 10, 1896, made application to the Indian councils of the Chickasaw and Choctaw nations, but because of their lack of means and ability to "pay the price demanded" were never enrolled by the tribal authorities. This fact is a notorious one, not only in the Chickasaw and Choctaw nations, but extends far beyond their limits.

To say that this court should in seventeen days' time vacate and set aside the judgment of the Federal courts in the Territory rendered during a period of almost seven years' time, without even the right of an appeal to a higher tribunal, is something unheard of in American jurisprudence.

I most sincerely trust that you may be able to give this bill your earnest support and attention. No more just measure affecting a particular class of people could, it seems to me, come up for your consideration.

Thanking you for your numerous past favors, I am,

Very respectfully,

J. F. SHARP.

COMANCHE, IND. T., January 19, 1904.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I noticed that you had introduced a bill in Congress providing for an appeal of one case as a test from the judgment of the citizenship court to the Supreme Court of the United States.

I desire to express my approval of your sense of right and justice. Never in the history of our country, I am sure, has there been a parallel with the present method of disposing of the vast interests of the people who hold their homes and their all under judgments of the United States court. It was a most remarkable piece of legislation when Congress provided for three men who should have the power to set aside the judgments of judges of the United States court and dispose of the lands and homes of some 4,000 people, of value reaching into the millions, and be able to do this absolutely without any right

of appeal or remedy whatever to correct their judgments if erroneous. Placing in their hands these interests, with the absolute power of disposal subject to influence of the vast sums of money which the opponents of these people could afford to provide, I can't think that the Members of Congress voting for such a bill could have comprehended just what they were doing.

If they could know the feeling of distrust with which the public in this country generally view this citizenship court, I am sure they would not refuse to relieve the citizenship court of the bad odor that now hangs over it by allowing their judgments to be reviewed by that tribunal in whom the American people have confidence, the Supreme Court of the United States. Especially should this be true when you remember that all these cases have been tried in the United States court, first by a master in chancery, and finally by the judge of the court, and these courts have pronounced a judgment adverse to the judgments heretofore made by the citizenship court. I have never yet in my conversation with people in the Territory heard any express word of confidence in the judgments of the citizenship court. On the other hand, the feeling seems to be unanimous that the court is not a court, but the agents of the attorneys representing the Chickasaw and Choctaw nations. I can't think that Congress can have any other desire than that justice may be done, and I know that no reasonable objection can be made to submitting the matter on a test case to the Supreme Court, and to oppose this by representatives of the Indian nations is to confess the truth of the opinions of the public as to the citizenship court. Personally I know nothing of the members of the court and would not in any way cast any reflection on their honesty; but I say that it is only justice to them as well as the people to place them beyond any charge by allowing their judgments to be reviewed. Trusting you may succeed in passing the bill,

I am, as ever, yours, very truly,

H. B. LOCKETT.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Interior and the Dawes Commission have deliberately violated an act of Congress and an Indian treaty by refusing to allot timber lands to Choctaw Indians. Mr. Bixby, when before the Indian Committee recently, was asked the following questions:

Mr. STEPHENS. I believe, under an agreement between the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians and the Congress, they had the right to select timber lands; that the only lands segregated were mineral lands?

Mr. BIXBY. The Choctaw and Chickasaw agreement unquestionably give the members of the tribes a right to select lands upon which pine timber was growing.

Mr. STEPHENS. Upon which they had their homes?

Mr. BIXBY. Whether they had their homes there or not.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I can not account for the reason why an executive officer refuses absolutely to permit a plain act of Congress to be carried into effect. Mr. Bixby explicitly, when before our committee, admitted this to be a fact.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. With a great many things the gentleman has stated I agree; but if I understand correctly the explanation made for this action before the committee, it was that there was an attempt being made at present to obtain possession of very valuable timber lands through allotments that might be made. I wish to ask the gentleman if it was not a fact that it appeared that it was for the purpose of subserving the interests of the Indians that those timber lands were withheld from allotment?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that persons entertaining an evil design always have some excuse to give for it.

It is clearly evident to my mind that the Secretary has violated the law by refusing to allot land to these Indians, and he must have some excuse; and the gentleman from New York is correct in stating that he said the fear that some white men would come and take these Indians' timber land away from them was the reason. Any lawyer knows that the timber growing upon land is part of the realty. The law clearly stated that the homesteads of these Indians are inalienable; then how would it be possible for some man to come along and buy or take the timber away from them? It is not reasonable.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it not a fact that there are certain white men in the Indian Territory practically obtaining possession of Indian allotments in spite of the restriction of inalienation by means of leases and subleases?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman is correct, and I will further state that the report of Mr. Brosius, the secretary of the Indian Rights Association (which report you will find in a recent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), shows that several members of the Dawes Commission belonged to some of these trust companies, and some of the clerks and other governmental officials have also belonged to the companies, and the very object and purpose for which these trust companies were organized was to get hold of these valuable Indian lands and lease and deal in them for the purpose of speculating on them.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman to say that under the law the Indians could be allotted this land; that it was made the imperative duty of the Dawes Commission upon application to allot them.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It was.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And they have persistently and deliberately refused to observe that law and allot the land?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes; and they are now refusing to observe the law by refusing to allot the timber lands to the Indians, to which they are entitled by treaty and by the act of Congress.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And it is to be clothed in the Curtis bill, section 6, with the power to sell the timber upon this land,

and as I am informed the scale or estimate that has been made, that is now in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, appraising them at about one-tenth their value will be the basis upon which the Secretary approves the sale of these lands at a reasonable value.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman is correct in his statement, and the following letters from a prominent attorney at Chickasha, Ind. T., explain the true situation. The letters are as follows:

CHICKASHA, IND. T., December 22, 1903.

