

Union of Burlington, Kans.; the United Presbyterian Church of Crandall, Kans., and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Burlington, Kans., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Petitions of Charles Colville and 49 others, and H. B. Evans and 17 others, of McMinnville, Tenn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRELL: Resolution of Commodore Barry Council, No. 578, Knights of Columbus, of Philadelphia, in favor of erecting a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petitions of T. H. Lawson and 23 others, and W. H. Thomas and 8 others, of Stockton, Cal., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIXEY: Petition of Rev. J. P. Stump and 37 others, of Alexandria, Va., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: Papers to accompany claim of James A. Morgan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Henry J. Heard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Vincent Avet—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Alexander Roth—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Marie Annette Bouigny—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 8401, to pension James W. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of members of the Grand Army of the Republic post at Baxter Springs, Kans., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHULL: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 15001, granting an increase of pension to John Watkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Nine petitions of citizens of Texas, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMALL: Petition of W. E. Whaley and others, of Camden County, N. C., in favor of a parcels-post and a post-check bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: Two petitions of numerous citizens of Iowa, against the passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of John W. Barber, Henry C. Retan, Garrett A. Van Ness, and Willis H. Bertram, in favor of bill H. R. 5760—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of F. L. Iddings and others, of Lansing, Mich., and the South Lyon Presbyterian Church, of South Lyon, Mich., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Woman's Clubs of Leslie, Mich., favoring a national forest reserve in the White Mountains of New Hampshire—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolution of Dewey Woman's Relief Corps, of Leslie, Mich., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Leroy Grange, No. 840, Patrons of Husbandry, of Williamston, Mich., in favor of a good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Papers to accompany bill to correct the military record of George Hollenbeck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolution of the Board of Trade of Mankato, Minn., against the enactment of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Board of Trade of Mankato, Minn., in favor of extending the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Lemars, Iowa, in favor of a parcels-post and a post-check bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Larchwood, Iowa, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VREELAND: Resolution of Acme Lodge, No. 231, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron-ship Builders, of Olean, N. Y., in favor of bill H. R. 7056—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Albert Wheeler and others and Edgar S. Taylor and others, of Ripley, N. Y., in favor of bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Joseph G. Hart and 39 others, of Doylestown, Pa., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of citizens of New York, in favor of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 13, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

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

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

PAYETTE-BOISE IRRIGATION PROJECT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in further response to a resolution of the 31st ultimo, a petition signed by the chairman and clerk of the committee on organization of the landowners of Boise and Payette valleys, Idaho, relating to the securing of Government aid in support of the Payette-Boise irrigation project; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

CAPITOL BUILDING, JUNEAU, ALASKA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the Territory of Alaska requesting an appropriation of \$250,000 for the purchase of a site and the construction of a capitol building thereon at Juneau, Alaska; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXPOSITION.

Mr. COCKRELL. On the 11th instant the President pro tempore laid before the Senate an invitation from the president of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition inviting Congress to be present at the opening of that exposition on the 30th of April, and it was read, and ordered to lie on the table. I move that the invitation be taken from the table and referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions, and that it be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

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 the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 7266) to ratify, approve, confirm, and amend an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the manufacture, distribution, and supply of electric light and power in the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii;

A bill (H. R. 9649) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the maintenance and supply of fuel and illuminating gas and its by-products in Honolulu; and

A bill (H. R. 13300) granting certain rights and privileges to the commissioners of waterworks in the city of Erie, Pa.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5438) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the contingent fund of the United States Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (S. 10) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Taft;

A bill (S. 94) granting a pension to Alvin Rhine;

A bill (S. 203) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Kent;

A bill (S. 320) granting an increase of pension to Hiram W. White;

A bill (S. 329) granting an increase of pension to Bushnell B. Loomis;

A bill (S. 725) granting an increase of pension to Amanda L. Mardin;

A bill (S. 1310) granting a pension to Ella C. Tupper;

A bill (S. 1478) granting an increase of pension to Leroy R. Hawthorn;

A bill (S. 1570) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Robinson;

A bill (S. 1572) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Hughey;

A bill (S. 1618) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Herran;

A bill (S. 1989) granting an increase of pension to John McCabe;

A bill (S. 2030) granting an increase of pension to Elias L. Fidler;

A bill (S. 2046) granting an increase of pension to William G. Scott;

A bill (S. 2124) granting an increase of pension to David W. Johns;
 A bill (S. 2248) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Sommers;
 A bill (S. 2252) granting an increase of pension to David Inches;
 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;
 A bill (S. 2423) granting an increase of pension to Benson C. Bellamy;
 A bill (S. 2458) granting a pension to John H. Oney;
 A bill (S. 2645) granting an increase of pension to Le Roy B. Church;
 A bill (S. 2711) granting an increase of pension to Fannie S. Moore;
 A bill (S. 3018) granting an increase of pension to George W. Sullivan;
 A bill (S. 3029) granting an increase of pension to Margaret French;
 A bill (S. 3030) granting an increase of pension to Charles O. Fargo;
 A bill (S. 3198) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Reynolds;
 A bill (S. 3305) granting an increase of pension to James K. Deyo;
 A bill (S. 3308) granting an increase of pension to Jesse C. Lott;
 A bill (S. 3327) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Moore;
 A bill (S. 3490) granting an increase of pension to Bucklin H. Wood;
 A bill (S. 3493) granting an increase of pension to John C. Van Campen;
 A bill (S. 3561) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Draper;
 A bill (S. 3778) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Catey;
 A bill (S. 3867) granting an increase of pension to Osmer S. Deming;
 A bill (S. 3956) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Fleming;
 A bill (S. 3986) granting a pension to Cynthia Speaks;
 A bill (S. 3988) granting an increase of pension to John L. Hughes;
 A bill (S. 4001) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin A. Provoost;
 A bill (S. 4056) granting an increase of pension to George G. Wright, alias George Gravett;
 A bill (S. 4192) granting an increase of pension to Jamas H. Whaley;
 A bill (S. 4242) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Fisher;
 A bill (S. 4249) granting an increase of pension to Mary Gilroy;
 A bill (S. 4364) granting an increase of pension to Joshua McCormick;
 A bill (S. 4381) granting a pension to Mary P. Wilson;
 A bill (S. 4428) granting an increase of pension to Edwin W. Ford;
 A bill (S. 4487) granting an increase of pension to Aaron M. Mason;
 A bill (S. 4496) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Fletcher;
 A bill (S. 4507) granting an increase of pension to Francis G. Hoffmire;
 A bill (S. 4602) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Imus;
 A bill (S. 4621) granting an increase of pension to George Draper;
 A bill (S. 4635) granting an increase of pension to David Miserer;
 A bill (S. 4670) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Devine;
 A bill (S. 4673) granting an increase of pension to John W. Paris;
 A bill (S. 4742) granting an increase of pension to Earl B. French;
 A bill (S. 4759) granting a pension to John M. Manlove;
 A bill (S. 4811) granting an increase of pension to Phebe Sibley;
 A bill (S. 4815) granting an increase of pension to Angeline P. Root;
 A bill (S. 4827) granting an increase of pension to John F. Burkholder;
 A bill (S. 4842) granting an increase of pension to Siloam Williams;
 A bill (S. 4846) granting an increase of pension to John Taylor;
 A bill (S. 4891) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth G. Illsley;

A bill (S. 4920) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Mullens;
 A bill (S. 4948) granting an increase of pension to Elijah A. Peyton;
 A bill (S. 5056) granting an increase of pension to James D. Folsom;
 A bill (S. 5112) granting an increase of pension to Kittil Torgeson;
 A bill (S. 5124) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Avery;
 A bill (S. 5149) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. McKean;
 A bill (S. 5181) granting an increase of pension to John W. Pearson;
 A bill (S. 5182) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Davis;
 A bill (S. 5208) granting an increase of pension to William A. Bentley;
 A bill (S. 5211) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Haywood;
 A bill (S. 5243) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Ross; and
 A joint resolution (S. R. 44) as to the provisions of an act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the payment of certain fees, purchase money, and commission paid on void entries of public lands, approved June 16, 1830.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I regret very much that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] will be unable to serve upon the conference between the representatives of the two Houses on the naval appropriation bill. He has asked me to request that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] be substituted in his place as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate, and I make the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] asks to be excused from service upon the conference committee on the naval appropriation bill, and that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] be substituted in his place. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

GOVERNMENT OF CANAL ZONE.

Mr. HALE. While I am up, I submit an amendment to the so-called "Panama bill," which I ask may be read and printed.

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

Insert at the end of the bill the following additional section:
 "SEC. 28. That all stores, supplies, machinery, materials, and men sent by sea, either by the United States or by any of its contractors, for any and all purposes connected with the building of the Panama Canal, shall be transported in United States built vessels or ships whenever the Secretary of War shall be able to enter into contracts with such vessels or ships for such transportation at prices and rates that he may deem reasonable, and, in such case, the provisions of section 3709, section 3826, and section 3718, to and inclusive of section 3732 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and all provisions of law prescribing action in departmental contracts, shall not be applicable to contracts made under the provisions of this section; and all transportation at sea for the purposes of building the Panama Canal, as provided in this section, whenever the same may be in charge of the head of any other Department of the Government, shall be subject to the provisions of this section as applied to transportation under the Secretary of War."

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Woman's Branch, Alliance of the Unitarian Church, of Concord, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a library post; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the memorial of J. Orrison, of Washington, D. C., and the memorial of Gustave Bender, of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the trustees of the Woman's Industrial Exhibit of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish at Washington, D. C., a permanent national and international exhibit of woman's handiwork; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of Charles E. Patch, of Boston, Mass., and the petition of Ralph Whitcomb, of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation regulating the erection of buildings on the Mall in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOPKINS presented a memorial of the International Religious Liberty Association, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to further protect the first day of the week as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Winona County Medical Society, of Winona, Minn., praying for the passage of the

so-called "Heyburn pure food and drug bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Mankato, Minn., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Mankato, Minn., and a petition of the Commercial Club of Red Wing, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of the Jackson County Medical Society, of Indiana, praying for the passage of the so-called "Hepburn pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Century Club of Greencastle, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to create the Colorado Cliff Dwellings National Park; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Indianapolis District, Indiana Conference, Indiana, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the Buchanan County Medical Society, of Missouri, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Mercantile Club, of Kansas City, Kans., praying that an appropriation of \$1,500,000 be made for the improvement of the harbor at Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo., and the permanent improvement of the Kaw River at or near its mouth; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LATIMER presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 3447) for the relief of Michael B. Ryan, son and administrator de bonis non of John S. Ryan, deceased, late of Charleston, S. C.; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PRESIDENT M'KINLEY'S SPEECH AT BUFFALO, N. Y.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, there are a large number of requests for the last speech of the late President McKinley. I know it would accommodate a great many if it could be printed as a Senate document. I ask that it may be so printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana asks that the last speech of the late President McKinley may be printed as a Senate document. Is there objection?

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator refers to the Buffalo speech?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Buffalo speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the order is made.

COTTON GROWING.

Mr. MORGAN. I have here a paper which I want the Senate to print in the RECORD and also as a document. It is a report of the speech of Mr. J. Arthur Hutton, vice-chairman of the British Cotton-Growing Association, made at a meeting of the Manchester Statistical Society, in Memorial Hall, Manchester, Wednesday, 10th of February, 1904.

This paper contains the only statement I have ever seen of all the movements made in Manchester, England, for the growing of cotton in the different provinces, colonies, and dependencies of Great Britain. It is full of very important information which the cotton-growing people of the United States ought to possess, and I want to give it proper circulation. It is an official paper from the Manchester Society on the work of the British Cotton-Growing Association. It is a very valuable paper. I do not care, of course, to have it read at the desk, but I desire that it shall be printed in the RECORD and also as a document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama asks that the paper sent to the desk be printed in the RECORD and that it also be printed as a document. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator, and the order is made.

The paper referred to is as follows:

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COTTON GROWING ASSOCIATION.

[The West African Mail, February 13, 1904.]

Before entering upon the details of the subject on which I have the honor of addressing you this evening, I must express my deep regret that I am unable to fully repay the compliment you have paid me by laying before you any full and detailed statistics relating to the production and consumption of cotton. Had I known a few months ago what I know to-day, and had I realized then what I was undertaking, I must confess I should not have yielded so readily to the very energetic persuasions of your honorary secretary.

I should have found my task comparatively light had there been an up-to-date edition of Mr. Thomas Ellison's most excellent book on the cotton trade, published in 1886. There is a great opportunity for one of the members of this important society to bring out a publication to supplement Mr. Ellison's work. During the last two months I have studied all the blue books and statistics I could get hold of, and all I have been able to evolve is a confusing and contradictory mass of figures. To give you some little idea of the dif-

culties I have had to contend with, some of the statisticians calculate 500 pounds to the bale, some 400 pounds to the bale, some 450 pounds, and others do not tell you on what basis they are reckoning. Nor do the statistics of any two authorities agree.

Following one set of figures, I find there is at the moment a deficiency of nearly 2,000,000 bales, whereas another set of figures clearly proves that we are not short of cotton and never have been. I may add, as a further example, that I have come across no less than three different estimates of the number of spindles in this country at the present moment, varying from 47,000,000 to 50,000,000.

My original intention was to lay before you full and detailed statistics of production and consumption, and I can assure you that my inability to do so is not due to any failure on my part to appreciate fully the compliment you have paid me in asking me to address you, and I must therefore beg you to overlook the shortcomings of my paper. I know that statistics and the discussion of them are the life and breath of this society, and it is to me a matter of the very greatest regret that I can not meet your wishes on this point.

WORLD-WIDE IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION.

It is almost a truism to state that the question of the future supply of cotton is by far the most important problem before the world at the present moment. This is not merely a local matter affecting the interests of the merchants and manufacturers of this country, or of the millions of people who are directly and indirectly dependent on the cotton trade—it is a far bigger question than that; for there is hardly a single country which is not affected by a failure of the cotton crop or by an insufficient supply of raw material for the most important manufacturing industry in the world.

Cotton has rightly been called "King Cotton," for it is no exaggeration to say that at least one-quarter of the population of the world is under his sway. England is not the only country which is suffering from short supplies; Germany, France, and even the United States are feeling to-day the evil effects of this short supply and the great aggravation of the evil by the unscrupulous manipulations of greedy speculators. I am not one of those who think that legislation can remedy these evils—I am convinced that the only real and lasting remedy is a full and sufficient supply of cotton. So long as there is any doubt as to the annual crop of the world being equal to the annual demand on it, so long will speculators—whether in the United States, in England, or elsewhere—trouble and harass the unfortunate user. Many remedies have been proposed and discussed lately, but to my mind there is one—and only one—effective remedy, viz. a full supply of the article itself.

All the speculator cares about are the fluctuations on paper; a steady price is to him an abomination, and there is nothing he dislikes so much as the actual commodity in which he gambles. He wants no cotton: he would not know what to do with it if he had to keep it, and, provided there is a sufficient supply, his manipulations can be defeated by tendering delivery of the real article—to use an expression which is becoming classical, "smother him in cotton." It is, I am afraid, useless to argue the moral side of the question, but I must confess that I do not envy the wife and children of the speculator, nor the speculator himself, who is willing to cause untold misery and hardship on the toilers of the world in order that he may gather together a few more hundreds of thousands of dollars.

PRODUCTION.

The present crop of the world, as far as I can ascertain, is somewhere about 16,000,000 bales of 500 pounds each, divided, in round figures, as follows:

	Bales.
United States	11,000,000
India	3,000,000
Egypt	1,000,000
Rest of the world	1,000,000

It will be noticed at once that by far the largest proportion, viz. 70 per cent, is obtained from North America, with the natural consequence that the price of the whole of the cotton of the world is ruled by the crop of the United States. Apart from all other considerations, this is not a safe position, and one can easily see that if the basis of supply were very much wider, and if we obtained more of our cotton from other sources, we should have a much steadier annual supply, and would be less dependent on the vagaries of the weather and the manipulations of speculators in one particular part of the world.

On examining the figures of previous years two facts stand out very prominently. One is that the supplies from India have not increased anything like so rapidly as those from other centers of cultivation; e. g., in 1890 India's total crop amounted, in round figures, to 2,700,000 bales of 500 pounds, a figure which was not reached again until 1899, and in the season ending 1903 the crop amounted to 3,000,000 bales, an increase in thirteen years of only 300,000 bales. On the other hand, the American crop has increased in the last ten years from about 8,000,000 to close on 11,000,000 bales, the Egyptian from 800,000 to 1,000,000, and the rest of the world from 250,000 to 1,000,000 bales. Had India's crop increased at all proportionately to the growth of other parts of the world, we should to-day have a production there of nearly 3,500,000 bales of 500 pounds, and we should not be in quite so bad a position as we are now.

There are some members of the British Cotton Growing Association who firmly believe that a more immediate solution of our present difficulties is to be found in India, and that if proper steps were taken a largely increased supply of cotton could very soon be obtained from that country, or, what comes to nearly the same thing, a great improvement in quality. No doubt cotton of the short and inferior staple usually produced in India is not of much use to the majority of Lancashire spinners, but one must not forget that any cotton grown is of use, provided it is of usable quality. Even if it be of the shortest staple, it will relieve the demand on the next best grade, and the extra supply of the better quality so released will release the demand on the next higher grade, and so on; and, vice versa, if there is an increased supply of the best Sea Island, the spinners who can utilize the same will not be forced onto the market for the next lower grade.

The second fact which strikes one is the want of elasticity in recent years in the production of cotton in the United States. Taking periods of three years, so as to partially neutralize the variations from year to year which one must naturally expect, we find the annual increase in the quantity of cotton grown to be as follows:

	Bales.
Three years ending 1894	40,000
Three years ending 1897	280,000
Three years ending 1900	680,000

But when we come to examine the figures of the last three years we find that the crop of the United States has averaged little over 10,500,000 bales, or about the same quantity as in the previous triennial period, and shows no increase whatever. The result of this is that the world's crop of cotton, which in 1898 amounted to about 15,500,000 bales, has increased in the last five years to about 16,000,000 bales of 500 pounds, or by about 100,000 bales only per annum. I should like it to be clearly understood that I put these and all other figures before you merely as approximate ones, for, as I have already explained, I have not found it possible to obtain any really reliable data of the production and consumption of cotton.

CONSUMPTION.