HON. JOHN H. STEPHENS, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of recent date in regard to the interest of some Choctaw Indians as set forth in my former letter received and noted. I rather think you misconstrued the meaning of my former letter, as it seems you received the idea that it was the failure to approve certain Choctaws by the Secretary which was the basis of my complaint. The matter to which I intended to call your attention was the withdrawal of certain lands, appraised by the Commission as timber lands, from allotment, and the refusal of the Commission to permit it allotted by the Choctaws, when under the treaty it was intended to be allotted just the same as any other land, and that there is nothing in the treaty to indicate that this character of land should be withheld from allotment for any reason.

My information is that it is withheld from allotment for the purpose of trying to secure legislation by Congress giving the Secretary authority and power to sell said land by sealed bids. This, it seems to me, would give a greater opportunity for fraud and for speculators upon the property of the Indians than could be obtained through any other means. It seems that the Indians should be permitted to take their allotments out of the common lands of the two tribes anywhere they desired, especially on said land, as it is not specially reserved under the treaty, and if you are familiar with the supplemental agreement with the Chickasaws and Choctaws you will note that there is nothing to indicate that this character of land should be withheld from allotment for any purpose.

I thought perhaps a resolution might be introduced in Congress calling upon the Secretary to show cause why this land was withheld from allotment, and it might cause the same to be opened for allotment.

I do not desire to trouble you too much with this matter, but if you could aid me in any way along this line I will appreciate it very much.

Yours, very truly,

F. E. RIDDLE.

CHICKASHA, IND. T., February 12, 1904.

HON. JOHN H. STEPHENS, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I received the examination and statement of Mr. Bixby before your committee. I note he states that unless the committee recommends some legislation in regard to the timber proposition they will go ahead and allot it under the existing laws.

I am reliably informed by some of the best Indian citizens who reside in the timber belt that the Indians are not desirous of having any new legislation on the subject, but are insisting upon selecting their allotments under the treaty as it now exists and as has been ratified by them; that they have been living in that section of the country for years, they and their families and relatives, and to be refused to select their allotments as they see fit and want them will cause them to be separated from their relatives and families and will not at all suit them.

I think Mr. Bixby is mistaken when he claims that the Indians were about to be robbed of their timber. I do not think there would be near so much danger of their being robbed of their timber as there would be of their being robbed of the rents of their land when Mr. Bixby says that they rent 160 acres of the best farming land here, which is already in cultivation, for \$25 per year, and that he thinks that is the best arrangement that they could make. As you will see, that would only be 15 cents per acre, and our best land here is worth \$3 per acre, if it is worth a cent. So you see that Mr. Bixby's statements that the Indians are being robbed, on one hand, and, on the other hand, in regard to leasing of their lands, that they are making the best arrangement, are somewhat inconsistent.

My idea is that new legislation along this line will simply tend to create disturbances and delay the work of the Commission, and I am advised by many of the Indians who live in that belt that they will not accept allotments anywhere else. Another thing, a great deal of that land that has timber on it is fairly good land for cultivation, and if there should be a law passed permitting the Commission to sell the timber, then all the Indians, as I understand, would be permitted to participate in the funds received from the sale and the Indians who live in that section of the country would have to take the land from which timber was cut and only get a very small per cent of the money received from the timber. If a portion of the Indians are permitted to select their lands under the treaty it seems that it would only be fair that all of them should be treated alike and all have the same privilege.

I hope your committee will not recommend any new legislation that will likely delay and prolong the work of the Commission.

Wishing you much success in your endeavors, I beg to remain,

Yours, very truly,

F. E. RIDDLE.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas permit me to make a suggestion? It is not a question. Is not this the condition of affairs, that it is thought unwise for the Dawes Commission to allot those timber lands? The Dawes Commission and the Secretary are not refusing to obey the mandate of Congress, but they are performing other duties that they must at the same time perform and are delaying for the time being the purpose of this statute so far as timber land is concerned, and in the meantime bringing the matter to the attention of Congress, so that if Congress in its wisdom sees fit to change this statute it can do so, and then they will go right along in accordance with the desire of Congress and perform their duty.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. But, Mr. Chairman, it can not be true that the Dawes Commission has so much work to perform that they can not allot this land to the Indians.

Mr. SHERMAN. The gentleman was present when Mr. Breckenridge—no; I think it was Mr. Bixby who stated—

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I care not what was stated. The fact is that this Commission has recently discharged a number of clerks because they claimed they have no work to perform in the Indian Territory.

Mr. SHERMAN. But that is another class of work.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is not the entire work of the Indian Territory under the control of the Dawes Commission?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then, why should they discharge their clerks and claim that they can not reach this timber-land matter and allot it to the Indians?

Mr. SHERMAN. There are various divisions of work. The gentleman here and myself, in Congress, have one line of work to perform, and the gentleman from Minnesota has another.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is there anything to prevent this Commission from receiving the applications of the Indians and sending men to allot lands to them? I will explain to the gentleman from New York the reason is given plainly by letters and telegrams from the Department showing that they propose to hold up these allotments for the purpose of securing from Congress legislation to carry out other designs. They do not assign the reason of their failure to comply with the law to be that they do not have the time to do it, but the other reason that they propose the delay in order to secure legislation that will segregate many thousands of acres of valuable pine timber land and have them sold in unlimited quantities to lumber companies—in other words, to the lumber trust.

Mr. SHERMAN. They assigned, if the gentleman will permit another brief interruption, as a reason before our committee no desire to hold up Congress and hold up the work or hold up anybody, but they stated that, in their judgment, it was wise to make this change that was suggested, and so they postponed that division of the work until they could bring the subject to the attention of Congress, and if Congress then thought wise not to make any change, then they would go along and complete the work as originally contemplated.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The question is this: Does the gentleman contend for a moment that an executive officer has a right to refuse to perform a duty expecting that Congress will change the line of that duty as marked out by law for him to follow?

Mr. SHERMAN. I contend that an executive officer who is given not only authority, but to whom is intrusted a certain amount of work, can use his judgment in performing such portion as he desires first, and if, in his judgment, he thinks it is unwise to perform some portion of it, he may temporarily delay that and go on with other work until he calls the attention of the legislative body to it to take action and make change if that body deems it wise so to do; and that is this case.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the statement of Mr. Bixby, alluded to by the gentleman from New York, is printed, and I will put it in the RECORD with my remarks, and that will explain his object and also that of the Secretary of the Interior. The statement made by Mr. Bixby was in answer to questions asked by me, as follows:

Mr. STEPHENS. I believe under an original agreement between the Choctaw and Chickasaw and the Congress that they had a right to select timber lands; that the only lands segregated were mineral lands?

Mr. BIXBY. The Choctaw and Chickasaw agreements unquestionably give the members of the tribes a right to select land upon which pine timber was growing.

Mr. STEPHENS. Upon which they had their homes?

Mr. BIXBY. Whether they had their homes there or not.

Mr. STEPHENS. And is it not a fact that recently the Secretary of the Interior has prevented those people from taking those lands, without any law whatever?

Mr. BIXBY. It is a fact that upon the recommendation of the Commission those lands are not being allotted at the present time.

Mr. STEPHENS. The law requires that they have a right to select timber land?

Mr. BIXBY. I think it did.

Mr. STEPHENS. Then, why does the Commission disregard the act of Congress?

Mr. BIXBY. I am glad you ask me that, because perhaps I should explain this situation. Just before the opening of the land offices in the Chickasaw and Choctaw nations I received letters from Governor McCurtin advising me that certain syndicates or land-improvement companies were about to receive possession of the pine timber in the Choctaw Nation at a consideration entirely inadequate, and that as a matter of fact the Indians were about to be robbed of their pine.

I presented the letters to the Commission the next day, and the Commission instructed me to make an examination of the situation immediately and to report back to the Commission what I found. I immediately went down to the Choctaw Nation, looked the ground over, and made inquiries and investigations, and made up my mind that Governor McCurtin did not overstate the situation. I so reported to the Commission, and recommended three propositions, any one of which, if adopted, would dispose of the matter. The proposition adopted was that these lands should be withheld from allotment until the Secretary of the Interior could be advised of the situation, and with the thought also in mind that perhaps Congress might also be advised. That recommendation was approved. We did advise the Secretary that we had withheld these lands temporarily from allotment, not in a spirit of attempting or of thinking we ought to oppose a law of Congress—

Mr. STEPHENS. But that prevented the Indians from taking their allotments?

Mr. BIXBY. Yes; but not especially to their injury.

Mr. STEPHENS. It has indefinitely postponed the allotment?

Mr. BIXBY. Not necessarily.

I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, how much time I have used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used forty-two minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on the 3d day of March, 1901, Congress passed an act providing for the sale of town lots in the towns of Lawton, Hobart, and Anadarko, in Oklahoma. Under this act, at a public sale in that year, these lots brought about \$750,000 cash. This money was placed in the hands of Secretary Hitchcock, where it has since remained, despite the fact that the towns to which it belongs have used every means in their power to secure this money.

The following letter, dated nearly two years ago, is only one of many such efforts, and I will add that Mr. Hitchcock utterly ignored this courteous request:

LAWTON, OKLA., May 20, 1902.

To the HON. SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The county commissioners of Comanche County, Okla., request the authority to incur an indebtedness of \$5,000.

Said indebtedness to be paid from the funds derived from the sale of town lots in Lawton, Okla., in the month of August, 1901, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1901. (31 Stat., 1093-1094.)

Said indebtedness to be incurred for the purpose of providing additional jail facilities for the county.

Following the request and estimate, the county commissioners state that the temporary jail building is wholly inadequate for the accommodation of its inmates at this time; that it has a capacity sufficient to accommodate only sixteen prisoners, and that there are at this time twenty-six inmates in said jail.

This is an extensive county, one of the largest in the Territory, and next to the Indian Territory, where large bands of criminals congregate and commit depredations in our county.

At the last session of the grand jury, in three days twenty-nine indictments were returned, eight of which were for murder, and all the remainder, except two, were for serious felonies.

More than fifty cases where prisoners were out on bond in felony cases were not considered.

It is the opinion of the board of county commissioners that when the grand jury can sit for a sufficient length of time to consider these matters, that many indictments will be returned for various offenses committed against the laws of our Territory, and that unless the honorable Secretary of the Interior will grant relief at once criminals will have to be turned loose from our jail upon the people of our county.

Respectfully,

[SEAL.]

Attest:

SAM STRAUSS,
Chairman Board of County Commissioners.

W. G. GORMAN, County Clerk.

Mr. Chairman, the law relating to the sale of these town lots within what was formerly the Kiowa and Comanche Indian reservations in Oklahoma provides that—

The lands so set apart and designated shall, in advance of the opening, be surveyed, subdivided, and platted, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, into appropriate lots, blocks, streets, alleys, and sites for parks or public buildings, so as to make a town site thereof: *Provided*, That no such person shall purchase more than one business and one residence lot. Town lots shall be offered and sold at public auction to the highest bidder, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, at sales to be had at the opening and subsequent thereto.

The receipts from the sale of these lots in the respective county seats shall, after deducting the expenses incident to the surveying, subdividing, platting, and selling of the same, be disposed of under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior in the following manner: A court-house shall be erected therewith at such county seat, at a cost not exceeding \$10,000, and the residue shall be applied to the construction of bridges, roads, and such other public improvements as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem appropriate, including the payment of expenses actually necessary to the maintenance of the county government, until the time for collecting county taxes in the calendar year next succeeding the time of the opening. No indebtedness of any character shall be contracted or incurred by any of said counties prior to the time for collecting county taxes in the calendar year next succeeding the opening, excepting where the same shall have been authorized by the Secretary of the Interior.