I would now ask you to turn your attention from the question of supply to that of demand. As far as I can ascertain, in 1855 the number of spindles in the world, apart from Japan, China, Canada, Mexico, and Brazil, was as follows:

	Spindles.
Great Britain.....	45,400,000
Continent.....	28,200,000
United States of America.....	16,100,000
India.....	3,800,000
Total.....	93,500,000

Four years later, in 1859, the numbers were approximately as follows:

	Spindles.
Great Britain.....	45,500,000
Continent.....	32,500,000
United States of America.....	18,300,000
India.....	4,700,000
Total.....	101,000,000

These figures show a large increase on the Continent and in the United States, whereas there was practically no increase in this country. The total increase is 7,500,000 spindles, or 2 per cent, which I think is what one would expect to find, as I understand that is about the normal increase in the population of the world. All the same, I should not like to lay too much stress on the importance of these figures, for, after all, the number of looms is really the better guide to the increase of production, but the statistics as to this latter point I have been unable to obtain.

To turn now to the last available figures, viz, those for 1903, and which I think you can take as approximately correct, we find the following:

	Spindles.
Great Britain.....	48,000,000
Continent.....	34,000,000
United States of America.....	22,000,000
India.....	5,000,000
Total.....	109,000,000

I am also able to give you the figures of the spindles for other parts of the world, as follows:

	Spindles.
Japan.....	1,500,000
China.....	600,000
Canada.....	700,000
Mexico.....	500,000
Brazil.....	300,000

Giving a total for the world of 112,600,000 spindles.

As compared with the previous period, we notice that the total increase for the first-mentioned countries is 8,000,000 spindles, or again about 2 per cent, but we find that in Great Britain there is an increase of 2,500,000 spindles, as compared with an increase of 1,500,000 on the whole of the Continent. This does not look as if our trade was in quite such a stagnant state as some people would have us believe, and the fact remains that out of the total of 112,600,000 spindles we possess 48,000,000, or about 44 per cent.

On the other hand, in the same period the United States show an increase of 3,700,000 spindles, an increase which is almost entirely due to the marvelous growth of mills in the Southern States. It would take too long to enter now into this extraordinary extension of manufacturing, but I think we can safely conclude that what we cotton manufacturers have to fear in the future is not the competition of the protected countries of Europe, but the immense natural resources of America and the rapidly increasing population of that wonderful country.

The question which naturally arises is, What amount of cotton do all these millions of spindles consume? And I wish that I could lay before you some really reliable data on that point. As far as I can ascertain, in the five years ending 1855 the world's average consumption was approximately as follows, in bales of 500 pounds:

	Bales.
Great Britain.....	3,161,000
Continent.....	3,874,000
United States of America.....	2,541,000
India.....	594,000
All other countries.....	270,000
Total.....	10,840,000

To this has to be added a very large quantity for the amount consumed in hand spinning in India, China, and elsewhere.

In the following quinquennial period ending 1900 the figures are as follows:

	Bales.
Great Britain.....	3,353,000
Continent.....	4,588,000
United States of America.....	3,367,000
India.....	1,171,000
All other countries.....	752,000
Total.....	13,232,000

Showing an increase of 2,392,000 bales.

It is very difficult to draw any definite conclusions from these figures, showing, as they do, that consumption is much less than production, but I think we can take it as certain that the normal annual increase in the consumption of cotton is about 400,000 to 500,000 bales per annum. If this increase continues, in ten years from now we shall require an addition of at least 4,000,000 bales to our present supplies, assuming that the latter were adequate for our needs, which we all know is not the case.

We discover from these figures one very astonishing fact, and that is, how much more cotton our neighbors require to keep their spindles running than we do. The American spindle devours about 90 pounds per annum, whereas on the Continent only 70 pounds is used up in the year. In Great Britain 34 pounds per spindle is ample. The real explanation is that in this country we put far more labor into the cotton and spin far finer counts and are making finer and better goods than are produced in other parts of the world. If we examine our own statistics, which I think are reliable, we find that twenty years ago we required annually about 33 pounds per spindle, and although the number of spindles has increased since then by 25 per cent, and although, as every spinner will tell you, our spindles are running faster than ever they did, yet our total consumption of cotton is little, if any, more than what it was in the earlier period.

Further than that, in this country the tendency every day is to spin finer and finer counts. It is very probable that many of those who have been preaching stagnation and decay in the cotton trade have been misled by this fact. An absence of increase in consumption of cotton is not necessarily a sign of stagnation, and this is proved by the fact that in the last four years

we have added 2,500,000 to the number of our spindles. The cotton trade of this country is the most highly organized in the world, and I for one have every confidence in the ability of our cotton manufacturers to compete with all comers in the open markets of the world, provided only that they have an ample supply of raw material at a reasonable price.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND.

As I have already admitted, the figures I have put before you are only approximate, and it would be unwise to lay too much stress on them; but I think there are one or two facts we may safely deduce. The world's consumption seems to be increasing in recent years at the rate of 400,000 to 500,000 bales per annum, though it must not be forgotten that these increases have taken place when cotton was nearer 4d. than 5d. a pound. If, during the next few years, we are going to have an average price of, say, 5d. to 6d. a pound, we are bound to experience a very great check in consumption. There may possibly be an actual reduction. Let us not forget that most of our customers are exceedingly poor, and that if the purchasing power of the consumer remains unchanged he can only buy four or even three shirts where he used to buy five.

I think we can also assume that the production of raw cotton throughout the world, at any rate during recent years, has not been increasing so fast as the consumption, and this is due almost entirely to the want of elasticity in the production of the United States, which, I am informed, is principally due to a want of sufficient labor. And again, we can not afford to disregard the fact that the inhabitants of the United States are using more and more of their own cotton every day, and that if this increase continues, in ten years from now there will be but a comparatively small surplus left over for the rest of the world.

FUTURE OUTLOOK.

The one solid fact which stares us in the face is that the present supply of cotton is insufficient to keep the spindles of the world fully employed, and the cotton trade has developed into a scramble for the available supplies. Such a position is the opportunity of the speculator, and so long as there is no material increase in the growth of cotton, so long will the user be at the mercy of the gambler. It is, perhaps, hardly necessary now to draw the attention of mill owners or of the operatives to the danger of the position. They recognized this fully last year if they had not done so before, but I think it is only within the last few months that the merchants and distributors have begun to realize that they too are to suffer.

Nor do I suppose that even to-day it is fully realized by those who are engaged in the many subsidiary industries connected with the cotton trade that they as well as dependent on King Cotton, still less by others who will only feel the full effects of the disaster when bad times and short wages in Lancashire have reacted on every industry throughout the Kingdom, not excluding the farmers, who grow so much of our food.

And what is the outlook for the future? That the present supply is insufficient we all must now admit, and where are we to look for an increase of supply? I am afraid not to the United States. The population of that great country is to-day about 80,000,000 and is increasing rapidly, and their own requirements of cotton goods, and consequently of cotton, are increasing in proportion. Although in North America there is land enough to produce far more cotton than is grown to-day, there is not sufficient labor to effectively cultivate the 23,000,000 acres now supposed to be under cotton.

Five years ago 23,000,000 acres provided 11,250,000 bales of cotton; to-day it is doubtful whether we shall have 10,500,000 bales from a largely increased acreage. I have been informed that many of the laborers have drifted to the towns, and however good the weather may be on many farms cotton has to remain on the trees until it is spoiled by the weather for want of labor to gather it. The consumption of cotton in the United States ten years ago was about 2,500,000 bales. In the following five years it increased to 3,000,000 bales, but in the last five years it has increased to 4,000,000 bales. The consumption in the North has been practically stationary, and the whole of the increase has been in the Southern States.

I do not think this increase will continue quite so rapidly in the next few years, partly because much of the surplus cheap labor has been absorbed, and partly because the present high price of cotton can not fall seriously to check consumption; but I think that we can make up our minds that the United States will use more and more of their own cotton every year, with the natural consequence that if other supplies are not forthcoming Europe and the rest of the world will have to go short. The problem to-day before the world is where those supplies are to come from, and the solution of this problem is the raison d'être of the British Cotton Growing Association; and it can be said, without fear of contradiction, that the movement now started is one of the most important in the world's history.

Similar associations are at work in Germany, France, and Italy, while Russia is also endeavoring to supplant her supplies by cotton cultivation in her Asiatic possessions. The British movement, however, is much the most important, for the field to be covered is so much larger. Let us fully realize that on the success or failure of this movement the future of our great cotton trade depends.

ORIGIN OF THE MOVEMENT FOR EMPIRE-GROWN COTTON.

Before I enter with more detail into the work the association has already achieved, and what are the plans for the future, it will perhaps not be out of place for me to give you briefly the origin of the movement.

At the annual dinner of the Oldham Chamber of Commerce, held in January, 1901, a most important discussion took place on the necessity of securing increased supplies of cotton for Lancashire spinners, and at a subsequent meeting a special committee was appointed, who at once proceeded to make inquiries into the possibilities of cotton growing in nearly every part of the British Empire. I think all who are under the sway of King Cotton owe the very greatest debt of gratitude to the Oldham Chamber of Commerce for being far-sighted enough to see three years ago what some of us are only beginning to see to-day; and still more grateful should we be to the chairman of that committee, Mr. J. E. Newton, to whom more than anyone else the origin of the British Cotton Growing Association is due.

It is all the more regrettable that Mr. Newton should have devoted himself so arduously to the work of the association that his health suffered in consequence, and that he has not been able for a long time to take any active part in its labors. I should also like to say one word of appreciation for the active labors of Mr. Atkins, the present secretary of the association, and who has given his whole heart to the work since the earliest stages. The report of this committee was presented to the Oldham chamber on November 18, 1901, and may be summed up in one sentence: That suitable cotton for the Lancashire trade could be grown in various parts of the British Empire.

The Oldham chamber then approached the other local chambers with a view to supporting a movement for extending the growth of cotton in our colonies, and a meeting was held at the Manchester chamber on February 18, 1902, when a large and influential committee was appointed.

In the meantime Sir Alfred Jones (of Messrs. Elder, Dempster & Co., of Liverpool) had been working to the same ends, but on different lines. In May, 1901, he sent out 10 tons of American seed to our West African colonies; and he was impressing on the governors of those colonies the necessity of trying to extend the growth of cotton. All those who have come across Sir

Alfred Jones can not fail to appreciate the unselfish manner in which he has given up time and money for the good of the cause, coupled with an unflinching flow of most generous hospitality.

The African committee of the Manchester chamber were asked to appoint representatives on the Oldham committee, and it soon became apparent to them that it would be far better if these two parallel movements—headed on the one side by Mr. Newton and on the other by Sir Alfred Jones—should do what scientific men say parallel lines can never do, meet together and be fused into one. That meeting took place, on their invitation, at the Albion Hotel on May 7—a gathering which was described by one of the newspapers as "epoch making." At any rate, before the meeting came to an end the impossibility had been turned into an actual fact, and the British Cotton Growing Association was born; and at a meeting held at the Manchester chamber on June 12 the association was formally inaugurated and an executive committee appointed, and it was decided to raise a guaranty fund of £50,000.

I will not weary you with any details of the earlier work of the association. We met with great encouragement from some of the Government officials, though others did not give us the help we were entitled to expect. We were loyally supported in finances by some of the representatives of the cotton trade; on the other hand, the response of the bulk of the trade was most disappointing, and in consequence thereof the work of the association was much crippled, and although funds are now coming in rapidly our progress has been thrown back at least twelve months by the want of a generous response to the numerous appeals for financial aid which were issued in the earlier days.

Not only were we troubled for want of funds, which put a stop to any extensive plan of operations, but we were almost overwhelmed in a mass of correspondence with every part of the British Empire where cotton could be grown. The work has now been subdivided and apportioned to different committees, but although this took place only recently the demands on the time of the committees are growing so rapidly that some further alteration may shortly be required.

INDIA.

In dealing with the work which has already been accomplished, I would commence with that part of the world where we have done least, and where some say most can be done, viz, British India. Interviews have been held with several of the leading officials connected with the agricultural department, and a good deal of correspondence has been taken and much valuable information has been obtained. As far as can be judged from past experience, all previous attempts to introduce American or other exotic varieties of cotton have ended in failure, and it is very doubtful whether it is worth while spending any more money in that direction.

It is, however, generally admitted that the quality of Indian cotton has distinctly deteriorated in the last ten years, and this seems to be due to the fact that all varieties are mixed together in ginning and that no attempt is made to select the best seed for planting purposes—the one and great essential of successful cotton cultivation.

The methods of cultivation, too, are most primitive, and all modern improvements are conspicuous by their absence. Judging from the obstinacy and reluctance of most English farmers to adopt improved methods or implements, or to learn any lesson from their scientific competitors in Denmark and elsewhere, it is very doubtful whether it will be possible to instill any new ideas into the head of the Indian ryot.

Nothing can be done without trying, and it is quite possible that the establishment of model farms in the midst of the cotton fields might afford valuable object lessons. If such farms were established, not only would they be the best educational method which could be adopted, but they might also be the means of providing the natives with improved and selected native seed. It was, of course, at once recognized that any attempts at the education of the ryot were absolutely beyond the power and the finances of the association, and representations were made to the Government urging them to take up the work, and the secretary of state was asked to receive a deputation.

I am sorry to say that it is only within the last few days that the secretary of state has consented to receive that deputation. No doubt there is some good reason for this delay, but in the meantime Lancashire is rapidly approaching harder times than have ever been known since the days of the cotton famine.

WEST INDIES.

It is perhaps not generally known that at one time we derived our principal supplies from the West Indies, and it is almost an irony of fate that we should be again turning our attention in that direction, and that there is a possibility of the unfortunate sugar planters of those islands finding their salvation not in sacrifices on our part to revive their decaying sugar industry, but in the growth of cotton.

At the commencement of the last century we obtained 40,000 bales, or about half of our total supplies, from our West Indian possessions, and it was not until the year 1802 that our imports from the United States for the first time exceeded those from the West Indies. In 1802 our total imports of cotton from our old sources of supply were less than 1,000 bales. A special grant of £400 was made by the association to the West Indian government for the encouragement of cotton cultivation, and we followed this up by supplying seed, gins, and presses. An advance was also made to a lady planter of Montserrat, the island of lime-juice fame. She grew some excellent cotton from sea-island seed, which realized about 11½d. per pound, and it is understood that she netted a profit of about £8 an acre.

A further amount was advanced this season, and it is believed that the result is all that could be desired. The question has been taken up most vigorously by the local authorities, and Sir Daniel Morris, the director of agriculture, is taking the deepest interest in the question. He has visited most of the island, and also British Guiana, delivering addresses and advising the farmers to go in largely for cotton. In addition to that, he has paid a special visit to the United States in order to study American methods of cultivation. A large amount of correspondence has taken place, and there is no doubt that we can rely on the West Indies for a considerable addition to our supply of sea-island cotton in the immediate future.

Unfortunately, owing to their impoverished condition, few of the landowners have sufficient capital to undertake cotton growing without some financial assistance, and our very great thanks are due to the authorities at the colonial office for the ready and businesslike way in which they have met the difficulty. It has now been arranged that under the joint guaranty of the local authorities and the association, grants shall be made to all respectable planters who wish to undertake the growth of cotton—so much when the land is planted, so much when the crop is partly grown, and a further amount on shipment. The cotton will be consigned to the association and the surplus proceeds handed over to the planter.

Thanks to the generous arrangements made by the Government there will be no locking up of the association's funds, and the risk which will be run will be very small, except in the case of devastation by a hurricane, which is, unfortunately, too frequent an occurrence in that part of the world. This is, however, a risk well worth running for the sake of the great end we have in view, and it is to be hoped that in a few years' time we shall again have a large supply of cotton from our West Indian possessions, and that the plant-

ers there will have earned such a profit as will enable them to pay off every existing mortgage and charge on their lands.

Before returning to Africa, where our greatest hopes are centered, I should mention that correspondence is being carried on with Australasia, Ceylon, Burma, Borneo, Fiji, and, in fact, with every British possession where cotton can be grown; but it is unnecessary to take up your time by going into details on this part of the subject.

EGYPT.

Egypt, with the Egyptian Soudan, was naturally a field to which the early attention of the association was directed. Although, according to our constitution, the principal object of the association was the encouragement of cotton cultivation in British possessions, it was felt by the committee that the protectorate we exercise over Egypt was sufficient to justify them in considering this part of the world within the scope of their mandate.

It was soon discovered that in Egypt proper no action on the part of the association was necessary, as the Egyptian Government and the Egyptian people were fully alive to the advisability of increasing the cultivation of cotton as much as possible. It was, however, disappointing to learn that the new Nile dam would not result in an increase of acreage of much over 15 per cent. On the upper Nile the quantity of suitable land available is enormous, and a certain amount of cultivation has already commenced, and cotton has been grown equal to the very best Egyptian. Unfortunately there are two great difficulties in the way—a want of labor and a want of transport.

The first difficulty time alone can overcome, unless immigration from India or elsewhere takes place; but the long-talked-of Suakin-Berber Railway would effectually solve the transport question. The association has been in constant communication with Lord Cromer on this subject, and the seriousness of the situation has been pointed out to him and the absolute necessity of pushing on with this railway with all possible speed. It would probably expedite matters a little if our local members were also to bring pressure to bear on the home Government in Parliament to urge the rapid construction of this railway.

Quite recently a new field has been discovered in the neighborhood of Tokar, on the Red Sea, and we are informed that in this district there are very large possibilities—it is said that the land available is capable of growing a crop as large as the present growth of the whole of Egypt. If this be true, we can regard with rather more equanimity the largely increased demands of recent years for Egyptian cotton, which I understand are due principally to the fact that cloth made from Egyptian cotton is much more suitable for the mercerizing process than that made from American or other growths.

Although the bulk of our spinners to-day are interested only in a question of the supply of American cotton, I am inclined to think that the question of the supplies of longer stapled cotton will become of growing importance every year, in view of the undoubted tendency of our manufactures to become of finer and better quality; and therefore, though the urgent necessity to-day is the provision from new sources of a supply of cotton to take the place of American, we can not afford to disregard any field capable of producing cotton of a longer and better staple.

UGANDA.

From Egypt one naturally proceeds to Uganda and British East Africa, and an expert has been sent there by the foreign office. It is too soon yet to speak with any certainty of what are the possibilities, but Sir Charles Eliot, the high commissioner, informs us that there is plenty of excellent cotton land and a good supply of cheap labor, and we hope that we can look to this part of Africa for an addition to our supplies of long-stapled cotton. It is a remarkable fact that up to now all attempts at naturalizing Egyptian cotton in America, India, and other places have not succeeded, the cotton produced soon losing the silkiness which is the main characteristic of the original variety. In British East Africa this is not the case, and a sample of cotton grown in the adjacent German protectorate was reported on in Liverpool as "the best Egyptian substitute" ever produced.

NYASSALAND.

Proceeding farther south, we come to British Central Africa, perhaps better known as Nyassaland, and here innumerable experiments are being carried on by several of the industrial missions, trading companies, and planters. The association has sent out a number of gins and agricultural implements, and has also supplied a large quantity of seed. Some excellent samples of cotton have been grown from Egyptian seed, and it is now certain that we have here one of the most promising fields for future supplies. A considerable acreage has been put under cotton, and in addition separate advances of £1,000 each are being given this year to two planters, under Government supervision, and gins and other machinery are being supplied.

At least 2,000 acres will be put under cotton, and the crop, when marketed, will be sent to the association for sale, and after repayment of the advances and expenses the balance will be handed over to the planters. If these two experiments are successful, it would certainly be advisable to very largely extend this system of advances. There is plenty of suitable land and a good supply of cheap labor—unless serious drafts are made on the latter for the South African gold mines—and we are informed that it might be possible to get 100,000 to 200,000 acres under cultivation in 1905. Of course the financing of such a large scheme as this is altogether beyond the existing funds of the association, but there should be no difficulty in finding the necessary money by some means or other.

It is certainly in the interests of Lancashire to give these advances, and so insure that as much cotton as possible should be consigned to the association. This will at least result in the cotton coming to this country without the intervention of any middleman or speculator, to the benefit of both the grower and the user, though its ultimate destination will depend on who is willing to pay the highest price for it after it has been landed in England. There is, however, one rather serious difficulty in Nyassaland—the question of transport. At the present moment everything has to be conveyed to the Zambezi by hand labor, and after that water transport is available.

There is an efficient transport company, and the charges are sufficiently reasonable to make it possible for the planter to produce cotton economically and to enable him to put the same on the Liverpool market at about 4½d. to 5d. per pound. Should, however, the growth of cotton very largely develop—of which there is every probability—I am afraid that much labor which should be employed in cultivation will be fully occupied in conveying the cotton down to the Zambezi. There is therefore all the more necessity that the projected railway which has been commenced should be pushed on with all possible speed, and pressure in the House of Commons could again be very usefully exercised by our local members of Parliament.

RHODESIA.

The next British possession we reach is Rhodesia, where extensive experiments are being carried on by the British South Africa Company. As far as we know, excellent cotton can be grown there, but I am afraid the available supply of labor is not sufficient for any very large additions to our supplies, and this is still more true of the adjacent Transvaal colony, where cotton can certainly be grown, but where the supply of labor is fully absorbed by the gold mines.

WEST AFRICA.

I now come to the last portion of my subject, but by no means the least, and that is British West Africa. The area of this country is very large—our West African possessions are about one-third the size of the whole of India—but of course cotton can not be grown everywhere, nor is it desirable that the whole country should be largely dependent on one single product. The total area is, in round figures, 500,000 square miles, and if it were possible to get only one-tenth of this area under cotton, we should obtain 30,000,000 acres, which, at the rate of one-third of a bale to the acre, would give 10,000,000 bales of cotton.

Here is undoubtedly an immense possibility. Then, again, we have a large supply of cheap labor—a conservative estimate of the total population of West Africa is 20,000,000 of inhabitants—in northern Nigeria alone there are supposed to be at least 10,000,000 natives. It should not be forgotten that the colored population of the United States, by whom the bulk of the cotton is grown, is not much over 10,000,000. And last, but not least, the land can be obtained for almost a nominal rent. It is therefore easy to understand that the association is making very active efforts to encourage the growth of cotton in this part of the world, where cotton is already cultivated to-day and has been cultivated for centuries.

Most of the West African cotton which has been exported in previous years is of rough quality, though of moderately long staple, rather like the Peruvian variety, and for which there would never be a large market, as it is principally used for mixing with wool. But there are some excellent native varieties, and from Sierra Leone a sample was received which was a good deal better than average American, white and silky and of fine and fairly long staple. We have still much to learn of native varieties, and although some excellent results have been obtained from imported American seed it is very possible that we may ultimately obtain the most suitable cotton for Lancashire, either from native seed or from a cross between native and American. The prospects are most hopeful, and I for one am firmly convinced that Lancashire's future salvation lies mainly in West Africa.

If I am not wearying you too much, I propose to give a short account of what has already been done and afterwards what we think should be done.

PROSPECTS IN THE GAMBIA.

The first colony we come to is Gambia. Owing, however, to gross apathy on the part of our Government in years gone by, this colony is a comparatively narrow strip of land along the river, hemmed in on all sides by the French. It was nevertheless felt that no opportunity, however small, should be neglected, and an expert was sent there early last year. Unfortunately, owing to circumstances over which the association had no control, Mr. Severs, the expert, came home after a comparatively short residence, and the work has had to be recommenced practically de novo. Mr. Echolls, a young American expert, has recently gone out and will at once commence an experimental farm, which will serve as the very best possible object lesson for the education of the natives.

Mr. Severs reported that there was plenty of good land suitable for cotton, but that there would probably be a difficulty in persuading the natives to take up anything new. Some very fair samples of cotton have been grown, and it would undoubtedly be of great advantage to the colony if cotton growing could be established there as an additional native industry, for at the present time Gambia is practically solely dependent on one product, the groundnut crop. One undoubted advantage Gambia possesses, and that is an excellent waterway, the Gambia River, which is navigable for small steamers throughout the greater part of the colony, so that there is no necessity for any expenditure on a railway or other means of transport.

PROSPECTS IN SIERRA LEONE.

Proceeding farther south, the next British possession we reach is the colony of Sierra Leone. Here we find a larger extent of territory, a larger population, and probably, with the exception of Lagos and southern Nigeria, there is in this colony a better prospect in the immediate future than in any other of our West African possessions. The association was fortunate in securing for Sierra Leone the services of Mr. Shelby Neely, a very able young American from the Mississippi Valley. Although nothing very great has been achieved up to now, slow but substantial progress has been made.

Small experimental plots were planted last season with American seed, but the cotton has not yet reached this country. The very best sample of cotton from West Africa was sent home by Mr. Neely, and was obtained from plants grown from native seed which he found during his investigations. As far as our present knowledge extends there seem to be two districts suitable for cotton—the Sherbro district, in which there are four waterways, and farther north along the existing railway—so that the transport difficulty will not be of consequence just yet. Unfortunately, Mr. Neely was invalided home last November, or one might almost say fortunately, for it enabled the association to discuss very fully with him the question of cultivation.

Acting on the information obtained from him, the committee have been able to take into consideration a much more vigorous and larger scale of operations, and it has been decided to station an expert in the Sherbro district and another on the railway, and in addition three black expert farmers have been sent out from the United States. It is therefore to be hoped that in the coming season a fair amount of land may be brought under cultivation, with a view to a much larger extension later on.

PROSPECTS IN THE GOLD COAST.

After leaving Sierra Leone we proceed eastward to the Gold Coast Colony, which has large tracts of excellent land and a large population, but where, unfortunately from the Lancashire point of view, many gold-mining companies have established themselves, and in consequence thereof not only has the price of labor considerably advanced, but practically the whole of the surplus labor of the western portion of the colony is fully absorbed. There are, however, favorable possibilities in the eastern portion, and with the idea of neglecting no opportunity Mr. Fisher, one of our experts, was sent out in June last year. His report on the capabilities of the land is most encouraging, and he also tells us that the natives are most intelligent and very ready to learn.

As an instance of the agricultural possibilities of this colony I may mention that the export of cocoa, which ten years ago was almost an unknown article, and which five years ago amounted to 150,000 pounds in weight, had increased in 1902 to over 5,000,000 pounds in weight and £35,000 in value, and is now the most important product of the colony after palm oil. This is solely and entirely due to native cultivation, with Government assistance. We can only hope that we may be able to obtain as satisfactory results with cotton.

The trade of the eastern portion of the colony is served partly by roads and partly by the Volta River; and if a railway were constructed from Akkra to Kpong, it would undoubtedly bring much cotton land within economical reach, but at the present moment the association would hardly be justified in urging the Government to go to the expense of constructing this railway, although some excellent cotton has been grown from seed supplied by the association, and there is every probability of successful cultivation on a moderate scale, and which would be much larger if there were a better supply of labor.

Adjoining the Gold Coast is the German colony of Togoland, which, although not altogether within the scope of my subject, is most interesting as the place where the first modern attempt has been made to establish cotton cultivation on a scientific basis in West Africa. The German agricultural committee commenced operations in 1901, and, like everything done by that intelligent nation, started their work on a sound and scientific basis.

An immense amount of educational work has been done, and all sorts of experiments have been carried out, such as hybridizing, sterilizing the seed, experiments with fertilizers, inoculation against the Tsetse fly, and so on. They have been most generous in giving us the benefit of their experience, not only in West Africa, but in East Africa and elsewhere, and I am glad to say that the most cordial relations exist between this important body and the British Cotton-Growing Association, and it is fully recognized on both sides that in the present troubled waters England and Germany are in the same boat and must help one another.

PROSPECTS IN LAGOS.

Passing by the French colony of Dahomey, we come to Lagos, in some ways the most promising field of all. Inhabited by a large and intelligent population, already given to agricultural pursuits, and already well acquainted with cotton cultivation—in, however, the most primitive methods—with large undulating park-like tracts of land in the hinterland, with a railway already reaching toward the interior, Lagos offers greater possibilities of large and immediate results than any other of our West African possessions.

Unfortunately there has recently arisen a good deal of dissension and ill feeling between the natives and the European population, owing to the revival in a very objectionable form of the old custom of levying tolls or octroi in the large native towns of Abeokuta and Ibadan, with the unfortunate consequence that the cause of cotton growing has suffered very severely, and the results from last season's planting are neither so large nor so good as the association confidently expected.

Much of the seed which was sent out was never sown and is to-day lying rotting in the interior, and the machinery which was sent out early last year was not got into working order until October last. This machinery would probably not be working to-day had not the association sent out Mr. Evans with a mechanic to superintend the buying and ginning. Two experts were sent out last May, Messrs. Hoffman and Barnes, natives of the West Indies, and we understand that they have succeeded in carrying out a great deal of educational work.

A moderate amount of cotton has already been received, and of pretty fair quality, but certainly nothing like the amount which was expected. This may be due to the aforementioned trouble caused by the Hinterland tolls, but no doubt the crop was seriously affected by the deficient rainfall in 1903, as there is also a large falling off in the supplies of all kinds of native produce. These, however, are transitory troubles, and there is every reason to confidently expect a large supply of cotton from Lagos within the next two or three years, for it must not be forgotten that in former times Lagos exported considerable quantities of cotton—as much as £76,000 worth in one year.

As the best of the cotton land is in the Hinterland, it is absolutely necessary that immediate steps should be taken to extend the railway beyond Ibadan, the present terminus, toward Ilorin, and so open up the Yoruba country, which, for all practical purposes, is quite inaccessible. Nor should there be a moment's delay in coming to a decision on this point, for the railway will take some years to construct, and unless it is put in hand at once the whole of the present limited amount of available land will be fully developed before any further country is opened up.

If in the opinion of the authorities the colony itself is unable to find the money for the extension of the railway, I do not think that we should hesitate one moment in bringing the very strongest pressure to bear on the Government to vote imperial funds or give an imperial guaranty for the purpose. Nor should our efforts be confined to urging the extension of the railway, for much can be done by the construction of roads which would render it possible to bring cotton down to the railway in light carts.

PROSPECTS IN SOUTHERN NIGERIA.

Adjacent to Lagos is southern Nigeria, a large tract of country with, we believe, a considerable amount of land suitable for cotton growing. The population is large, but of a lower and less intelligent type than is to be found on other parts of the coast. Mr. Prince, an expert, was sent out there, and, in addition to some small experimental plots, he cleared and cultivated a plantation of about 50 acres some way up the Niger River, close to Onitsha. This was sown with imported American seed, and the cotton has been gathered and is now ginned.

A large representative sample has been sent home, and is just the cotton we want in Lancashire; and if 1,000,000 bales of this cotton were available to-day we could smother Mr. Sully and all his friends in it with the greatest of ease, and every mill in Lancashire would be running full time, every operative receiving decent wages and be independent of soup kitchens and other charitable assistance, which must be almost an insult to the sturdiness of character and natural pride of the Lancashire lad.

At the moment we do not feel at all sure which is the best place to carry out experiments on a large scale. The cost of clearing forest land in the neighborhood of the existing plantations is very great, and there is the further disadvantage that the clearing takes time, and delay is just what Lancashire can least afford at the present moment. No doubt there are large tracts of land suitable for cotton where little or no clearing would be required, but the necessary arrangements will take time, though arrangements are now being made for the thorough investigation of the Sobo plains.

One undoubted advantage southern Nigeria possesses, and that is that the country is largely intersected by a number of natural waterways, which afford a cheap and ready means of transport, and consequently no expensive railways are necessary, though probably later on it will be incumbent on the government to provide a regular steamer service.

PROSPECTS IN NORTHERN NIGERIA.

Northern Nigeria, with its large area of over 300,000 square miles and a population of over 10,000,000, certainly offers at some future date an enormous field for the cultivation of cotton; more promising, indeed, than any other of our West African possessions. The Hausas are most intelligent, and far more civilized than the majority of the inhabitants of West Africa. They are naturally a peaceful race, devoting their energies to agricultural and commercial occupations. Most of the trouble which has been experienced up to now has been with the Fulani—the ruling class—an altogether different type. There is no doubt that cotton can be grown there; in fact, it has been more or less systematically cultivated for centuries.

It would be most unfortunate if this vast tract of territory, one-fifth the size of India, were to be allowed to lie undeveloped for want of proper means of transport. Here we have a country capable of producing all the cotton we want and many other things besides, with enormous latent possibilities, and which has cost this country several millions of money, and which is to-day costing the British taxpayer close on £400,000 per annum. And all this is lying idle for want of the £500,000 or £1,000,000 required for the construction of a railway to connect the interior with the navigable waters of the Niger. Until this railway is constructed it is impossible for there to be any large development of trade, which to-day does not reach £100,000 per annum.

No business man would hesitate for one moment in spending the necessary capital to turn a losing estate into a paying one.

I can not understand how the Government can allow one moment's delay, and the sooner the work is commenced the sooner will trade be developed, whether in cotton or other articles, and the British taxpayer will be relieved of a considerable burden. I don't know any better investment for imperial funds than this Nigerian railway, for not only will it turn northern Nigeria into a paying concern, but it will at the same time afford a priceless boon to the most important manufacturing industry of the British Empire. In addition to the railway, roads to act as feeders for it and a public steamer service on the Niger River will be necessary, but these can come later on. It is hardly necessary to say that it would be unwise for the association to embark on any costly experiments in cotton cultivation if the Government decides not to supply the necessary funds for the provision of proper means of transport.

COST OF CULTIVATION.

It has very justly been argued that if the efforts of the association are eminently successful more cotton will be produced than is required, and the price will fall so low that all the people we have induced to cultivate cotton will suffer considerably. Some would say that it would be time enough to bother about this when the possibility is turned into a fact, but I think I should be paying a poor compliment to this important society if I were to imagine that you were accustomed to treat important questions in such a shortsighted and unstatesmanlike manner.

As far as those countries are concerned where long-stapled cotton would be grown, I do not think we need trouble ourselves much, for even if there were a substantial fall in prices, there would still be an ample margin of profit; but when we turn to West Africa the question arises, and must be considered: Will West Africa be able to compete with the United States? At the moment one can not say definitely what is the present cost of production in West Africa, and even if we knew to a fraction what the cotton grown up to now had cost, it would not be much guide, for there is no doubt if the industry extends and better methods of cultivation, ginning, pressing, and handling are introduced the cost will be very much less.

There are, however, one or two things we do know. Labor in West Africa is very much cheaper than in the States, for any amount of labor can be had for 6 pence to 1 shilling a day. And further, land in West Africa can be had at an almost nominal rent, and if cultivated by the native, as a rule no rent at all is paid, except, perhaps, some small tribute to the chief of the community. On the other hand, I am informed that in the United States a cash rental of 10 shillings to 20 shillings per annum per acre has to be paid, or when, as is mostly the case, the rent is paid in kind, about one-third of the crop is handed over for the rent of the land, another third for the use of implements, fertilizers, etc., when provided by the landlord, leaving one-third for the farmer.

Although in the States there are many plantations of considerable acreage, the bulk of the crop is grown on small farms varying in size from a few acres up to 20 acres. I am informed that larger farms are quite the exception. You can readily understand that these small farmers are not wealthy men, and consequently can not afford to wait until their crop is harvested. They have to get credit from the local stores or from the local money lenders, which generally takes the form of mortgages on their growing crops. This and the rent is a very heavy tax on the cultivator and a serious addition to the price of cotton.

On the other hand, I am informed by every West African governor with whom I have discussed the question that the West African can get on perfectly well without any advance whatever. I have also talked the matter over with Mr. Neely and Mr. Prince, and they both say that there is not the slightest necessity for any advances. Their opinion is, I think, very important, for they have both been brought up in the cotton fields of America and are accustomed to this system of credits. Taking one thing with the other, I am firmly convinced that West Africa will soon be able to grow cotton much more cheaply than America, and should production overtake consumption it is the American farmer who will suffer by the fall in price and not the West African.

FUTURE WORK.

Before I conclude I should like to say one word about the future. Until just the last month or two many of us felt much disheartened by the lack of financial support we met with in quarters where we should have received the most. Oldham did well, but nowhere else. This, I am glad to say, is now all changed, and the Northeast Lancashire Masters' Association have set a most worthy example by increasing their subscription to £10,000, and for this increase we owe very great thanks to Mr. Henry Higson.

There is also a movement on foot outside the association for raising a very large sum of money in its aid, and I, for one, hope it will never again be necessary to issue another appeal for support. Many of the committee have most unselfishly devoted much valuable time to the work, and time is just the one thing a hard-worked business man can least afford to give. Speaking for myself and my colleagues, I can only say that we are most of us willing to devote our time for the good of Lancashire, but the least we ask in return is that Lancashire should back us up with ample financial support.