June 30, 1902, the law was amended to increase the appropriation for court-houses, and gave to the Secretary of the Interior authority—

to cause to be expended, subject to his control and supervision, and upon the recommendation of the legally constituted authorities of each of said towns, for the construction of waterworks, schoolhouses, and such other municipal improvements as may be advisable and advantageous to the inhabitants of said towns, the following additional sums, to wit: For the town of Lawton, \$150,000; for the town of Anadarko, \$60,000, and for the town of Hobart, \$50,000.

The Secretary of the Interior designated as county-seat town sites Lawton, Anadarko, and Hobart, and all the lots were sold, the sales aggregating \$736,033. (See Annual Report Secretary of the Interior, 1901, p. 63.) The moneys were deposited with the assistant treasurer of the United States at St. Louis, Mo., to the credit of the Secretary of the Interior on account of town sites. It appears from the daily statement of assets and liabilities of the assistant treasurer dated August 31, 1903, that there remains of this sum now on deposit \$623,156.43.

The claim of the Government to the lands of Indian tribes extends to the ultimate title and to the exclusive power of acquiring possession. (*Johnson v. McIntosh*, 8 Wheat., 543.) The fee was in the United States, subject only to occupancy. (*United States v. Cook*, 19 Wall., 592.) The right of occupancy was relinquished by the Indians and the Government entered into possession of the lands. The moneys derived from the sale of public lands are public moneys, to be covered into the Treasury of the United States as other public revenues, and can be appropriated to such uses as Congress may by law designate.

Mr. Chairman, public moneys, whether in the Treasury of the United States, deposited with an assistant treasurer, in the hands

of an officer of the Government, or in any other place, retain the character of public funds; the title remains in the United States; they cease to be public moneys only when paid out in liquidation of a legal demand and to a lawful claimant. (4 Comp. Dec., 210.)

In section 22 of the act of May 2, 1890, which act created a temporary government for the Territory of Oklahoma (26 Stat., 92), it was provided:

That in case of any lands in said Territory of Oklahoma which may be occupied and filed upon as a homestead, under the provisions of law applicable to said Territory, by a person who is entitled to perfect his title thereto under such laws, are required for town-site purposes, it shall be lawful for such person to apply to the Secretary of the Interior to purchase the lands embraced in said homestead, or any part thereof, for town-site purposes. He shall file with the application a plat for such proposed town site, and if such plat shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior he shall issue a patent to such person for land embraced in said town site upon the payment of the sum of \$10 per acre for all the lands embraced in said town site, except the lands to be donated and maintained for public purposes, as provided in this section. And the sums so received by the Secretary of the Interior shall be paid over to the proper authorities of the municipalities when organized, to be used by them for school purposes only.

Comptroller Matthews, replying to a letter from the Secretary of the Interior relating to the disposition of moneys received by the Secretary of the Interior under this provision, on July 13, 1892, said:

I have the honor to say that, in my opinion, Congress did not intend that the moneys derived from the sale of town sites in Oklahoma, under the act referred to, should be disposed of in such a manner that no account thereof could be kept at the Treasury. The act sets apart the moneys received from the sales of the respective town sites for school purposes, and provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall pay over the same to the proper authorities of the municipalities when organized. This is in legal effect an appropriation of the proceeds of sales of such town sites for the purpose indicated. There is therefore no reason why the proceeds of the sales of such town sites should not be deposited in the Treasury as other public revenues, to the credit of miscellaneous receipts "on account of sales of town sites in Oklahoma Territory, under section 22, act of May 2, 1890," and under the authority of said act the Secretary of the Treasury will issue appropriation warrants for the amounts so deposited, setting them apart and making them subject to the requisition of the Secretary of the Interior for the purposes indicated in the act.

A detailed account of the deposits made on account of sales of each particular town site should be kept in order that payments may be made by settlements in favor of the respective municipalities when organized, as suggested in your letter.

I would say that I have ascertained that the moneys received from town-site sales, under section 22 of the act of May 2, 1890, above cited, have been covered into the Treasury and paid out on warrants, in accordance with the decision of the Comptroller, and it is clear that the funds received from the sale of town lots under the act of March 3, 1901, is in every respect the same as under the act of May 2, 1890, and Congress in both cases appropriated the proceeds so received for specific purposes.

Section 234, Revised Statutes, provides that—

All claims and demands whatever by the United States or against them and all accounts whatever in which the United States are concerned, either as debtors or creditors, shall be settled and adjusted in the Treasury Department.

Section 3622, Revised Statutes, provides that—

Every officer or agent of the United States who receives public money which he is not authorized to retain as salary, pay, or emolument shall render his accounts monthly.

Section 7 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat., 206), provides that—

The Auditor for the Interior Department shall receive and examine all accounts * * * relating to * * * public lands.

Mr. Chairman, the Comptroller of the Treasury in a decision (to the Secretary of the Treasury) dated December 13, 1900, held—

When the Commissioner of Indian Affairs assumed the duty of collecting funds properly collectible by Indian agents he also assumed the duty of accounting for said funds in the manner prescribed by law and regulations.

If it were conceded that the receipts of Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, need not be accounted for, it would be an easy step to the concession that the disbursement of such funds need not be accounted for.

The only safe, proper, and legal view of the question seems to be that set forth in your letter to the Secretary of the Interior, dated July 10, 1900, as follows:

It seems to be clearly the duty of an officer of the United States who receives moneys which belong to the United States, either in his own right or as trustee, to render such full and explicit account as will admit of a proper and exact audit.

Mr. Chairman, under this rule it seems incumbent upon the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to keep an accurate record of all funds received by him from miscellaneous sources, whether from mining leases, grazing leases, or otherwise, and whether the funds are of the class known as "Indian moneys, proceeds of labor," or otherwise, and to render such full and explicit account thereof as will admit of a proper and exact audit by the Auditor for the Interior Department, and it is so held.