In order to make it perfectly clear why additional funds are required, it will be as well to give an outline of the larger plan of action which has recently been receiving the careful consideration of the association. We understand that in Nyassaland 100,000 acres could be put under cultivation in the season 1904-5 if the association is willing to finance the same. An advance of 20s. an acre would be required, also assistance toward providing seed, gins, etc. Estimating the expenditure at 30s. an acre, it gives a total outlay of £150,000, much of which, if not the whole amount, would be recovered in the first season.

If Lancashire earnestly desires this large extension of cultivation, an immediate decision will be necessary, for a commencement would have to be made toward clearing the land in June or July this year, and all preliminary details would require to be settled before that date.

Turning from the east of the African Continent to the west, we find that owing to the nature of the people and local conditions but slow progress can be made under the present system whereby the natives should be educated toward cultivating small plots of cotton on their own land. In view of Lancashire's very urgent need, the committee are of opinion that it would be most advantageous to try the experiment of establishing several large model plantations in the most promising districts. These farms would have the most valuable educational effect on the natives, and would, of course, be made into centers for buying, ginning, and pressing.

Should it be found that by this method cotton could be grown at a profit, it might later on be advisable to largely extend these plantations, and so get more rapid results than can be obtained from the comparatively slow process of educating the natives to grow cotton on their own account. Such a plantation, with the necessary equipment of gins, presses, seed, implements, etc., can be estimated to cost £5,000 to £10,000 for the first year. It is certainly desirable that several of these experimental farms should be established, and in order to carry out this work effectively funds to the extent of £25,000 should be provided for this year alone, with an even larger extension in 1905.

There is one further advantage in the establishment of these model farms, viz, the excellent means they would provide for the education of experts. The available supply of competent men, with the necessary knowledge, is exceedingly limited, and it is absolutely necessary that young Englishmen should be sent out at once to obtain a thoroughly practical education in cultivation.

In addition to this expenditure in Africa it might be desirable to devote, say, £20,000 toward the establishment of ginning and buying centers in other parts of the world.

From the above it will be seen that the association could very usefully lay out £250,000 during the two ensuing years. Much, however, of this expenditure would be recovered in the form of cotton grown, and can therefore be regarded as capital expenditure. This capital could continue to be usefully employed in carrying on the work or could be returned to the subscribers should the association at any time consider that its work was completed and could be safely left in the hands of others. It therefore rests entirely with Lancashire, and I might say with the country generally, to declare, in no uncertain voice, whether they are prepared to find the necessary funds for the salvation of the largest industry of the world.

I think the account of the work of the association which I have given you will enable you to partially realize the enormous task we have undertaken and the huge field we have to cover. Now that larger funds are coming in, and that we are consequently able to develop experiments on a much larger scale, I am confident in two or three years' time we shall obtain a really appreciable and much-needed addition to our sadly attenuated supplies of cotton.

I believe this movement to be one of the very highest importance to Lancashire, and, looking ahead, no one can tell into what it may ultimately develop—possibly some huge corporate body on the lines of, say, the Mersey Dock and Harbor Board, and which will be managed solely for the benefit of both growers and users, and we may then see Lancashire practically growing her own cotton and having it brought straight from the producer to the doors of her mills, without hindrance or interference from greedy speculators and gamblers and others, who prey on the commerce of the world.

Let Lancashire only realize that it is no use going to governments and asking them to stop speculation; let her learn her lesson and realize to-day, if she has not done so already, that her salvation lies mainly in her own hands, and then, and not till then, we may be able to look on Mr. Sully and all his gang as benefactors in disguise.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 26th ultimo, proposing to appropriate \$250,000 to pay the Wales Island Packing Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York by American citizens, etc., intended to be proposed to the general deficiency appropriation bill, reported it with amendments, submitted a report thereon, and moved that the amendments and accompanying report and papers be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 102) relating to the exemption of all private property at sea, not contraband of war, from capture or destruction by belligerent powers, reported it without amendment.

Mr. DILLINGHAM, from the Committee on Immigration, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5317) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved March 3, 1903, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3410) to extend to citizens of the United States who were owners, charterers, masters, officers, and crews of certain vessels registered under the laws of the United States, and to citizens of the United States whose claims were rejected because of the American citizenship of the claimants, or of one or more of the owners, by the international commission appointed pursuant to the convention of February 8, 1898, between the United States and Great Britain, the relief heretofore granted to and received by British subjects in respect of damages for unlawful seizures of vessels or cargoes, or both, or for damning interference with the vessels or the voyages of vessels engaged in sealing beyond the 3-mile limit, and beyond the jurisdiction of the United States, in accordance with the judgment of the fur-seal arbitration, at Paris, in its award of August 15, 1893, and so that justice shall not be denied to American citizens which has been so freely meted out to British subjects, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (H. R. 2009) for the relief of the estate of Sven J. Johnson; and

A bill (H. R. 9457) for the relief of Alexander S. Rosenthal.

Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4353) relative to fees and commissions on final entry or commutation of homestead entries, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FOSTER, of Washington, from the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 22d ultimo proposing to appropriate \$183,000 to construct wagon roads and bridges in the Mount Rainier National Park, etc., intended to be pro-

posed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported it without amendment, submitted a report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS, from the Committee of Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4608) appropriating \$50,000 for a textile and agricultural exhibit by the Government of the United States at Cape Town, South Africa, during the months of December, 1904, and January, 1905, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions; which was agreed to.

Mr. BURNHAM. I am directed by the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2327) for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the White Mountains, to be known as the National White Mountain Forest Reserve, to report it without amendment. I give notice that at a later day I shall submit a report to accompany the bill.

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

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

A bill (S. 5304) for the relief of the heirs of George T. Howard; and

A bill (H. R. 11337) for the relief of G. H. Dearen.

SALARY OF CONSUL AT NIUCHWANG, CHINA.

Mr. CULLOM. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5452) fixing the salary of the consul at Niuchwang, China, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that from and after the 1st day of June, 1904, the consul appointed to the port of Niuchwang, China, shall receive an annual salary of \$4,000.

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

FORT ABRAHAM LINCOLN MILITARY RESERVATION LANDS.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12687) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the opening of certain abandoned military reservations, and for other purposes," approved August 23, 1894, to report it favorably without amendment. The bill provides for the opening of a small abandoned military reservation, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act to provide for the opening of certain abandoned military reservations, and for other purposes," approved August 23, 1894, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto section 3, which said section shall read as follows:

"Sec. 3. That all persons now having, or who may hereafter file, homestead applications upon any of the lands situate within the abandoned Fort Abraham Lincoln Military Reservation, in Morton County, State of North Dakota, shall be entitled to a patent to the land filed upon by such person upon compliance with the provisions of the homestead law of the United States and proper proof thereof, and shall not be required to pay the appraised values of such lands in addition to such compliance with the said homestead law."

Mr. TELLER. I should like to have the bill read again. I do not know what it is.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. It provides for the opening of an abandoned military reservation to homestead settlers.

Mr. TELLER. If that is what the bill is, I do not object to it.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. That is what it is.

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

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. GIBSON introduced a bill (S. 5492) granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Holden; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BALL introduced a bill (S. 5493) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Kerns; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. QUARLES introduced a bill (S. 5494) removing the charge of desertion from the name of William R. Garner; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 5495) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Louise Scannell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BAILEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 5496) granting an increase of pension to Jesse L. Sanders; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 5497) for the relief of John N. Stratt, lieutenant in the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 5498) to amend section 55 of an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

Mr. NEULANDS introduced a bill (S. 5499) granting a pension to Matilda J. Henderson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 5500) for the relief of the heirs of David Knight; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. MALLORY submitted the following amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 14754) providing for the restoration or maintenance of channels, or of river and harbor improvements, and for other purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$3,000 for survey of the Caloosahatchee River from Punta Rassa to Fort Myers;

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$5,000 for continuing the improvement at the Cypress Top mouth of the Choctawhatchee River; and

An amendment providing for a survey of the bar at the entrance of Alaqu Bayou, on Choctawhatchee Bay, in the State of Florida.

Mr. BACON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$30,000 for increasing the facilities of the repair establishment of the Augusta Arsenal, Augusta, Ga., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment directing the accounting officers of the Treasury to ascertain the principal sum or sums heretofore allowed to the States of Massachusetts, Maine, New York, and Pennsylvania for money expended in behalf of the United States during the war of 1812 with Great Britain, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

UNITED STATES NAVAL MILITIA.

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

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 1,500 copies of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Naval Militia Association of the United States, held in Washington, D. C., January 14 and 15, 1904, together with the statements of Commander Usher, United States Navy, and Lieut. Sidney Bieber, of the naval militia of the District of Columbia, before the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, on March 15 and 16, 1904.

SALE OF PANAMA CANAL PROPERTY.

Mr. MORGAN. I submit a resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General is hereby directed to inform the Senate, at his earliest convenience, of the present state of the negotiation or agreement between the New Panama Canal Company and the Government of the United States, together with a copy of any agreement or agreements that have been made or proposed by said parties, or either of them, touching the sale of the property of the said canal company since March 11, 1903; and that he also transmit to the Senate copies of all papers relating thereto that are or have been in his possession and under his control, so as to inform the Senate fully as to the entire transaction.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. President, I think the resolution should go to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

Mr. MORGAN. That committee, Mr. President, have that resolution before them now, and they will not act. I can not get them together; I can not get a meeting called, and I propose to ask the Senate to act on it.

Mr. HOPKINS. There is no disposition, I understand, on the part of the committee to evade any responsibility. For that reason I think the resolution should go to the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. It is already before the committee in those very words, and offered by a Republican. Mr. President, let it go over until to-morrow if Senators want to discuss it.

Mr. HOPKINS. If my honorable friend will permit me, I ask that the resolution may lie over for a day, and I will consult with the Senator on the subject.

Mr. MORGAN. Let it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over.

AUGUSTA ARSENAL, GA.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to report to the Senate, at as early date as may be consistent with a careful investigation into the condition, location, character, and capacity of the Augusta Arsenal, at Augusta, Ga., what steps the best interests of the United States call for to secure the utilization of the establishment of the Ordnance Department at said arsenal with a view to the present and the future needs of the military establishment.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 13300) granting certain rights and privileges to the commissioners of waterworks in the city of Erie, Pa., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPEAL OF THE DESERT-LAND ACT, ETC.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have in my hand a document which contains testimony pertinent to the proposed repeal of public-land laws given before the Committee on Irrigation of the House of Representatives. I had expected to use a few pages of this in a speech I made a few days since, but it had not then come from the printer. I now ask unanimous consent that for a reprint of my speech I may call from this document and submit a few pages as a part of that speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Extract from hearings before the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands of the House of Representatives on the proposed repeal of desert-land act.]

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION OF ARID LANDS,
April 4, 1904.

Hon. FRANK W. MONDELL, chairman, presiding.

STATEMENT OF MR. GEORGE H. MAXWELL, OF CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. MAXWELL. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, I would like to state that in appearing before your committee I am appearing in a double capacity. I am a member of the standing committee of the National Board of Trade, appointed at their last meeting, January 21, at which resolutions were adopted on this subject, and the standing committee appointed to aid in pressing the matter before Congress; and with the permission of the committee I would like to present those resolutions to the Congress, together with the report accompanying the same.

"RESOLUTIONS OF THE NATIONAL BOARD OF TRADE, ADOPTED AT ITS THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING AT WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 21, 1904.

"Whereas the ultimate object to be accomplished in the disposition of the public domain is to secure the actual settlement and cultivation of the largest possible area of such lands to agricultural crops by a class of settlers who will actually live on said lands and till them in comparatively small farms, thus enlarging to the utmost the agricultural production and consequent general prosperity of the country; and

"Whereas the rapid absorption of these public lands into large holdings, under the desert-land act and the commutation clause of the homestead act, unaccompanied in the majority of cases by permanent settlement and cultivation, threatens to seriously retard the development of the West, and the abuses and frauds which have been committed under these laws and under the timber and stone act can only be prevented by a repeal of these laws; Be it

"*Resolved*, That the timber and stone act, the desert-land act, and the commutation clause of the homestead act should be forthwith repealed, and in future all agricultural and irrigable land reserved exclusively for actual settlers under the homestead act, and that in future the Government should reserve the title to forest lands, selling only the stumpage of matured timber; and also that the forest work of the Government should be consolidated in the Bureau of Forestry of the Department of Agriculture.

"*Resolved further*, That the great irrigation works necessary to save from waste and utilize for irrigation the waters of our large western rivers should be built as rapidly as the lands will be taken and utilized by farmers in farms of 100 acres or less in area, and the entire cost of construction repaid to the Government through a charge imposed on the lands reclaimed, as provided in the national irrigation act.

"*Resolved further*, That we indorse and approve the selection by the United States reclamation service and the Secretary of the Interior for construction under the national irrigation act of the Tonto Basin Reservoir in Arizona, the Truckee-Carson River system in Nevada, and the St. Mary-Milk River Valley system in Montana, and urge that the actual work of construction on all these projects should be pushed to completion without delay.

"*Resolved further*, That we indorse and urge the immediate passage of H. R. 8460, being the bill embodied in the House of Representatives Report No. 48, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session, the said bill, as shown in said report, having been approved by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior and recommended for passage by the Committee on the Public Lands of the House of Representatives.

"*Resolved further*, That we indorse the Quarles bill as recommended for passage in the report of the Senate Committee on Public Lands at the last session of Congress, and reintroduced in this session, being Senate bill 832, Fifty-eighth Congress, first session, and urge the immediate passage of said bill in this session of Congress, in order that the monstrous abuses and frauds which have been and are now being committed under the acts therein mentioned shall be forthwith stopped; and that we call the attention of Congress and of the country to the facts set forth in said Senate report, which show the urgent need for the immediate repeal of said laws, said report being known as part 1 of Report 3108, Fifty-seventh Congress, second session.

"*Resolved further*, That no laws should at any time or under any circumstances be enacted by Congress which would permit anyone to acquire title to public lands, except an actual settler who had lived five years on the land, as required by the original homestead act, and that no grant of public lands should ever be made to any State or Territory for any purpose whatsoever, and that there should be no extension of the provisions of the Carey Act.

"*Resolved further*, That we urge upon Congress the prompt enactment of a measure which will compel the immediate location or retirement of all lieu-land scrip of every description, and that no more such scrip shall ever be issued.

"*Resolved further*, That the secretary of this board be, and is hereby, instructed to immediately transmit a copy of the foregoing resolutions to the President of the United States, and to every Senator and Representative in Congress, and also to every organization which is a member of this board, and request their earnest cooperation to secure the passage of the bills above

referred to, and to the enactment of all legislation necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

"*Resolved further*, That the committee on forestry and irrigation of this board be continued, to cooperate with the secretary and commissioner of this board in carrying into effect the foregoing resolutions, and to report to the next annual meeting of this board, and that the said committee be composed of all members of the last committee of this board on forestry and irrigation and of this committee who have attended this annual meeting, being the following-named persons: William H. Chadwick, F. B. Thurber, F. L. Hitchcock, George H. Anderson, E. S. Lyon, George H. Maxwell.

"Respectfully submitted.

"R. S. LYON.

"GEORGE H. MAXWELL."

(Unanimously adopted.)

I am also the executive chairman of the National Irrigation Association, which is an organization of the business men of the country, and I have here a list of the members of the association, made some little time ago. We have had a good many members since then, and if any member of the committee desires to look over this list I would be very glad to have him do so, and I might also state—

Mr. VAN DUZER. This is here alphabetically, not by States?

Mr. MAXWELL. Alphabetically, yes. At the last meeting of the board of directors of that association the identical resolutions of the National Board of Trade were adopted as being the resolutions by which the National Irrigation Association stands in this matter. I also submit a list of the officers of the National Irrigation Association, which I would be glad to have included with my remarks:

"THE NATIONAL IRRIGATION ASSOCIATION.

"Thomas F. Walsh, president, Washington, D. C.; James H. Eckels, treasurer, Chicago, Ill.; Benjamin F. Beardsley, general secretary, St. Paul, Minn.; George H. Maxwell, executive chairman, Chicago, Ill.; Guy E. Mitchell, corresponding secretary, Washington, D. C.; John H. Fowler, recording secretary, Chicago, Ill.

"*Vice-presidents at large*.—Charles A. Moore, New York; James Deering, Chicago; David R. Francis, St. Louis; Peter Cooper Hewitt, New York; Homer Laughlin, Los Angeles; D. R. Noyes, St. Paul; Louis Stern, New York.

"*Board of directors*.—C. B. Boothe, chairman, 17 Battery Place, New York City. George H. Barbour, vice-president and general manager Michigan Stove Company, Detroit, Mich.; vice-president Detroit Board of Trade; treasurer and ex-president Michigan Manufacturers' Association; ex-president National Association of Stove Manufacturers. Julius C. Birge, president St. Louis Shovel Co., St. Louis, Mo.; president American Hardware Manufacturers' Association. A. H. Comstock, vice-president Marshall-Wells Hardware Co., Duluth, Minn., and Portland, Ore.; chairman industrial committee Duluth Commercial Club. O. V. Dodge, vice-president and treasurer Kansas City Hay Press Co., Kansas City, Mo.; vice-president National Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers. John W. Dunn, president International Pump Co., New York, N. Y. John C. Eames, second vice-president and general manager H. B. Claffin Company, New York, N. Y. B. A. Eckhart, president Eckhart & Swan Milling Co., Chicago, Ill.; president Millers' National Federation; ex-president Illinois Manufacturers' Association. P. W. Gates, member executive committee National Business League; ex-vice-president National Association of Manufacturers. R. A. Kirk, Farwell, Ozmun, Kirk & Co., St. Paul, Minn.; member advisory board and ex-president National Hardware Association. F. S. Kretzinger, president American Fork and Hoe Company and American Handle Company, Cleveland, Ohio; president the Iowa Farming Tool Company, Fort Madison, Iowa; first vice-president American Hardware Manufacturers' Association; vice-president National Association of Manufacturers. William McCarroll, president American Leather Company, New York, N. Y.; president the Manufacturers' Association of New York. F. E. Myers, F. E. Myers & Bro., Ashland, Ohio, president National Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers. W. C. Nones, president Kentucky Wagon Manufacturing Company, Louisville, Ky.; ex-president National Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers. W. H. Parlin, president Parlin, Orendorff & Co., Canton, Ill., Kansas City, Portland, St. Louis, Indianapolis, Dallas, Des Moines, Omaha, Denver, Minneapolis; ex-president National Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers. D. M. Parry, president Parry Manufacturing Company, Indianapolis, Ind.; president National Association of Manufacturers. Erskine M. Phelps, president National Business League, Chicago, Ill. Fayette R. Plumb, Fayette R. Plumb Company, Philadelphia, Pa., ex-president American Hardware Manufacturers' Association. C. W. Post, president Postum Cereal Company, Battle Creek, Mich.; president Association of American Advertisers. J. W. Scott, Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co., Chicago, Ill., vice-chairman National Association Merchants and Travelers. H. C. Staver, president Staver Carriage Company, Chicago, Ill.; ex-president National Association Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers; ex-president Carriage Builders' National Association. H. M. Wallis, president J. I. Case Plow Company, Racine, Wis.; vice-president National Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers. Clarence Whitman, Clarence Whitman & Co., New York, N. Y., president Merchants' Association of New York. W. S. Wright, president Wright & Wilhelmy Company, Omaha, Nebr.; president Omaha Commercial Club; member executive committee National Hardware Association.

"*Executive council*.—George H. Maxwell, chairman, Fisher Building, Chicago, Ill.; C. A. Carlisle, South Bend, Ind.; A. H. Devers, Portland, Ore.; Elliott Durand, Chicago, Ill.; Eltinge Elmore, Milwaukee, Wis.; B. A. Fowler, Phoenix, Ariz.; Clarke Gopen, Madison, Wis.; Arthur Gunn, Wenatchee, Wash.; Wm. A. Kelsey, Meriden, Conn.; Everett B. Kirk, St. Paul, Minn.; Henry E. Lewis, Lincoln, Nebr.; E. H. Libby, Clarkston, Wash.; Jesse E. Northrup, Minneapolis, Minn.; I. D. O'Donnell, Billings, Mont.; Tom Richardson, New Orleans, La.; Hermann H. Roloff, New York, N. Y.; J. A. Smith, El Paso, Tex.; Francis B. Thurber, New York, N. Y.; Delbert Utter, Caldwell, Wis.; Henry R. Whitmore, St. Louis, Mo.; W. M. Woolbridge, Hindsdale, Mont.

"*State vice-presidents*.—Arizona, Alexander O. Brodie, Phoenix; California, Thomas R. Bard, Los Angeles; Colorado, D. C. Dodge, Denver; Idaho, O. E. McCutcheon, Idaho Falls; Kansas, E. R. Moses, Great Bend; Kentucky, C. F. Huhlein, Louisville; Maine, Hugh J. Chisholm, Portland; Massachusetts, Herbert Myrick, Springfield; Minnesota, T. L. Schurmeier, St. Paul; Mississippi, T. C. Catchings, Vicksburg; Montana, Paris Gibson, Great Falls; Nebraska, Euclid Martin, Omaha; Nevada, J. E. Stubbs, Reno; New York, W. Caryl Ely, Buffalo; North Carolina, D. A. Tompkins, Charlotte; North Dakota, T. S. Underhill, Antelope; Oregon, E. M. Bramick, Portland; Ohio, James Kilbourne, Columbus; Pennsylvania, G. W. Atherton, State College; South Dakota, Wesley A. Stuart, Sturgis; Texas, F. F. Collins, San Antonio; Utah, J. W. Shurtliff, Ogden; Vermont, H. Fairbanks, St. Johnsbury; West Virginia, J. C. Brady, Wheeling."

Mr. VAN DUZER. Another thing I would like to have cleared up to my own satisfaction. The statement has been made—has never been made directly to me, but it is current comment around the Capitol—that people who desire the repeal of the desert-land act are a crowd of people generally who have gotten control of scrip, and if they can repeal the desert-land act the settlers

will have to come to them for scrip. I would like to have you explain that to the committee.

Mr. MAXWELL. I would like very much to explain that to the committee, but my fifteen minutes are up.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move that Mr. Maxwell be allowed additional time.

Mr. REEDER. The point is this: I want to hear from Mr. Maxwell further, but I also want to hear why they do not want those laws repealed. I want to hear from somebody on the other side. I will not stand in the way if he wants to proceed fifteen minutes further.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move that Mr. Maxwell's time be extended fifteen minutes longer.

Mr. BELL. I second the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, Mr. Maxwell may proceed.

Mr. MAXWELL. The question asked by Mr. VAN DUZER brings up a subject about which there has been a good deal of talk. I have seen more or less of items in the newspapers about it lately, and I want to make this statement absolutely. I saw an item in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, when I was up there, that Senator HANSBROUGH had stated in the Senate, as I recall it, that the movement for the repeal of the desert-land law was a movement of large landowners or land grabbers in the West to enable them to grab all the land there was left.

Now, that was the substance of it as I saw it. Now, I do not believe there is any move or any backing for the national irrigation movement or this repeal movement that I do not know about. I think I know about it, if there is. Now, I want to state as an absolute fact, and I will go into it with just as much detail afterwards as you gentlemen desire, that any statement that there is a syndicate of scrip owners pushing this repeal movement is an absolute, unqualified, and unmitigated falsehood. I saw a statement that some big land speculators who had been buying up very large tracts of land in Kansas were behind this movement, and their managers had been down here conferring with Senators and Congressmen. Now, if there is any such support as that for the national irrigation movement I know nothing about it. And I would like to know if there is, and if it can be made possible by the gentlemen who made the statement—

Mr. WILLIAMSON. If I understand you, all the land grabbing and reaching out for large ownerships of land is confined to cattlemen?

Mr. MAXWELL. Oh, no. I will give you an illustration, Mr. WILLIAMSON, right here. These are merely illustrations. In referring to the Chinook, the Miller & Lux, and referring to the Brady locations, I am merely giving illustrations, and I could bring them until the room was filled with them. The point is this: You ask if it is confined to cattlemen. I say no. This advertisement, which has been running in the Great Falls Tribune, of Montana, is an advertisement of an alleged cooperative woolen mill company, in which they are setting forth that if people will come in and buy their stock at \$100 a share they will steer them so they will locate their desert-land rights and eventually perfect title, get the lands, and make profit on them; and it is said this company desires to provide range for its sheep. I will bring that advertisement here and submit it to the committee. That is in answer to your question as to whether it is confined to cattlemen. I know personally of a great many cases where land has been and is being taken up under the desert land act by men who are merely taking it up as a speculative matter, who are not cattlemen; but I believe that out in Montana a larger area of desert-land which could be taken up is being taken up by men who propose to run cattle on it. It is valuable for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. You have been over this arid country a great deal?

Mr. MAXWELL. In a great many places. I have not been in Oregon at all, nor in eastern Idaho. I am very familiar with Montana, California, Arizona, and parts of New Mexico.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Have you or have you not noticed as to these large cattle concerns, at whose door it is alleged they are collecting large bodies of land, that almost every one of those land estates is for sale?

Mr. MAXWELL. I do not see any pertinency to that point.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I want to refute this argument that I find going broadcast that it is the cattlemen who are doing all this land grabbing.

Mr. MAXWELL. I will take you right through Montana and I will show you spot after spot where land is being taken up to-day by cattlemen.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I can show you in Oregon the French-Glen Company and Miller & Lux Company, and other large companies that can be taken up at less than cost. I can quote you the prices for the land.

The CHAIRMAN. While we are on that question of agitation for repeal, within your knowledge is it or is it not a fact that the land-grant railroads, owners of large areas of land, have contributed to the support of the National Irrigation Association, which you represent, and to the maintenance of the journals that you print, which have been advocating wholesale repeal of the land laws?

Mr. MAXWELL. The transcontinental railroads began four years ago contributing to an educational fund to bring about the inauguration of a national irrigation policy by the Federal Government, which resulted in the passage of the national irrigation act which you advocate. I had very grave doubts before that act was passed whether it was wise to have that act passed before the land laws were reaffirmed, so that we would be sure that the agricultural lands would go to benefit settlers, and I had a good deal of correspondence, among others with Senator GIBSON, of Montana.

We finally decided it was better to push the irrigation policy ahead, because until we could absolutely show that there was a way of getting Government land in the West reclaimed other than under the desert-land act we were confronted with the argument that the desert-land act was the only way you could get arid land reclaimed, and we had to have a desert-land act for that reason. Now, it was understood between members of our own association to a very wide extent, not with the railroads, but with the people who had no connection with the railroads, that we would support the national irrigation policy, and the moment that we got that bill through we would try to get these land laws remedied so that no man but a settler would get Government land—that is, agricultural or irrigable land.

Now, I want to make this statement absolutely and positively, gentlemen: The transcontinental railroads began, as I say, more than four years ago contributing to the fund of the National Irrigation Association. They are not the National Irrigation Association. They have no direction of its policy; they have never undertaken in any way, shape, manner, or form to direct its policy, and if they have liked our policy it has been simply because they believed it would not be bad policy in the West. And any statement that the National Irrigation Association has in any way, directly or indirectly, received support from the railroad companies upon the theory that it was going to make their lands more valuable or their scrip more valuable, or anything of that kind, is absolutely false. The fact is, gentlemen, when this question of the contribution of the railroad companies came up it came up purely and solely on the basis of getting the Government enlisted in the national irrigation policy—

The CHAIRMAN. Allow me just one question right there. The gentleman says that any statement that they did support this movement for repeal with the view of increasing the value of their lands (of which they own a great many million acres) and of their forest-reserve lands which can be used as a base for lieu selections or scrip (of which they own, say, 2,500,000 acres)—that their support to accomplish this object was for the purpose of enhancing the value of this land, you say, is false?

Mr. MAXWELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman say how or in what way he can read the minds of the gentlemen of the transcontinental railroads who are contributing to this fund in such a way as to know whether or not they have in their minds the idea that it will increase the value of their lands?

Mr. MAXWELL. I know what the policy of the National Irrigation Association has been from the start, and to this moment I know the railroad companies have never undertaken to shape its policy. They have simply followed it.

Mr. BELL. I would like to ask if the Secretary of the Interior has ever been applied to to withdraw temporarily any tracts of land that were being threatened by the desert-land law and refused to do so? Do you find now that there has been any obstruction along those lines?

Mr. MAXWELL. He has withdrawn lands. When it was found that perhaps they could not be brought immediately under the irrigation system he has thrown them open again. Many thousands of acres in northern Montana—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. You made a statement in reply to Mr. Bell that a considerable portion of these 40,000,000 acres was a class of land that never could be redeemed. Now, if the Secretary has withdrawn such lands, would not that show that he has ample authority under the laws, and if he has done this once or twice, or twenty times, he can repeat it; and by doing so are we not fairly well protected under existing laws?

Mr. MAXWELL. No; because the lands which are reclaimable under the desert-land act by nonresidents—take it especially in the State of Montana—are located all through the State, here and there and everywhere, on the little streams that run through the prairies.

Mr. BELL. Where the Government never will go?

Mr. MAXWELL. But where settlers will go—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to perfect some information I asked for. When you gave the name of the railroads that had contributed to these various funds you did not state the amounts they contributed.

Mr. MAXWELL. Six thousand dollars for each of the transcontinental lines and the Burlington and \$3,000 for the Rock Island.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That makes how much altogether?

Mr. MAXWELL. Thirty-nine thousand dollars.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now, for what purpose is that money used?

Mr. MAXWELL. It has been used for the expenses of the National Irrigation Association, and there has only been a part which has been available by that association for the circulation of its literature and the maintenance of our press bureau and the educational campaign which we have been carrying on for the last five years.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is an annual contribution?

Mr. MAXWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Has been going on for five years?

Mr. MAXWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And still continuing?

Mr. MAXWELL. Still continuing.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Six thousand dollars each for the transcontinental lines, the six of them?

Mr. MAXWELL. I include the Burlington.

Mr. FRENCH. What one pays less than \$5,000?

Mr. MAXWELL. The Rock Island.

Mr. FRENCH. That pays \$3,000.

Mr. MAXWELL. The funds of the association are drawn also from many different directions. This fund is only a part.

Mr. MARSHALL. What part?

Mr. MAXWELL. I think the fund exceeds \$50,000 altogether.

Mr. MARSHALL. Annually?

Mr. MAXWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Referring to this \$50,000 fund, who controls the disposition of that? Do you?

Mr. MAXWELL. We do.

GOVERNMENT OF CANAL ZONE.

Mr. KITTREDGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 5342) to provide for the temporary government of the canal zone at Panama, the protection of the canal works, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I desire to hear read again—I did not hear it read—an amendment to the bill which I understand was offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] this morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine offered an amendment this morning, which will be read at the request of the Senator from Alabama.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill the following new section:

SEC. 28. That all stores, supplies, machinery, materials, and men sent by sea, either by the United States or by any of its contractors, for any and all purposes connected with the building of the Panama Canal, shall be transported in United States built vessels or ships whenever the Secretary of War shall be able to enter into contracts with such vessels or ships for such transportation at prices and rates that he may deem reasonable, and in such case the provisions of section 3709, section 3826, and sections 3718 to and inclusive of section 3732 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and all provisions of law prescribing action in departmental contracts shall not be applicable to contracts made under the provisions of this section; and all transportation at sea for the purposes of building the Panama Canal, as provided in this section, whenever the same may be in charge of the head of any other Department of the Government, shall be subject to the provisions of this section as applied to transportation under the Secretary of War.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS] notified me yesterday that he has an amendment which seems to cover a good deal of the same ground that is covered by the amendment that has just been read at the desk. I am at a loss to know whether we ought to proceed with that amendment until the Senator from Maryland can come in. His amendment met my approval as far as I am personally concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to state to the Senator from Alabama that he had information a few moments ago that the wife of the Senator from Maryland is dangerously ill, and he will not be here.

Mr. MORGAN. This feature of the bill, Mr. President, is new. It has never been before the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals. It is very important, and from the reading as I heard it at the desk I am inclined to believe that it ought to be adopted, but I would not like to say so and vote to that effect until it has had a careful examination and explanation by the Senator who has offered it.

In this connection, and in view of the fact that an objection was made this morning which carried over a resolution which I offered to get more information about this matter, I would say I am a little surprised at the haste and eagerness that is pressing this bill to consideration at this hour, supplanting all other business. I do not understand the situation. I am sorry I do not, for I do not want to indulge in conjectures or suspicions about any matter or any movement in the Senate where the facts, if they were known, would clear up the situation and put us in an attitude to give due consideration to this very important bill.

But I suppose, Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has found it necessary for some reason to become intensely energetic on the subject of pressing the bill through, and that he will be sustained, of course, by his colleagues on the other side of the Chamber. But I think we are rushing upon events here and upon propositions that we will be regretting very much if we hurry through them. There is no pressure necessary for the passage of this bill within the next ten days, so far as I know. It has been given out from the newspapers, who are, of course, our only sources of information on this side of the Chamber—we have no other light except what the newspapers very kindly give us, and generally very accurately—we have information from the newspapers that on the 23d day of this month, in Paris, a transaction is to take place of some kind which is to fix the rights of the United States with reference to the treaty that has been ratified now for more than a month, and which contains a provision that \$10,000,000 shall be paid on the exchange of ratifications.

I believe, Mr. President—I am bound to say I am convinced that the delay of the payment of the \$10,000,000, accompanied with the pressure that is brought to bear now when we have still ten days between now and the fated 23d of April, is for some occult purpose that I am incapable of comprehending, and as to which I could not venture a conjecture without possibly doing injustice to some person connected with the Government. But we are left to conjecture and to nothing else.

I had hoped that the Senator from South Dakota, in view of the situation, would be willing to have some time left to the Senate for the consideration of this great measure upon the propositions that for the first time were submitted to it on yesterday evening.

There are probably not five Senators on this floor who had read the bill that is now before the Senate or the counter project—the substitute I had the honor to offer yesterday—or the report of the minority of the committee upon that substitute. They were printed in the RECORD in order that Senators might have the opportunity at their homes, when they were not embarrassed with continual interruptions, to contemplate and to study the plan of government for the canal zone in Panama. They have not had time to do it; and if I were to take my seat and withdraw all objection to the passage of the bill this morning the Senate would feel that I had treated them with serious injustice in not explaining or having explained, as the Senator from South Dakota has not attempted even yet to explain, the purposes and the plan of his proposed legislation.

The Senator has had two bills before the Senate on this subject, both of which I have here. The first is S. 4513; the second is S. 5342. But the Senator stated on the day he reported back S. 5342, as was stated yesterday also, that that bill was reported by the committee without amendment. That is very true as to that particular bill, but the plan of the Senator, a part of which he has succeeded in retaining in this second bill, has been blue penciled by the committee and blue penciled by the consulting friends outside of the committee, I suppose, until now it bears scarcely a resemblance to his original bill. Yet the Senator took the pains to say that his bill had been reported back without amendment. Well, was his bill reported back without amendment? If it was not, why not?

Mr. President, for the purpose of bringing this subject right home to the consideration of the Senate I will for the present withdraw my offer of the amendment by way of a substitute to the bill, and ask that the bill be taken up by sections for consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama withdraws his proposed substitute.

Mr. MORGAN. Temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Temporarily. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask that the bill be read by sections for amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first section will be read.

The Secretary read section 1, as follows:

That the President is hereby authorized upon the acquisition of the property of the New Panama Canal Company and the payment to the Republic of Panama of the \$10,000,000 provided by Article XIV of the treaty between the United States and the Republic of Panama, the ratifications of which were exchanged on the 26th day of February, 1901, to be paid to the latter Government, to take possession of and occupy on behalf of the United States the zone of land and land under water of the width of 10 miles, extending to the distance of 5 miles on each side of the center line of the route of the canal to be constructed thereon, which said zone begins in the Caribbean Sea 3 marine miles from mean low-water mark and extends to and across the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific Ocean to the distance of 8 marine miles from mean low-water mark, and also of all islands within said zone, and in addition thereto the group of islands in the Bay of Panama named Perico, Naos, Culebra, and Flamenco, and, from time to time, of any lands and waters outside of said zone which may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said canal, or of any auxiliary canals or other works necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of said enterprise, the use, occupation, and control whereof were granted to the United States by Article II of said treaty. The said zone is hereinafter referred to as "the canal zone."

Mr. MORGAN. I offer as a substitute for that section section 11 of my substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama offers an amendment, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out section 1 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the sum of \$10,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be paid to the Government of the Republic of Panama, in compliance with the stipulations of the treaty with said Republic dated November 18, 1903. And the President shall cause said money to be paid to said Government without delay. And thereupon he is directed and required to take possession of and to occupy the canal zone described and defined in said treaty as the property of the United States, and he shall cause the flag of the United States to be raised over said zone, and shall require the Isthmian Canal Commission to proceed forthwith to perform their duties in said zone and in places appurtenant thereto, according to law.