Again, on December 3, 1902, in what is known as the "Menominee logs case," the Comptroller said:

I think the Auditor was justified in raising the point that the method pursued leaves a defect in the records which may come up to plague future investigators. Governmental business is not the work of a day, or even the lifetime of any person. It is a continuing business, and prudence as well as experience dictates such a persistency in records as will leave to future officers a record that will enable them to ascertain what their predecessors have done and the reasons for their actions.

* * * In order to perfect the records in the Auditor's office, I would suggest that the Auditor obtain from the Interior Department (if the present papers are not sufficient for that purpose) information as to the transaction, and that the same be filed with the accounts of the Indian agent for the quarter ending June 30, 1902, and a notation be made on the official statement of the account referring to the papers filed therewith. This will preserve a record of the transaction in the very place where one would naturally look for it hereafter.

Mr. Chairman, the large sum of money arising from the sale of these Oklahoma town lots has never been placed in the Treasury of the United States, as is shown by the letter of the Acting Treasurer. It is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 2, 1904.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Referring to your communication of the 29th ultimo, in relation to a bill passed during the Fifty-sixth Congress providing for the sale of town lots in the towns of Lawton, Hobart, and Anadarko, Okla., and requesting information as to the amount of money in the Treasury to the credit of said towns, I have the honor to state that the town lots referred to were sold by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat., p. 1094), and the proceeds thereof disbursed by him.

No proceeds of the sales have ever been covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Respectfully,

R. B. ARMSTRONG,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear to my mind that in this matter we have another illustration of the manner in which Mr. Hitchcock has ignored the plain laws of the United States, and thereby disregarded his oath of office as well as the rights of the citizens of the counties and towns to whom this money belongs. There have been several destructive fires in these towns which destroyed hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of property. Mr. Hitchcock should be compelled to refund to those people the money lost by these fires, for the reason that had some of this money been put into waterworks this property would not have been destroyed. Some time ago I introduced in this Congress a resolution calling on Mr. Hitchcock to account for this strange violation of law. A few days ago he ordered work to begin on these waterworks.

I am glad to know that the Secretary has in this instance recognized that the Congress of the United States can at least inquire into his arbitrary actions and call him to account for his refusal to obey the law that he has sworn to obey as an officer of this Government.

Mr. Chairman, the best thing in the message of President Roosevelt is as follows:

No man is above the law and no man is below it; nor do we ask any man's permission when we require him to obey it. Obedience to the law is demanded as a right, not asked as a favor.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to know why the President, if he means what he says, does not cast out of his Cabinet Secretary Hitchcock, who in the many instances I have cited has openly defied the law and refused to obey it. By removing this member of his Cabinet the President would do more to earn the gratitude of millions of western people than he has ever done by any official act, and I speak not as a partisan, but as an humble citizen of this great Republic.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States at the beginning of this Congress in his message points out the fact that almost every Department of this Government is reeking with fraud and corruption. He says that—

The special investigation of the subject of naturalization under the direction of the Attorney-General and the consequent prosecutions reveal a condition of affairs calling for the immediate attention of the Congress. Forgeries and perjuries of shameless and flagrant character have been perpetrated, not only in the dense centers of population, but throughout the country; and it is established beyond doubt that very many so-called citizens of the United States have no title whatever to that right, and are asserting and enjoying the benefits of the same through the grossest frauds.

Again, he says in the same message:

I now recommend, as a matter of the utmost importance and urgency, the extension of the purposes of this appropriation, so that it may be available, under the direction of the Attorney-General, and until used, for the due enforcement of the laws of the United States in general and especially of the civil and criminal laws relating to public lands and the laws relating to postal crimes and offenses and the subject of naturalization. Recent investigations have shown a deplorable state of affairs in these three matters of vital concern. By various frauds and by forgeries and perjuries, thousands of acres of the public domain, embracing lands of different character and extending through various sections of the country, have been dishonestly acquired.

It is hardly necessary to urge the importance of recovering these dishonest acquisitions, stolen from the people, and of promptly and duly punishing the offenders. I speak in another part of this message of the widespread crimes by which the sacred right of citizenship is falsely asserted and that "inestimable heritage" perverted to base ends. By similar means—that is, through frauds, forgeries, and perjuries, and by shameless bribes—the laws relating to the proper conduct of the public service in general and to the due administration of the Post-Office Department have been notoriously violated, and many indictments have been found, and the consequent prosecutions are in course of hearing or on the eve thereof. For the reasons thus indicated, and so that the Government may be prepared to enforce promptly and with the greatest effect the due penalties for such violations of law, and to this end may be furnished with sufficient instrumentalities and competent legal assistance for the investigations and trials which will be necessary at many different points of the country, etc.

But, Mr. Chairman, the most startling declaration made by the

President in this message is the following, every word of which is true:

While there may have been as much official corruption in former years, there has been more developed and brought to light in the immediate past than in the preceding century of our country's history.

It might be well for us to inquire into the cause of this recent official corruption which surpasses that of the preceding century of our country's history. Can it not be found in the fact that one political party has practically been in power for more than forty years, and that the conditions surrounding this party make it impossible for it to throw out of office such men as Secretary Hitchcock and numerous others that I might mention, who are responsible for or have participated in this wholesale plunder of the people?

Mr. Chairman, I have cited the President's recent statement, showing that there is now more corruption in this Government than ever before, and I will cite another very eminent Republican authority giving the remedy for this corruption. The last clause of the Republican party's platform in 1856 gave this remedy, viz:

The recent startling developments of fraud and corruption at the Federal metropolis show that an entire change of administration is imperatively demanded.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope that the Democratic party will adopt the whole of that section as part of its platform in the coming national campaign and make it the battle cry and paramount issue therein, in the hope that the gallows erected by Haman (the Republican party) in 1856 for the Democracy will be the gallows on which this Haman will be hanged by the American people in 1904.

The following is section 6 of the Republican platform of 1856, to which I have alluded and from which I have quoted:

That the people justly view with alarm the reckless extravagance which pervades every department of the Federal Government; that a return to rigid economy and accountability is indispensable to arrest the systematic plunder of the public Treasury by favored partisans, while the recent startling developments of frauds and corruptions at the Federal metropolis show that an entire change of administration is imperatively demanded.

Mr. SHERMAN. The gentleman from Texas does not want to use any more time to-night?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I will yield to the gentleman from South Dakota some time if he desires it.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not like to ask the House to remain any longer to-night.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOUTELL, 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. 12684, the Indian appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate concurrent resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 50.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made from the St. Jones River, at Dover, Del., to a point on Little River and thence to Delaware Bay for the purpose of determining the advisability and cost of constructing a canal between the said rivers and the deepening and widening of Little River, so as to provide a channel suitable for the needs of commerce from Dover, Del., to Delaware Bay.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13290. An act making an appropriation for clearing the Potomac River of ice.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 3780. An act 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.; and

S. 121. An act granting additional lands adjacent to the site of the University of Montana to the State of Montana for uses of said university.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 8850. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Joyce;

H. R. 6089. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Nagle;

H. R. 865. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Chase;

H. R. 11021. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Weems;

H. R. 2019. An act granting a pension to Mallie Gwynn;

H. R. 6352. An act granting a pension to Mary Huff;

H. R. 8227. An act granting a pension to Lucius E. Polk;

H. R. 4045. An act granting a pension to Minnie Gusler;

H. R. 19. An act establishing a United States court at Marietta, Ind. T.;

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; and

H. R. 9308. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River between the counties of Wright and Sherburne, in the State of Minnesota.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARDWICK for ten days on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock) the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Mahlon Hamilton, administrator de bonis non of estate of John Hamilton, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation for repairs of Government property at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. HINSHAW, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11585) to amend section 493 of the Revised Statutes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1320); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3204) permitting the Kiowa, Chickasha and Fort Smith Railway Company to sell and convey its railroad and other property in the Indian Territory to the Eastern Oklahoma Railway Company, and the Eastern Oklahoma Railway Company to lease all its railroad and other property in the Indian Territory to the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, and thereafter to sell its railroad and other property to said the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1324); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

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. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 9872, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 13416) providing for the licensing of custom-house brokers, and for other purposes, accompanied by a report (No. 1333); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11348) to set apart certain lands in the State of South Dakota as a public park, to be known as the Battle Mountain Sanitarium Park, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1334); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2863) granting an increase of pension to David C. Coleman, reported the same with-

out amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1302); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8462) granting an increase of pension to James Walts, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1303); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4330) granting a pension to Catherine Tully, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1304); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11906) granting a pension to Margaret Jones, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1305); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12493) granting an increase of pension to Sarah N. Maddox, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1306); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11616) granting a pension to August Bockerman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1307); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2914) granting an increase of pension to Charity M. Farmer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1308); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7482) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Pettit Morrison, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1309); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11597) granting an increase of pension to Amanthus P. Joyner, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1310); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9599) granting a pension to Grace P. Paddock, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1311); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11402) granting an increase of pension to Agnes B. Hesler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1312); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12504) granting an increase of pension to Juliett Field, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1313); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11612) granting an increase of pension to G. H. Abney, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1314); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9834) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth McL. Haughey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1315); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6923) granting a pension to Olive Bassett, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1316); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 878) granting a pension to Robert S. Rose, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1317); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12491) granting a pension to Peter Scott, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1318); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5533) granting an increase of pension to Hugh L. Freeman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1319); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. TIRRELL, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8113) for the relief of Agnes W. Hills and Sarah J. Hills, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1321); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LIND, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1352) for the relief of Lindley C. Kent and Joseph Jenkins as the sureties of Frank A. Webb, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1322); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3950) for the relief of W. R. Akers, of Alliance, Nebr., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1323); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9758) for the relief of the heirs of George McGhehey for services rendered as mail contractor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1325); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PRINCE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1127) for relief of William J. Hines, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1326); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 64) to correct the military record of William B. Thompson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1332); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. PRINCE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3976) for the relief of John Thomas Owen, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1327); which said bill and report were ordered laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6084) for the relief of Emanuel Peck, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1328); which said bill and report were ordered laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2997) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Bernhard Stueber, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1329); which said bill and report were ordered laid on the table.

Mr. SLAYDEN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2828) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of H. C. Haynes, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1330); which said bill and report were ordered laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2827) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James L. Northcutt, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1331); which said bill and report were ordered laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12108) for the relief of Mary Douglas Griffiths, and the same was 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. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 13414) to provide for the temporary government of the territory or zone of land to be occupied and controlled by the United States for the construction of an interoceanic canal and other works necessary and convenient for the operation and protection of said enterprise, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 13415) to place the page force of the House of Representatives on the annual pay roll—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means: A bill (H. R. 13416) providing for the licensing of custom-house brokers, and for other purposes—to the House Calendar.