Mr. MORGAN. The substitute for that section brings up the question which is preliminary to all other questions involved in this legislation, and which is vital, as I believe, to the success of our operations in building a canal at Panama. If that substitute should be voted down, other questions will then arise upon the balance of the bill which of themselves are of vital importance to the success of the governmental scheme or plan that we propose to introduce into that canal zone. But I believe that the Senate of the United States, when it comes to consider the present situation, will not take ground of the sort that it is asked to take in the first section of this bill.

In discussing this section of the bill I am necessarily embarrassed, as other gentlemen on the floor of the Senate must necessarily be, by the want of information. What is the information that is needed? It is upon the question of the acquisition of the property of the New Panama Canal Company. We have no information on that subject at all, and yet this bill postpones every movement in respect of the canal until that property is acquired.

The President is authorized upon the acquisition of the property of the New Panama Canal Company to take the measures of government in regard to this canal zone which are planned and defined in the bill. Until that canal zone is acquired the bill is inoperative. It is only upon the acquisition of that property that the President is permitted by Congress to enter upon anything of a practical character whatever in connection with the building of the Panama Canal or the organization of a government there or of control over it.

It is upon the acquisition that he is authorized to act; it is upon the acquisition that the bill becomes operative; and until that acquisition is completed, or, in the language of the Hay-Varilla treaty, is consummated, of course this bill amounts to nothing. We are legislating for a future condition that may happen or may not happen. What do we know about the acquisition of this property? What property is it that we are going to acquire? What is the description of it? It is the property of the New Panama Canal Company. What is that property? It consists of a leasehold interest in certain land located in the State of Panama—the Republic of Panama now—and a concession that originated with the Colombian Government, and has been transferred by operation of law, as it is said, from Colombia to Panama, and by operation of a treaty—the Hay-Varilla treaty—from Panama to the United States.

That is a part of it. But a report of this New Panama Canal Company that I have here before me, which I had printed as a document the other day by the Senate, contains an account of the many other assets they have; some of them money in their treasury in Paris—that is property of this canal company—various surveys that have heretofore been made at such a supposed cost—I grant you it is imaginary—but supposed cost, as we in treating with that company for certain properties prior to the ratification and consideration of the Hay-Varilla treaty priced at \$2,000,000. That is property of that company.

There is also railroad stock said to belong to that company, and it does belong to it, which it purchased for a price a little over

\$18,000,000 some years ago. That railroad company is chartered in New York. It held a concession from Colombia that had no connection with the canal except this: That it was the prior occupant of the present canal route, and when the Panama Canal Company had a concession granted to it, it entered into a stipulation that it would buy out the railroad and get the privilege of going through upon its line, or in the vicinity of its line, before its charter under the Wyse concession could become perfect. This \$18,000,000 worth of stock comprises about seventy-nine eighths, I believe, of the entire stock of this American corporation, the property connected with it or that it represents—a majority—there being left only about 10 per cent of the whole value of the stock in the hands of other holders, who are people of the United States.

The property connected with it is of immense value. This great railroad has been in operation for more than fifty years—I believe about fifty years—and the improvements made upon it have been of the first class. It carries as heavy iron as any railroad in the world. All the cross-ties, as was stated by one of the witnesses before the Inter-oceanic Canal Committee on the hearings, are of lignum-vitæ or some wood almost equally as imperishable, and were laid down at an enormous cost. The road has been heavily ballasted, and it carries immense loads from ships' cargoes which are transferred from Panama to Colon and from Colon to Panama. That railroad is of such value as a piece of property that for about five years of its existence, according to the statement made by M. Hutin, who was the director-general of the canal company, it earned more than 12½ per cent net profit upon this investment, which cost originally \$8,000,000, and they paid for it more than \$18,000,000. In three years, in the decade of the nineties, the net profits of that railroad company were over 31½ per cent. So that it is an immensely valuable property.

The Congress of the United States is supposed to be at least deliberately considering a measure of importance—of the greatest possible importance—connected with this great subject, and the language that we bring into this bill for the purpose of determining our rights to be acquired hereafter by the President is—

That the President is hereby authorized, upon the acquisition of the property of the New Panama Canal Company—

Naturally and necessarily that would mean all the property of the New Panama Canal Company.

We have had some prior legislation on this subject and made very careful inquiry into the situation at the time the Spooner law was passed, and the property that was specified in the Spooner Act expressly included this railroad stock. This bill does not.

The Spooner law by necessary implication excluded the money they had in their treasury. This bill does not exclude it. It takes it in. If there is anything above the earth or on the sea or under the sea available that is owned by that New Panama Canal Company, it has got to be acquired before this bill can take effect.

Are we legislating, Mr. President, here in this loose way upon this great subject? Do we expect the people of the United States to spend their money by the fifty millions of dollars upon such loose, ill-connected, and ill-jointed legislation as this? This bill is imperfect, premature, incomplete, uncertain; and it is no more in correspondence with what is required by the Spooner law, if that is to be referred to, than it is in correspondence with something that never was put in print.

Now, what is being done or what has been done to gain this vast property? Nothing. We have got a Government here, and it is a Government supposed to be composed of three great departments; but its legislative department, which stands above all the others, controls the political destiny of this country, to say the least of it, and its internal government as well has no information on the subject of what is being done to get this property, or what the property is after we get it, whether it is located here or in Paris or upon the ocean, for the Panama Railroad Company owns three or four ships that ply regularly between New York and Panama. Our great commission that went out on a tour of exploration the other day sailed on one of the ships that belong to the Panama Railway Company. Do we get those ships? Do we get the railroad itself? The Hay-Varilla treaty expressly says we do. This bill does not say so. Ought there not to be something more definite in this bill than this in order that we may know what it is we are waiting for? Are we waiting for the acquisition of property that is totally undefined and unknown, as to which we have no guide, even of inquiry, that I know anything about, unless it might be the Spooner law? But when we come to that we find that it is not all the property of that company that we get; that it is only a certain part of it.

When is this property to be acquired and by whom? Has Congress passed any law since the Spooner Act to authorize the President of the United States to acquire this property? I know of none and have heard of none. Why did we put that provision in the Spooner law, that the President might make the purchase? It was because we knew we could not put that provision in a treaty,

that it would not be operative as a statute if incorporated in a treaty. A law is necessary, indispensable, to authorize the President to make a contract on behalf of the United States. That is not one of the functions of the Presidential office. He was not elected and qualified and sworn into office for the purpose of making bargains with A, B, and C that may concern the United States Government. He can not make a bargain without express authority of law. When he makes a bargain under the authority of law, a total line of cleavage, demarcation, and separation takes place between his constitutional functions as President of the United States and as the agent of the Government to make that bargain.

No law has been passed to authorize the President of the United States to make this acquisition. Neither is it in the Hay-Varilla treaty. There is no provision in that treaty that the President of the United States shall make the contemplated purchase. It is to be done by the United States, and not by the President. What does that always mean? It means by some act of law passed by the Congress of the United States authorizing the President, or any other agent that Congress may see proper to designate, to make a trade. The President, therefore, has no authority under the Hay-Varilla treaty, for it is not even mentioned in the Hay-Varilla treaty. The agency for the making of this contract is not mentioned or the manner of it is not mentioned in the Hay-Varilla treaty, or the price, or the time when the contract is to be completed, or who is to ratify it after it is completed—none of these are provided for in the Hay-Varilla treaty, nor are any of them provided for in any law existing on the statute book.

If we are going to wait for the purchase of this property from the New Panama Canal Company, had we not better see what we are going to pay for it and by what time the contract shall be completed, or else it shall be off? Shall we leave everything connected with this as a matter of inference, clothing the President of the United States with this discretionary, arbitrary, unrestrained power?

Mr. President, when the legislation of Congress approaches that line this country is in extreme danger. I have never seen an approximation made to it heretofore that was anything like so close or anything like so dangerous as that which is to be gathered from the language of this act.

Do we say in this act "that when the President shall acquire by purchase this property?" Not by any means. It is "upon the acquisition of the property of the Panama Canal Company;" and the United States can not acquire that property except by an act of law. There must be some statute to authorize this purchase, some designation of the party to make the contract, and there must be some ratification on the part of Congress of the contract when made. There must be some inventory or other description of the property that we are concerned in. And yet we are postponing the government of this zone, the possession and the occupancy of it, or any authority over it, until somebody in some way has acquired some property from the New Panama Canal Company—all the property it has got. That is no predicate in law or reason for this bill. I speak respectfully, but I am obliged to use the phrase and say that the Senate will simply stultify itself in passing the bill in this form, unless the real purpose of it is to postpone indefinitely the acquisition of this property in Panama and the building of a canal there.

I have been all the time seriously apprehensive, Mr. President, that that was the real purpose of a great deal that has been done—to postpone it indefinitely, to find excuses for not doing it—and now it seems that this expectation of mine is about to be realized.

But do we propose to leave to the President of the United States, without the guide or authority of any statute at all, the exercise of the indeterminate and boundless power of dealing with this subject as he may by inference choose to deal with it, or as he may by a stretch of the law—if the law existed, even—choose to deal with it, or by an interpretation of the meaning of the Hay-Varilla treaty he may choose to deal with it? Are we to leave all of this great contract to be admeasured, to be adjusted, to be completed, to be executed by some power that we inferentially suppose we find in the hands of the President of the United States as President? I do not think that the Senate of the United States, Mr. President, can venture upon ground that is so utterly obnoxious to all the views that have heretofore been taken of the powers of the President of the United States and so in contrast and in conflict with all of the practices of this Government.

When we do that, when we leave such work, such power, such operations in the hands of the President by mere intendment, or rather by a surrender—an implied surrender, to say the least of it—of the powers of the Congress of the United States, we at once clothe him with all power to do all things that he may choose to do, leaving to ourselves merely the opportunity, if it shall ever exist, of refusing to ratify what he may have done. But in this bill no such right is reserved to Congress. This bill excludes the idea of a ratification of the purchase by Congress.

That, Mr. President, dislocates the entire system of the Government of the United States as to the constitutional powers of the President. It does nothing less than that. It is a departure from all precedent. There is no justification for it; there is no excuse or apology for it; there is no argument upon which it can be justly based in logic or in law. I do not propose to make that departure by my vote. I suppose it will be made, but it is my duty as a member of this body to offer what resistance I can, at least in the way of argument and suggestion, to prevent Congress from abandoning into the hands of the President of the United States these vast powers, without guide and without direction and without our ratification, unless our ratification is to be implied from the fact that we surrender and say to him, "Do as you will with what is ours."

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Alabama a question?

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

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. When this bill was in committee, the Senator from Alabama offered a substitute for it. That substitute was printed April 1, 1904, and is now on the desks of Senators. I want to inquire of the Senator from Alabama if the substitute proposed by him does not proceed to form a civil government for the canal zone without any reference to the acquisition of property from the New Panama Canal Company?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. If that is so, if the Senator is right about that, and has no objection to that substitute, and it is a proper thing to do, what is the difference in the state of the case as between the two bills? That is all that is provided for in the bill reported by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KITTREDGE]. It provides for a civil government for the canal zone without going on to specify any of the property that has been acquired or may be acquired in the future from the New Panama Canal Company. It states, it is true, following the language of the treaty, that upon the acquisition of all the property—I presume that is the meaning of it—of the New Panama Canal Company this government for the canal zone shall go into operation.

I am unable, so far as I am concerned, I will say to the Senator from Alabama, to understand why the same objection that he is now making to the pending bill would not hold good against the substitute proposed by the Senator.

Mr. MORGAN. I flatter myself, Mr. President, in an extraordinary sense in being able to see anything at all that escapes the attention of the Senator from Oregon; but still I do see, according to my feeble sense, the difference, and I see it so plainly that I am astonished that the Senator from Oregon has not seen it. In the substitute I offered in the committee the New Panama Canal Company is not mentioned, is it?

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not.

Mr. MORGAN. No, it is not mentioned; it is ignored. I mention the thing that we are required to do under the Hay-Varilla treaty in order to get the right in Panama; and when we have acquired the right to the zone, then to proceed, according to law, to ascertain whatever other privileges may belong to any person under that treaty or outside of it.

The bill before the Senate at this moment fixes the acquisition of this property as the condition precedent to any further action at all. Until you have acquired the property you can not do anything. My amendment is that we have acquired the property under the Hay-Varilla treaty against the objection of every person in the world, except Panama. Panama would have the right—and if she were as great as is Great Britain or as is Germany, she would exercise it in a moment—to say to us: "You have not completed this treaty according to its terms; and therefore it is off. You have not paid what you agreed to pay on the exchange of ratifications. You have not performed your obligation; and therefore it is off." But I suppose the weak bantling, still in the lap of its mother, although crowned a king, has not any opportunity according to the strength of its own conscience and backbone to say anything to us on the subject. It prefers to sit there and mewl, and do other things like that, and take its milk that we distribute to it, and say nothing about it. It is imbecile, and therefore we disdain to regard its rights. If it was strong, even the President might hesitate to take such liberties with it.

That is the real situation between the two Governments. But, as I said in a report here, if Panama had as much force or power about it, or as much sense of independence even, as Santo Domingo, we would not have been permitted, by nearly six weeks, to defer the payment of that \$10,000,000 without any known excuse. When Morgan, the fiscal agent—the man whose hands began to dabble in Panama finances in De Lesseps time, and handled two millions of money of the old Panama Canal Company in New York—when he comes here as fiscal agent of the New Panama Canal Company and demands the money—he has been here

two or three times, so the newspapers say, and they furnish all the light we have got—for some reason or other the President postpones it, and says "We are not ready to pay."

What is that reason, Senators? Some on the other side know it. I do not. The information is possessed upon that side of the Chamber, and why can not some man over there rise in his place and say to the world what is the reason why this money has not been paid? You know the reason; I do not. I have called for it in every form that I know how. I get no response except a motion to lay on the table or a motion to postpone or the locking the doors of the committee room so that they will not take action upon the questions regarding information.

That is where we stand to-day, and I am making a picture of the truth just as the world and as the Almighty see it, and you can not deny it. We are going ahead without this knowledge, and the Senator from Oregon has not been able as yet to see that there is a difference between proceeding after acquiring property rights from the New Panama Canal Company and proceeding without reference to those rights, whatever they may be—proceeding in our own right under our treaty with Panama and in accordance with its terms, instead of asking leave of the Panama Canal Company that we may do our duty to Panama.

Now, what do I propose in this eleventh section, which I have offered as a substitute for the pending bill? That the Government of the United States shall pay \$10,000,000 to Panama. I propose, in order to get rid of all questions as to whether or not this money can be raised under the Spooner law, to make it an appropriation direct from the Treasury, so as to escape all doubt and difficulty about it. I propose that when that money is paid the Government of the United States shall enter into the actual occupancy and possession of that zone and raise the flag of the United States above it.

That flag has never been raised above it in the right of the United States Government. Take and occupy that zone, so that if any hostile country adjacent to or remote from it should choose to plant its foot there for the purpose of acquiring any right whatsoever the Government of the United States would be in possession under its flag, and could say to that country: "This is our possession; this is our property; this is our right, and here we are prepared now to formulate and to prepare, with every due precaution, a government for this zone."

That is the first step to be taken, so far as I understand it. That is the preliminary step, and the only preliminary step that I think is necessary or proper to be taken under the circumstances that now surround us. This bill says a different or additional preliminary step must be taken. What is that? You must acquire the right of the New Panama Canal Company, its property of every kind, before you can govern the canal zone. It is only upon the acquisition of those rights that you have the right to govern.

There is the difference in the two propositions, and I hope the Senator from Oregon now perceives it. It is the starting point, it is the groundwork, the plan of these two widely different propositions.

If my substitute is adopted by the Senate we shall have no further concern about what is to take place in Paris until our tenants, who hold concessions that we respect upon this canal zone or some parts of it, who hold certain canal rights and privileges there, shall come to us and say: "What are you going to do with us? What is our status here? We have been supposing that we were the landlords and the owners of this property; that you could not get any title to it at all until you extinguished our rights." Our reply would be: "You have greatly misconstrued the Wyse concession, under which you are contending, for that makes you only a tenant for a term of years, with certain privileges there. Your tenancy terminates at the end of ninety-nine years and the property reverts to the owner of the soil, whether it is Colombia, or Panama, or the United States. Here is your concession. What do you propose to do about it?"

"We propose to sell you all the work we have done here for \$40,000,000," or, "We propose to add to that the work done since we first made the proposition," which would probably run it up to \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000.

The United States would say: "We believe we would rather purchase from you and undertake the job of digging the canal ourselves than to stand by and see you attempt to cheat us as you have cheated Colombia. We want to get rid of you anyhow. We do not want a set of men there upon our property who are accused by our Canal Commission of having robbed the old canal company. We will make a contract with you. We will submit it to Congress. We will let the Congress of the United States say what disposition they intend to make of the property of the United States."

Does not the Constitution of the United States prescribe that Congress has the right to make laws for the government of the territory of the United States or for its disposal? Is not that an ex-

press injunction of the Constitution of the United States? We can not get rid of a piece of public property; we can not dispose of it to anybody at all; we can not remove incumbrances from it, when we own it, otherwise than by act of the Congress of the United States, because the jurisdiction, broad and universal, I may say, given by the Constitution to the Congress of the United States over all public property necessarily compels whoever deals with this property to come to the Congress of the United States for its authority.

That is my reading of the Constitution, Mr. President. It may be incorrect, but if it is I would as soon believe that the Lord's Prayer was incorrect, or that I did not understand it.

Therefore, I take issue with the Senator from Oregon upon the proposition that I have at any time intimated to anybody that it was necessary to get any rights from the New Panama Canal Company before we could establish a government in Panama, whatever sort of a government we are to have there. I do not think that very much of a government ought to be established there except a strong government. But we have never heretofore been required, nor are we, in my opinion, upon a fair construction of the Hay-Varilla treaty, required to obtain any right whatever from the New Panama Canal Company before we proceed to govern that zone. It is contrary to the whole tenor of the treaty.

Under the Spooner law, as I have always construed it, and I trust that the honorable Senator who is the author of that very important measure agrees with me in that construction, the acquisition of the property of the New Panama Canal Company was made a condition precedent to any treaty with Colombia for acquiring that particular location. That had to be done, and at not exceeding a certain cost. The contract need not have been completed and consummated in every particular, so that it was an arrangement that this had to be done, and the question of the title of the company had to be investigated by the law officers of the Government before the President was authorized to take any steps at all to acquire the rights from Colombia.