By Mr. GRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 13417) for a public building at the city of Bainbridge, Ga., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 13418) in relation to the elective franchise, defining offenses against the same, and prescribing punishments therefor—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 13467) to promote the safety of travelers on railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to strengthen the construction of day or passenger coaches, mail cars, chair, smoking, and combination cars and tourist sleepers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WACHTER: A resolution (H. Res. 240) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills to appoint an assistant clerk for the remainder of the session—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 13419) granting an increase of pension to George Weeks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 13420) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Chapman, of Pickens County, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 13421) granting an increase of pension to Micajah Hill, alias Michael C. Hill—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13422) granting a pension to Jesse C. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK: A bill (H. R. 13423) granting an increase of pension to Christian P. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEEMER: A bill (H. R. 13424) granting an increase of pension to John E. Ault—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 13425) granting a pension to William H. Small—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13426) granting a pension to Caroline Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13427) granting a pension to George W. McCollen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13428) to correct the military record of John Fenstermacher, of Whitehall, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 13429) granting a pension to Martha A. Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13430) granting a pension to Selestine Randall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13431) granting a pension to John Scanlon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13432) granting a pension to John Nixon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13433) granting a pension to Jacob T. Child—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13434) granting a pension to R. A. Dougherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13435) granting a pension to Archibald Groom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13436) granting an increase of pension to William T. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 13437) granting a pension to William P. Crawford—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 13438) granting an increase of pension to John W. Comer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: A bill (H. R. 13439) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius B. Alliger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 13440) granting an increase of pension to R. R. Dill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13441) granting a pension to George W. Drake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 13442) to reimburse Clyde P. Halfhill, late a member of Company H, Fiftieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILDEBRANT: A bill (H. R. 13443) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Burger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHONEY: A bill (H. R. 13444) granting an increase of pension to Eugene H. Harding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 13445) for the relief of E. J. Seeds—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OTIS: A bill (H. R. 13446) granting a pension to Sara A. Wardell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 13447) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Rickman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13448) granting an increase of pension to Susan D. Lovell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13449) for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Love—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 13450) for the relief of Robert L. Moore—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 13451) granting an increase of pension to Frank Wenzel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13452) granting an increase of pension to Eli Bunting—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13453) granting an increase of pension to Ezekial Steele—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13454) for the relief of James W. Kenney and the Union Brewing Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 13455) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13456) for the relief of Richard E. Cross—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 13457) granting a pension to Catharine Essig—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13458) granting a pension to Hannah A. Robison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13459) granting a pension to Sarah Soper—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 13460) for the relief of Reuben K. Deaver—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13461) granting an increase of pension to William Curtis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 13462) for the relief of Annie White—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13463) for the relief of certain occupants or claimants or owners of property at Nogales, Ariz.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 13464) to amend the naval record of William H. Harlin—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13465) granting a pension to Jacob Weiss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 13466) for the relief of William G. Keats—to the Committee on War Claims.

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 the Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast, against bill extending time for applying coasting navigation laws to the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of the National League of Commission Merchants of the United States, defining the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of residents of Woodland, Ill., against repeal of the anticanteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Elias Block & Sons, of Cincinnati, Ohio, against passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. Drayer and 41 others, of Momence, Ill., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 10170, granting increase of pension to Wilhelm Dickoff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENTON: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 13016, to establish a court of record at Grove, Ind. T.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Five petitions, representing 181 citizens and two Christian societies of Kansas, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of Typographical Union No. 305, of Newburg, N. Y., relative to an eight-hour law, etc.—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Washington Camp, Patriotic Sons of America, of Newburg, N. Y., relative to a bill to regulate immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE: Petition of the Baptist Church of Noank, Conn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON: Resolutions of Commodore Perry Post, No. 350; Memorial Post, No. 141, and Cleveland City Post, No. 403, Grand Army of the Republic, Cleveland, Ohio, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Ohio Universalist Convention, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of London Grove Grange, No. 63, Patrons of Husbandry, of Avondale, Pa., in favor of increased appropriations for agricultural experiment stations—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Nine petitions of residents of various rural routes in Kansas, relative to increase of salary for rural carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of T. F. Jones and 59 others, of Walnut, Kans., and Rev. T. E. Nichols and others, of Labette County, Kans., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Resolution of the National League of Commission Merchants, in favor of legislation defining powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petitions of J. P. Burdslee and 5 others, of Tama, Iowa; A. L. Cotton and 14 others, of Taylor Township, Iowa; E. L. Price and 39 others, of Tama, Iowa, and Rev. G. H. Crocker and 24 others, of Marshall County, Iowa, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRIER: Petitions of R. B. Hatch and 40 others, of Peterboro, N. H., and Lisbon (N. H.) Methodist Episcopal Church and 31 others, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS: Resolutions of Grand Army posts in California and Nevada, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: Petitions of Rev. Powell M. Cain and 27 others, of Ray County, Mo.; James Kelly and 124 others, of Davies County, Mo., and Rev. R. K. Kelly and 47 others, of Grant City, Mo., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Two petitions of J. A. Gorton and others, of Arcadia, Wis., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Enosburg Falls, Vt., in favor of the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Charles Sabin and 55 others, of Rockford, Ill., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: Petition of the legal representatives of the estate of Thomas W. Chilton, of Tennessee, praying for reference of claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOEBEL: Petitions of the People's Distilling Company and the Turner-Looker Company, of Cincinnati, Ohio, against the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petitions of Roger Williams Baptist Church, of Providence, R. I., and W. E. Dennett and 43 others, of Burrillville, R. I., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of members of Ohio University faculty, of Athens, Ohio, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Keys Post, No. 574, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Ohio, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of the Eleventh Congressional district of Ohio, against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAY: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 2130, for the relief of the estate of Branon Thatcher, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of the United Presbyterian Church of Thompsonville, Conn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of John Williamson and 23 others, of Tingley, Iowa, for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of Griffin Circle, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Nebraska, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Rev. M. C. Smith, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and 18 others, of Valparaiso, Nebr., and William Stelle and 11 others, of Aurora, Ill., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of Rev. C. W. Marlow and others, of Co-

leta, Ill., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of the First Presbyterian Church of New Brunswick, N. J., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the legislature of New Jersey, in favor of improving the Passaic River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: Petition of citizens of Toronto, Ind., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of J. W. Usher and others, of Kentucky, in favor of bill H. R. 3574, for the relief of farmers and tobacco growers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELIHER: Resolutions of the Gloucester Board of Trade, recommending that the Navy Department set aside a vessel for the purpose of destroying derelicts along our coast—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of the Gloucester (Mass.) Board of Trade and the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, recommending an arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of E. W. Northup, M. D., and other citizens of Nebraska, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUTTZ: Petition of Rev. J. W. Long and 8 others, of Rockford, N. C., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: Petitions of W. U. Ratcliff and 109 others, of New Sharon, Iowa, and James Bridge and 58 others, of Oskaloosa, Iowa, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church South of White County, Ark., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of Rev. F. R. Lewis and other ministers of Kennebunk, Me., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY: Petitions of John T. McLean and 4 others, of Clarks, Nebr.; Rev. J. B. Leeton and others, and D. M. Sigler and 36 others, of Silver Creek, Nebr., and J. S. McLaughlin and others, of Emerson, Nebr., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNARY: Petition of the Massachusetts State Pharmaceutical Association, in favor of bill H. R. 9303, for a reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petitions of T. A. Thompson and 12 others, of Hope, N. Dak.; P. J. Hennes and 30 others, of Niagara, N. Dak.; the Fargo Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 8 others, of Fargo, N. Dak., and Rev. O. N. Oleson, and 6 others, of Elliott, N. Dak., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of Burns, Kans., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany House bill granting increase of pension to Mrs. Susan D. Lovell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Rickman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: Petition of Robert V. Taylor, praying reference of claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petitions of the Methodist Protestant Church and Christian Endeavor Society, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and Rev. Atvill Conner and 8 others, of Buckeyetown, Md., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Robert L. Moore—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER: Petitions of the Ministerial Association and 8 others, of Monroe City, Mo., and Rev. Henry Eubank and 49 others, of Triplett, Mo., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of H. C. Gilbert Post, No. 160, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Missouri, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 4369, to increase pension of August Strick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: Resolution of James Shields Post, No. 57, Grand Army of the Republic, of Wellington, Kans., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Kansas River Improvement Association, relative to the improvement of the Kansas River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCUDDER: Petition of the Bausch Picture Frame and

Molding Company and others, in favor of reduction of taxation on grain alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIRAS: Petitions of the Sixth United Presbyterian Church, the Union Methodist Church, and John W. Gazaway and 19 others, of Allegheny, Pa., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of Rev. F. M. McConnell and 50 others, of Brownwood, Tex., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Petition of Charles L. White and 14 others, of Cherry Valley, N. Y., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNOOK: Petition of William G. Kopp, of Defiance, Ohio, recommending an increase of salary of rural carriers to \$850 per year—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of W. D. Jolly and 23 others, of Panhandle, Tex., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of the Free Methodist Church of St. Paul, Minn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Norwegian-Danish Methodist Episcopal Church of St. Paul, Minn., in favor of a bill to prevent nullification of State liquor laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members of Park Congregational Church, of St. Paul, Minn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Zion's German Evangelical Church, of St. Paul, Minn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the German Emanuel Church Evangelical Association, of St. Paul, Minn., in favor of a bill to prevent nullification of State liquor laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the First Baptist Church of St. Paul, Minn., relative to a bill to prevent nullification of State liquor laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Duluth Builders' Exchange, against the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 11828, granting a pension to Mary C. Whitten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Retail Grocers' Association of Minnesota, in favor of the Tawney bill (H. R. No. 6)—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Duluth Board of Trade, in favor of the Quarles-Cooper bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Boiler Makers and Iron-ship Builders of America, relative to a bill to extend laws for coastwise trade to the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of the Minnesota State Association of Builders' Exchanges, against an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution of the Minnesota State Association of Builders' Exchanges, against the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of C. S. Clark and 36 others, of Rochester, N. H., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 314, in favor of bill H. R. No. 6—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Charles Marten Post, No. 436, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Fred W. Luft and 10 others, of La Salle, Mich., and C. C. Hitchcock and 8 others, of Flat Rock, Mich., in favor of the Brownlow good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Willis H. Birtram, of Addison; petition of Charles Strewing and 23 others, of Flat Rock; memorials of William B. Fuller, of Addison; James B. Saunders, of Ann Arbor; Martin Brockway, of Petersburg, and Franklin Craig, of Palmyra, all in Michigan, in favor of bills H. R. 5760 and 9313—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church and Temperance Union, of Detroit, Mich., and O. J. Blackford and 34 others, of Detroit, Mich., for the passage of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of W. W. Frank and 34 others, of Pomfret, N. Y., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to W. L. Lawrence; papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Uriah J. Chesshir, and papers to

accompany bill granting a pension to Margaret J. Thackery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Resolution of the Consolidated Stock and Petroleum Exchange, of New York, in favor of bill H. R. 7871—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of Rev. M. L. Smith and 234 residents of West Virginia, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. E. Cochran and 5 others, of Salama, W. Va., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 4, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved.

DISTRICT EXCISE BOARD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the excise board of the District of Columbia for the license year ended October 31, 1903; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the disposition of useless papers in the files of that Department; which was referred to the Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS UNDER ACT OF 1893.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 2d instant, certain statements, with programme attached, showing in each case proceedings under the act of February 20, 1893, known as the "Tarsney Act," relating to the completion, construction, and bids for public buildings in the country, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. MARTIN a director on the part of the Senate of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum, under the requirements of the act approved June 10, 1872.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. MCKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a 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; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 468) granting an increase of pension to Henry Christy;

A bill (H. R. 892) granting an increase of pension to Abram H. Hunt;

A bill (H. R. 958) granting an increase of pension to Alfred H. Rogers;

A bill (H. R. 3776) granting an increase of pension to Alfred I. Judy;

A bill (H. R. 3903) granting an increase of pension George C. Sherman;

A bill (H. R. 5176) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Dutch;

A bill (H. R. 6022) granting an increase of pension to George W. Travis; and

A bill (H. R. 11287) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (S. 121) granting additional lands adjacent to the site of the University of Montana to the State of Montana for uses of said university;