In the absence of such a provision in the Spooner law, the President, in the exercise of the diplomatic powers, might have made a treaty with Colombia that omitted these provisions entirely, but the Spooner law came in and made the purchase from the canal company a condition precedent, and required that it should be performed, because we assumed, and we did it contrary to the fact that we had got the consent of Colombia that the Panama Canal Company might make a bargain with us for the sale of their property, and we did not take the chances of having to go to the Panama Canal Company after the treaty was ratified and attempt to make a bargain with them, and give them the opportunity to turn us down by refusing to sell. That was a wise precaution.

When we come to the Hay-Varilla treaty the whole character of the condition changes. In the third article of the Hay-Varilla treaty we get absolute ownership of the canal zone. I call it sovereignty because the treaty uses the term "sovereignty." We get the ownership as if we were sovereign of it, and we exclude all sovereignty of Panama within that zone. I, therefore, conclude, and in reaching that conclusion I am sustained by every lawyer with whom I have ever conversed, particularly by that very able lawyer and statesman, Judge Taft, who stated his opinion, on an examination before the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals, that the third article in the Hay-Varilla treaty was the equivalent of an annexation of that territory to the United States. That is what it is. There is nothing left of it. The test of it, if we want a test, is this: The Congress of the United States, whenever the Government has paid that \$10,000,000 and completed that treaty, has the perfect right to legislate with respect to every matter of government in that zone, or as to the disposal of that property. Congress, under the terms of the treaty, can consent to the sale of it to Great Britain if it wants to. It is absolute ownership. That is what it is, and there is where we are.

Now, when that absolute ownership of the canal zone is completed, we find on looking around that there are some privileges there which we are bound to respect and intend to respect. There is a lease there, made under the Wyse concession, which rests upon property which we have acquired, or a part of it, and only a part of it, for we could dig a canal right alongside the other one if we chose to do it without asking the leave or license of the Panama Canal Company. They have a privilege, an easement with respect to a tract of land, which lease defines the rights of the parties very carefully. We say to the lessee, the New Panama Canal Company, "Whatever your rights may be upon this property in the nature of a lien or lease or incumbrance, we are prepared to respect them or we are prepared to purchase them, or to allow you to go and execute your contract and have all the benefit of it." We can do either, according to our judgment of what is best for the United States. That is our situation, and neither the Spooner law nor the Hay-Varilla treaty authorizes us to change it.

Now, that being our situation, the provisions that are made in the twenty-second article of the Hay-Varilla treaty, according to the language and according to the necessary interpretation of article 3 and of all the rest of the articles of that treaty, our rights are perfect for the extinguishment of the claim of the Panama Canal Company or the contemplated purchase, as it is called, of its property, are conditions subsequent, not precedent. Our title vests, and a condition subsequent can not divest it, unless it is so provided in the treaty, as it is not.

But what is this condition subsequent? Panama says to us, "We have made this arrangement with you because we want a canal built here. It might turn out that you do not want to build a canal here; that you simply want to secure the right and lock it up, and you are under no express obligation to build a canal. This treaty does not bind you to build a canal. There is no obligation of that sort upon the United States. We want the canal built. We have taken over by succession from the Government of Colombia her rights under the concession made to the canal company. Are you ready to carry them out? Do you want to execute this treaty?"

Panama made a reservation for her own protection, which was that if the United States did not build the canal—that is the meaning of it—she should have the right to have the canal completed under the Wyse concession.

Now, there is the difference between a condition precedent and a condition subsequent in a contract. That is manifest enough to any lawyer who has ever considered the subject. The most that can be said of the last paragraph of article 22 of the Hay-Varilla treaty is that it is a condition subsequent, intended for the protection of the Government of Panama in having the canal built. It was not a condition precedent as to the investiture of our rights of property under article 3, which included the canal ditch and also the Panama Railroad.

Here we are, then, with the perfect right of possession, having paid the \$10,000,000; having raised our flag above the zone; having put our agents and officers there. We are in position to do all that we have a right to do, and we can go on and build the canal without saying one word to the New Panama Canal Company, except that the Government of Panama would have the right to say, "Upon the canal you have completed here the same conditions attach that would have attached if it had been completed by the Panama Canal Company." That is the whole story.

Mr. President, I do not know what there is in the influence that the New Panama Canal Company exerts over the Congress of the United States or the President of the United States that puts its claims in front of everything else and requires that they shall be first dealt with and satisfied before we shall go on and execute the treaty that the Senate of the United States has ratified, and the ratifications of which have been exchanged with Panama.

What is a treaty ratified and proclaimed by the President of the United States? The Constitution of the United States says it is the supreme law of the land. From what time does that supreme law of the land take effect? From the date of the proclamation of the President that the ratifications have been duly exchanged. The President and the Senate make a law in conjunction with the foreign government that cooperates with us in making the treaty, and when that is done the treaty becomes valid and operative by proclamation and not otherwise, and becomes the supreme law of the United States. Is the Panama treaty the supreme law of the United States to-day? If it is the supreme law of the United States, nothing needs to be added to it to make it efficacious to pass the property to us. It is the supreme law of the United States in contemplation of law, for within the contemplation of law we have actually paid or in some way satisfied Panama as to the \$10,000,000.

If this treaty were brought up and its validity were questioned in a court at this hour, and a lawyer were to get up and say that the \$10,000,000 has not been paid, and therefore the treaty is not operative, the court would say to him, "In presumption of law the \$10,000,000 has been paid, or else some arrangement has been made by which the payment has been dispensed with." But we can not go behind the proclamation of the President that it is the supreme law of the land. We are to be governed by it. No exception has been created to it by any statute or arrangement or any subsequent treaty, and therefore it is the supreme law of the land. So in legal contemplation, though not in honest truth, as Congress must look at the subject, the Hay-Varilla treaty is to-day the supreme law of the land.

It gives us the right to go into that canal zone and occupy and govern it. Congress comes in, however, in this bill, and says, "You must not exercise that right until you have done something else." What is that? "You must go and dicker with the Panama Canal Company and get the right to govern the canal zone from it—settle with that company before you attempt to do anything else." That is the purpose of this bill. It is attempted to be concealed, but art enough has not been used in its language to conceal it. It is as obvious as the palm of a man's hand before

his vision that the purpose of this bill is to deny the efficacy of the Hay-Varilla treaty as passing the title to that property to the United States until we have acquired certain rights from the New Panama Canal Company.

Now, how that idea was injected into that treaty is more than I know. There are a few men who understand it perfectly well. My own opinion is that if the Secretary of State or the Assistant Secretary of State, or whoever negotiated the treaty, had understood that question as well as the artful Frenchman who came here and constituted the party of the other part in the negotiation, that feature of the treaty would probably never have existed. No question would ever have arisen about it. We would have gone on and taken possession of that property, and then would have dealt with the New Panama Canal Company as our tenants, precisely as Colombia had the right to deal with them as her tenants.

Colombia never surrendered the right to deal with the New Panama Canal Company as her tenant. More than that, the New Panama Canal Company, while I am speaking, claims under that tenancy and is working under it. It is there in possession of the property, working under a pretense of digging a canal, which never was an honest pretense—not for a moment. But that pretense has been carried on and is being carried on for the purpose of preventing any occasion for forfeiting the contract, and only for that purpose. They have been at work in that way and are at work to-day. I asked Admiral Walker the question before the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals, and he answered it by saying that the Government of the United States had never in any way taken control of that property; that they had done nothing at all. I had supposed they had, and he denied it. He said they had only kept tab on the work being done there by the Frenchmen to see whether or not they were making an honest count—that is the substance of his statement—but that we were doing no work there at all.

Here, then, is the New Panama Canal Company as a tenant, as a lessee, in the possession of property acquired from Colombia, without interruption. Panama has never interrupted it; we have never interrupted it; and we take possession of our property down there, finding this company still at work under that concession. Now, what situation is that? Simply the transfer to the United States of all the rights that Colombia had in dealing with this company under that concession. We take the property cum onere; we take it subject to incumbrances and tenant's rights; but we take it.

This bill says "No, you do not take it, and you shall not take it until you first settle with the lessee." There is the difference between the two bills. There is no obscurity about it. If the honorable Senator from Oregon could not see it, it was because he would not give the matter sufficient attention to comprehend the situation.

To say that I have fallen into the same trap is quite unfair to me, because I do not mention the New Panama Canal Company in my bill. It is not necessary that it should be mentioned.

Mr. President, where is the \$10,000,000 we are to pay Panama to come from? Some say they are going to get it out of the Spooner Act. I say if you get it out of the Spooner Act by any indentment at all, in my opinion you will do a great injustice to that law, for the Spooner law no more contemplated the payment of \$10,000,000 to the Republic of Panama for the purchase of rights there than this bill contemplates the payment of \$10,000,000 to China.

The Republic of Panama was not in existence. It was not even in the thought of the honorable Senator who framed that bill, and yet by a succession of legal intendments, one patched upon the other, we have got to the state of confusion now where not only the title has come to the United States against its express treaty obligations with Colombia, but there has followed this line of error until we find in the Spooner law, enacted by the Congress of the United States, \$10,000,000, which by construction may be taken, and without the consent of Congress, and applied to the purchase of the Panama Canal.

Such seems to be their decision as to the right to divert this appropriation; but have they taken the money and paid it to Panama? I ask again, why have they not done so? If it is the construction of the Spooner Act by the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber that the \$10,000,000 can be taken out of the Treasury by its authority and paid to Panama, why have they not done it?

Mr. President, when a great public duty like that, on which hangs many of the most important features of the future destiny of the United States, is neglected to be performed after demand has been made by Panama that the money shall be paid, the Congress of the United States needs some explanation of the reason for it. And when we ask for an explanation of it, it is refused. I must say that the refusal to explain that matter does no credit to the men who come before the people of the United States and say they are acting honestly and uprightly when they close their mouths against all ingress of inquiry and simply refuse to make

any explanation. Have the people and the Government of the United States reached that condition where any of their servants who are in public office can refuse to perform acts of this important character, which they say they are perfectly able to perform, but refuse to perform so plain a duty, and then refuse to assign a reason for it?

Now, let some Senator on the other side of this Chamber get up and tell us the reason why that money has not been paid. Then the people of the United States will begin to understand. I would to God that some explanation could be given, because in the absence of an explanation it is a mere flout of the law, it is in utter defiance of it, it is in utter disregard of law while the President pursues his own policy in silent contempt of the will of Congress and of the people. How many of these defiances have we had? In this transaction very many. But this is worse than all of them. Here is the money in the hands of the President, appropriated by Congress, as they say, for this purpose. Here is Panama demanding the payment of the money. Here is the President refusing to pay it, and at the same time refusing to give an explanation. The only explanation we find here is in this bill: "We are waiting to make a trade with the New Panama Canal Company." That is all the explanation.

When did the New Panama Canal Company acquire this supreme power over the President of the United States, and how did it acquire it? What has it got to distinguish it from all nations and all parties with whom we have had transactions heretofore that enables it to demand that the policy of the United States shall be thwarted, that the country shall be put into the attitude of refusing its most honorable, its most important, obligation, and that nothing shall be done in the direction of building this great canal, as to which the Congress of the United States four or five weeks ago appeared to be in a spasm of anxiety?

What influence is it that is so potent in this Government as that the New Panama Canal Company can stop the wheels of government, cause it to break all of its obligations, and disgrace the country, and yet no explanation need be made?

Gentlemen, you have got something to do besides passing this bill. You have the power to pass it; I know that. You have got something to do besides passing this bill. You have got to account for it to this people. They are not going to be disgraced in their Government to meet the private demands or personal ambitions which are involved in this breach of public duty.

The people of the United States are not used to having their public servants treat them in this way—to take their money, taxed out of their labors by laws of extreme severity, hoarded in the Treasury of the United States, set apart at one time for a purpose which has been utterly defeated, and now resorted to again for accomplishing a purpose altogether different from that, and when the time comes for the performance of these new undertakings, these new obligations, the President of the United States says, still: "I will not obey the law. I have proclaimed this treaty as the supreme law of the land, and it required the payment of \$10,000,000 to Panama on the exchange of ratifications. The exchange of ratifications took place weeks ago and the money has been demanded, and yet I will not pay it. You are bound by the law under my proclamation. I am not. I stand above the law. I stand outside of the law. You stand under it, according to my interpretation, and there you must stand until, in my private judgment and in my private wisdom, I choose to release you."

Oh, poor Americans! You have nothing left you except to get on your bended knees and ask pardon of the President that ever you supposed you had any liberties or any rights.

That is the point we have reached. That is where we stand to-day. A President himself is defiant of the law, and the only ground of his defiance is stated in this bill, that he has yoked the payment of the money to Panama with a payment of a sum of money contemplated but not yet agreed upon, so far as we know, to the Panama Canal Company.

In that nest of fraudulent speculators in Paris and in New York, possibly nearer to us than that, is to be found some hidden reason for handling the \$40,000,000 in this way. Somebody is going to be benefited by it. Somebody is going to pocket it. Who is it? When is it to be done? Why is the New Panama Canal Company yoked up, as I observed, in this bill, with the treaty, which is already the supreme law of the land according to the proclamation of the President, and why is it said that we shall not proceed and govern this territory until we acquire the property of the New Panama Canal Company? Let Senators, while they are on the floor answering me, answer that question. Let us see what they are going to say about that.

It is a contemplated purchase. It is not a completed one; it is one that is hereafter to be made. The Spooner law referred to a purchase that was to be completed on certain terms, and in advance of any action, the acquisition of the Panama route. That was all fair; that was candid and straight; and everybody understood it. But this is a contemplated purchase from the New

Panama Canal Company. It does not say anything about the old company or whatever rights it may have. If we have a title to that property or a contract for it under the Spooner law, why is it necessary to make a new one?

Why do we make a contemplated purchase and say so in that treaty when we have already a contract with the New Panama Canal Company that is obligatory? Let some Senator answer that question also. It has got to be answered, not to me, not to the Senate, not to the House, but it has got to be answered to the people, to the country, and they will not put up without an answer to it, because the demand is so honest and sincere and so just that the people are going to enforce it against whoever chooses to refuse it. You have got the question to answer, gentlemen, at some time or other, and you may just as well do it now as later.

The difficulty that has occurred in regard to this matter has been foreshadowed, or rather accounted for, in the newspapers upon several grounds. The first ground was that the New Panama Canal Company did not see proper to make a contract with us for the sale of their rights until they had got rid of a suit that Colombia was bringing in the tribunal of the Seine to ascertain whether or not they had a right to sell without the consent of Colombia. The President of the United States, so the newspapers inform us, said that it made no difference to him whether the tribunal of the Seine decided in favor or against the New Panama Canal Company upon that question, or rather in favor of or against Colombia's suit; that he would pay no attention to any judgment of that sort; that he would go and take possession under the Hay-Varilla treaty and settle these questions afterwards, as the convenience of the United States might serve.

With all this defiant boldness, why does he refuse to pay Panama what the United States has obligated itself to pay? That suit has been determined against Colombia. It is said now that we must have some action taken by the stockholders of the old Panama Canal Company. Matters are not in a satisfactory condition in Paris. It is true we sent the Attorney-General there. He investigated this subject and he said that the courts of France had lawfully taken jurisdiction of all the affairs of both companies, had passed judicial decrees for the sale of the property, and that the sale of the property would transfer all liens and incumbrances from the property itself to the purchase money, and that when we paid the purchase money we need not even make an inquiry about liens and incumbrances, because the action of the courts of France themselves had cleared the title.

Well, if that is so, Mr. President, and if the President of the United States accepted that opinion of the Attorney-General, why is it necessary to send agents to Paris to get the consent of these companies? They were the defendants in that suit. Their property was the subject-matter of inquiry and adjudication. The property was sold under the decree of the court. It is to be bought by the United States, or by somebody. Even the amount of the sale was prescribed, \$40,000,000, and the money was ordered to be distributed by the decree of the court. The court decreed that the stockholders of the New Panama Canal Company should have 40 per cent and the liquidator of the old Panama Canal Company should have 60 per cent of the \$40,000,000. They took it up in court, and they disposed of the whole subject even before the Hay-Varilla treaty was made. So effectual is justice in France that it anticipates the facts and decides questions before they exist. But so it is; and it was upon that examination that Attorney-General Knox reported to the President of the United States that the French courts were able to give a perfect title to the property, and had given it by their decrees whenever we paid the money to that company.

That being so, I should like to know where the necessity exists for sending our agents over to Paris to have arrangements made by the stockholders at their meetings of the old company and the new company for the sale of the property.

Mr. President, we can not quite speak with a double tongue on questions of this kind and expect the world to believe us. The world requires at least a show of verity and veracity in great transactions like this. If that French court had the power, as Mr. Knox said it had the power, to dispose of this property and to grant a perfect title to the purchaser, then there can be no occasion for sending men over there to get the consent of the old company or the new company or their stockholders to make that title valid. It can not be.

But that is what it is said we are waiting for, that after the Attorney-General has pronounced the title perfect we send agents to Paris to make it more perfect by getting the stockholders of the old company and of the new company in their stockholders' meetings to consent to the arrangement.

Are we stultifying ourselves? Do we expect that the American people will never have sense enough to understand their tergiversations—their wirings in and their wirings out? Do they expect to cloud this subject so with doubt and debate and diffi-

culty and suggestion that the honest minds of honest people can not comprehend it, and that they will take the whole matter for granted as being right, because the President or the Attorney-General has said so?

We are waiting, I suppose, for the 23d day of April. It is said that it requires a long time to make up the inventories. Mr. President, those inventories are here in Washington. I have examined them. They were brought before the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals when I was chairman there by Colonel Ernst. They were amongst the papers of the Isthmian Canal Commission. You can go down here now to the State Department, or wherever those records are kept, and make just as perfect an inventory of the property of the Panama Canal Company as you can do in Paris or anywhere else. That is all fustian; it is all pretense; it is not the truth. The facts that are here disprove it. They are, therefore, not waiting for that inventory. What are they waiting for?

I conjecture that they are waiting to give certain parties—syndicates—who hold the stock of these old companies a further chance to realize four or five million dollars at a haul on the bourse in Paris.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama will please suspend for one moment while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

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

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senator from Alabama may conclude his speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed with the consideration of the bill. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator from Indiana desires to go on with his bill, I would prefer to yield the floor at this point.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I do not care to go on with the bill until after the Senator has concluded.

CONSIDERATION OF PENSION BILLS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator from Alabama yield to me to make a request at this time?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 4 o'clock the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected pension bills upon the Calendar. There are about 225 of them upon the Calendar, and, it being late in the session, I hope the Senate will agree to this request, so that we may take them up and that they may be considered by the other House. It will take at least an hour and a half to go through with them, I think, and therefore I ask that we take them up at 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAIRBANKS in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota asks that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily at 4 o'clock, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected pension bills. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT OF CANAL ZONE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 5342) to provide for the temporary government of the canal zone at Panama, the protection of the canal works, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, Mr. President, I ask the honorable Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KITTREDGE] when he comes to explain this bill, if he proposes to explain it at all, to answer the question, "What are you waiting for?" What is to take place in Paris before you can proceed to govern this territory of the canal zone? Why should it be left in such a condition as it is? I have had my doubt about a good many things, and the current events seem to come along in a strange way about all these matters. Clouds and doubt and darkness overhang this question, and have overhung it all the time. Nobody has vouchsafed to make an expression as to what our actual policy was or what we intended to do, or what anybody else could do or intended to do, since the debate on the Spooner bill. Then everything was understood; nothing was withheld; all was fair. It was the contemplation of that Spooner law, on the other side of the Chamber and on this, that that legislation would build the canal at one of two places, and there would be no occasion for any additional legislation. We all anticipated that. I voted in conference and in the Senate for the Spooner amendment on that understanding. There could not be any misunderstanding about it.

Since that time, however, a fog of doubt has overhung every transaction of the Government in regard to this whole business. You can not point out one act in which the action of the Government has been clear and sincere and straightforward. It has

been dubious, crooked, evasive. We now seem to be counting upon the good faith of foreign countries for the security of our rights. In some way or other we seem to have a noose about France which we think will hold her and prevent her from escaping from our control. That is very doubtful. There was a time in the history of these proceedings, of recent date, when the celebrated Bunau-Varilla and Loomis, equally celebrated, met together at the Quill Club banquet and exposed their happiness before the world at having escaped from some tremendous crash or disaster that would have occurred if it had not been for Loomis and Varilla making a treaty and helping along the insurrection in Panama.

What was that important and dangerous situation from which they shrank? It must have been something that Varilla was familiar with. I do not think Loomis can be accused of extensive familiarity with anything outside of the United States. Varilla understood it. It was a threat of France, "If you do not put this Panama Canal Company ahead of your rights in this business and agree that a contemplated contract shall be complied with—not one that has been made, but a new one; not one that we will name out in the open or to the world or to the public, but a secretly contemplated contract, understood by you and by me—France will protect her citizens in that Isthmus by landing her troops."

That was the proposition. What is to prevent France from doing that to-day? Does our flag fly there? What part of the United States is that 10-mile zone to-day, except under the proclamation of the President, which he himself asks you to suspend by an act of Congress? He demands it of you, and you are about to do it.

Suppose France, or any other power which has a navy adequate to the task, should come into the Bay of Colon or Panama and land troops for the protection of the rights of her citizens there to-day, would she assail the flag of the United States there? Not by any means. Would she assail the actual or legal occupancy of the United States? Not by any means. What would she assail? The Hay-Varilla treaty, and nothing else.

Suppose Panama should say to a power that comes there, "We unite with you in your occupancy because the United States has not paid us the money, having it in the Treasury. Not being intercepted by an act of Congress, the President of the United States has taken it upon himself to refuse to pay it; therefore we unite with you; we merge our sovereignty into your sovereignty."

Is that provided for? Article XXIV of the treaty provides that she may do this without asking a question of us. Article XXIV of the treaty gives to Panama a perfect right to merge her sovereignty in any other state or federation of states on this hemisphere, or in Asia, or in Europe, it makes no difference where, asking us no questions, getting no leave or license from us.

She can make that most powerful and final and conclusive of all political agreements, that of the merger of her sovereignty into that of another state, and the United States can not object to it. Suppose she should conclude to merge her sovereignty into that of France, we are excluded by this bill from even raising an objection. We have made provision for it. Suppose she does that before we raise the flag there, and we then go and tender the \$10,000,000 to Panama and say, "Here, under this treaty we have got the right to these privileges in this canal zone; we bought them from Panama; they are ours; and if you merge your sovereignty in the French Government you do not convey that zone by any means. We object to it."

"But," says Panama, "you have not paid for it. Panama has concluded that you are competent to do nothing but to break your obligations. You have broken the main obligation in this case, the payment of the \$10,000,000 when we have demanded it, and we stand ready to transfer all our rights to France, and you can not object. When we merge our sovereignty we disregard that treaty, because you have not completed it."

Now, take that as a question between France or Germany or England and the United States and where would we stand? What Senator on that side has got the courage to face a proposition of that sort when the other party is as strong a power as either of those I have named?

But what is the attitude of the Government of the United States? Where is the honor of its obligations? Who has authorized the President of the United States to proclaim that treaty as the supreme law of the land when he has refused to comply with it and to complete its obligations? Will some Senator answer that when he comes to defend this proposition and this treaty?

Mr. President, we are very far from being in an easy situation about Panama. I do not venture upon any prediction as to the action of Colombia.

I have very little faith in that Government, very little respect for it. I think that it is inadequate to the government of its own people. Unless it drops some of its high pretensions or moves up to an atmosphere in which there can be some expectation that

they will be sustained, Colombia had better go out of business. That is my judgment about Colombia. Still she may disappoint us very much. There are those who expect that she will. But I leave her out of the contemplation entirely. Is that the only power in the world that has got an interest in the Panama Canal?

Where are the 5,000,000 or 8,000,000 people in France who are more or less directly connected with the subject? Who has put a salve upon their wounds or a balm upon their eyes to put them to sleep, so that they can not see what their interests are or at least see what their wrongs have been? We need not suppose that we have apsyxiated the French people because we made a bargain with a few robbers of those people for the purchase of an interest in this canal. The more contracts we make with the New Panama Canal Company and the lower we get the price the more we aggravate the resentful, revengeful, and justifiable antagonism of the people of France.

But there are other people. Has the Government of Great Britain no interest in the prolongation or procrastination of the completion of this canal? She has interests more manifest by far than any other country in the world, and she is not going to hesitate, as she has never hesitated to press her interests in any foreign country where it concerns the welfare of her subjects. She has got the controlling interest in the great Suez Canal. She acquired it by a coup d'état that made Disraeli more noted and more conspicuous for his ability, in the estimation of the world, than any Englishman who then lived. His policy has been carried into effect until now. Great Britain has acquired the possession and occupancy of Egypt for the purpose of guarding that canal and controlling it.

Within a few days past she has entered into a concordat or an agreement of some kind, we are informed by the newspapers, with France, by which France is to have all her colonies without interruption on the Mediterranean coast—Morocco and to the westward—and Great Britain is to have the colonization of Egypt to herself, unobstructed by France. The progress of the acquisition of power and authority on the part of Great Britain is a purpose that never sleeps in the British mind or heart.

We find now that she is operating again at Nicaragua, Nicaragua and Costa Rica, very suddenly and very surprisingly to me, at once recognized the independence of their competitor for a canal site—the Republic of Panama. I could imagine no reason of any ordinary sort why those two Governments, in performing that public act of recognition, should now virtually abandon all their hopes and expectations of a canal across the Isthmus at Nicaragua. I had hoped that we would hold on to that canal and to the privileges that Mr. McKinley had secured to us in regard to that canal; but they disappointed those hopes by turning to the other side of the question and becoming friends and advocates of the Panama Canal by the recognition that they gave to the independence of that Republic, and consequently to the building of the canal there.

It was a surprising situation, but light begins to dawn on that proposition. I go again to the newspapers. Where shall I go except to that source of supply for information? What can I know about it as a Senator of the United States except I can gather it from the newspapers? We find in the Washington Post of this morning the following, and it is very well worthy of the attention of the Senate:

Friction, it is learned, is again developing between Great Britain and Nicaragua over the Mosquito coast, which, since the early sixties, has been a matter of contention between the London Government and the Central American republic.

Great Britain has had no more interest in the Mosquito Indians since its last treaty with Nicaragua than I have had about the inhabitants of the Fiji Islands. They are a harmless, innocent-minded, yielding Indian tribe, and as lazy and filthy and dirty as human beings can be. All at once Great Britain again espouses the interests and rights of the Mosquito Indians. They were the starting point of the fifty years' trouble that we had under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and they have come back again.

It is stated that the London authorities once more will protest against any violation of the Zeledon-Wyke treaty of 1850, by the terms of which Her Britannic Majesty agreed to recognize the sovereignty of the Republic of Nicaragua over the country hitherto occupied or claimed by the Mosquito Indians. The British protectorate over this territory ceased, and in return the Nicaraguan Government pledged itself to assign the Mosquito reservation to the Indians and grant them certain rights of local autonomy. While the negotiations for a Nicaraguan canal were pending during the last few years the British Government was averse to pushing the Mosquito question.

There is an apology for the new outbreak of altruistic, philanthropic purposes on the part of the British Government. For the last few years she has not seen proper to press her demands in regard to the Mosquito Islands against Nicaragua because of the pendency of questions growing out of and connected with the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. That is a mere apology for delay.

With the ratification of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla canal treaty the London authorities believe the time is auspicious to settle the question with Nicaragua.

Accordingly, the London Government has informally mentioned its inten-

tions to the State Department officials and prepared to convey formal official assurances that it has no intention or desire of asserting any right of sovereignty or protection over the Mosquito territory, but, on the contrary, respects the full and paramount sovereignty of the Government of Nicaragua.

RIGHTS OF THE INDIANS.

The sole wish of the British Government, it is stated, is to bring Nicaragua to a real zation of the treaty obligation she is under to deal with the Mosquito Indians with justice and give to them those rights which Nicaragua promised they should at all times enjoy.

A number of Mosquito Indians have arrived in Jamaica recently with complaints of harsh treatment at the hands of the Nicaraguans. They have appealed to the British Government for redress, and in view of her treaty arrangement with Nicaragua, Great Britain feels constrained to call the matter to the attention of the Central American authorities.

As far as the State Department is concerned, it is said the purposes of the British Government are thoroughly understood and appreciated. It is stated that while the London Government is constrained to act with firmness, there will be no haste about its action.

WAR SHIP GONE TO BLUEFIELDS.

Diplomacy, it is earnestly hoped, will accomplish all that is desired, but significance is attached to the dispatch received yesterday from Jamaica that the British war ship *Retribution* had left that port for Bluefields to settle the dispute between the Nicaraguan authorities and the Cayman turtle fishermen, and also to arrange for the release of the schooners seized by the Nicaraguan Government and of the crews that have been imprisoned at Gracias a Dios. Nothing has been heard at the British embassy of the sailing of the *Retribution* nor of her mission.

Knowing the promptness of South American republics to appeal to the United States for succor on the ground that the Monroe doctrine is infringed, His Majesty's ambassador has been careful to make absolutely clear to the officials here the wishes of his Government in the matter, and there appears at present no possibility of the United States concerning itself in the controversy unless it tender its good offices in the interest of a satisfactory settlement.

Nicaragua and Great Britain for more than half a century have been engaged in disputes.

Mr. President, there comes up the old Mosquito question, which lay dead without the consciousness of its existence during all the time we were negotiating with Great Britain in respect of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and during all the time that we have been negotiating with Panama and Colombia in respect of the route at Panama. They had not anything more to say about the Mosquito question. Now, like the mosquitoes that confront the yellow-fever doctors down at Panama, and with an equal virus, I am afraid, in its bite, the Mosquito question comes swarming up in our front again, and war vessels move out to Bluefields under the pretext of settling questions between certain turtle fishermen.

What does all this mean? What is it going to result in? Have we not abrogated all the agreements we have made with Nicaragua and Costa Rica through the agency of the President and the Secretary of State of the United States that were put in solemn form in the covenant between us and those States? Have we not driven those States out of consideration? Have not Nicaragua and Costa Rica released themselves from all possible relations with us, even from the bonds of sympathy in respect of this matter? Has not Great Britain realized that at last we have been trapped into a work at Panama that is going to give the Suez Canal the control of the shipping of the world for twenty-five or thirty years to come, at profits that have run the stock of the Suez Canal in London and on the bourse to 800?

Does she not know and realize, is she so blind that she can not see, that these great advantages coming to her treasury and her people through the Suez Canal are matters worth enjoying for the next twenty-five or thirty years to come? In the meantime, has she not got the money and the credit, if she chooses to do it, to say to Nicaragua and Costa Rica, "If you choose to build an isthmian canal at Nicaragua here is the money, and you can build it inside of ten years. The United States has surveyed the route three times, four times, five times; yes, six times. The commission of the United States have verified these surveys and pronounced in favor of them; estimates have been made down to the cost of the last piece of timber or other material to be used in their construction.

"All this information you are possessed of without cost. Why can we not go along and complete this canal?" "Why," says some one, referring to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, "the United States has got from Great Britain the exclusive right to build this canal." Yes, well enough; but exclusive of whom? Of Nicaragua and Costa Rica? They were not parties to that agreement. No; their rights stand here unaffected. But that agreement was between the United States and Great Britain, and as to Great Britain, the United States had the exclusive right to build a canal at Nicaragua—not at Panama, but at Nicaragua. Therefore Great Britain has a perfect right to say to Nicaragua and Costa Rica: "Work out a treaty under your law exactly in the way that the Suez treaty was worked out under the laws of the Khedive of Egypt and is yet under those laws; work out a canal under those laws and we will take an interest in it; we will lend you the money; the United States can not object."

Then where will we be, with Canada on the one side—a growing country, powerful in its development—and a canal across the Isthmus of Nicaragua, 500 miles nearer to the coast of the United

States than Panama, that can be dug in ten years, while we are spending twenty-five or thirty years in digging the other. "The United States has deceived herself. We made friends with her by conceding everything in the world she could demand."

Is there anything to prevent this very movement, which is again based upon a pretense of taking care of the Mosquito Indians, from developing into another obstruction equal to that of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, starting upon the same basis, moving in the same direction, and having for its accessories and its supporters two sadly and seriously disappointed States—Nicaragua and Costa Rica—with whom we have broken an honorable and firm engagement under seal made by President McKinley?

Mr. President, I will yield the floor on this question to the honorable Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KITTEDGE], who, I see, is burning with anxiety to make a reply to what I have said.

Mr. FORAKER. If I may be allowed to do so at this time, I want to call attention to the fact that there are, as I understand, on the Secretary's desk two bills that have passed the House of Representatives, one of them affecting the question of an electric-light franchise and another granting a gas franchise in the islands of Hawaii. They ought to be acted upon, and I should like very much, if I could get consent, to have them laid before the Senate and considered at this time. They have both been considered in the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and one of them in the exact terms in which it has passed the House passed the Senate heretofore by a unanimous vote. I should say they will take only a few moments, just long enough to read them. There is no controversy, I am sure, about them in any way. If there should be, of course I would not ask for their present consideration.

Mr. KITTEDGE. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETTUS in the chair). The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the two House bills named by him. Is there objection?

Mr. KITTEDGE. I call the attention of the senior Senator from Ohio to the fact that at 4 o'clock the unobjected pension bills on the Calendar are to be taken up, and perhaps the pending bill can be laid aside a few minutes before that time.

Mr. FORAKER. I will be content if the Senator will agree to let me have fifteen or twenty minutes. I think the bills may take twenty minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry about the pending bill. Is the bill of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] superseded now as the regular order of business?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The unfinished business was laid aside temporarily that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KITTEDGE] might proceed with the canal-zone bill to-day.

Mr. MORGAN. I have not heard that statement made. The bill was laid aside while I had the floor to enable me to conclude my remarks, as I understood.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. That was the request I made. The request which the Chair put to the Senate was as broad as the one I have stated.

Mr. FORAKER. I do not wish to interfere with the unfinished business at all or with the pending bill unnecessarily.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I did not so understand that order. I understood that when I closed my remarks the Senator from Indiana had the right of way with his bill as the regular order of business. It seems now that that has been dispensed with in some way or other.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Then, in order that there may be no misunderstanding about it, I will ask that the unfinished business be further temporarily laid aside, so that the bill now under consideration may be proceeded with to-day.

Mr. MORGAN. I object to that, except to hear speeches from the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KITTEDGE] or whoever else chooses to speak.

Mr. KITTEDGE. Mr. President, I call for the record upon the request made by the Senator from Indiana at 2 o'clock, when the unfinished business was laid before the body, and the ruling of the Chair thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] was for the present consideration of the two bills which he named, and the question was whether there was objection. There was only a conditional consent on the part of one of the Senators, so that general consent has not been given.

Mr. FORAKER. I so understand; but the inquiry, as I understand it, of the Senator from South Dakota is as to the order made at 2 o'clock, when the unfinished business was, under the rules of the Senate, laid before the Senate. His inquiry is as to what order was made then as to the unfinished business, there apparently being some misunderstanding about it. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] said that he asked then that the unfin-

ished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the Panama Canal government bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the order was that the regular order be temporarily laid aside and then that the consideration of the bill now under consideration be proceeded with.

Mr. KITTREDGE. Then I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is proceeding, as in Committee of the Whole, on the bill (S. 5342) to provide for the temporary government of the canal zone at Panama, the protection of the canal works, and for other purposes, and the question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. KITTREDGE. I move that amendment be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota moves that the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama as a substitute for the first section of the bill be laid on the table.

Mr. MORGAN. I suggest a call of the Senate, because there is no quorum present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allee,	Dolliver,	Heyburn,	Overman,
Allison,	Dryden,	Kittredge,	Perkins,
Ankeny,	Dubois,	Latimer,	Pettus,
Bacon,	Fairbanks,	Long,	Platt, Conn.
Bailey,	Foraker,	McCreary,	Proctor,
Berry,	Foster, Wash.	McCumber,	Quarles,
Burnham,	Frye,	McEnery,	Stone,
Burrows,	Fulton,	Martin,	Teller,
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger,	Millard,	Warren,
Cullom,	Gamble,	Mitchell,	Wetmore.
Daniel,	Gibson,	Morgan,	
Dietrich,	Hale,	Nelson,	
Dillingham,	Hansbrough,	Newlands,	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-nine Senators have responded to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MORGAN. I call for the yeas and nays on that motion.

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

Mr. BAILEY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. As I do not observe him in his seat, I withhold my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. I do not see him in the Chamber. So I withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. GIBSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. KEARNS]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. KITTREDGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. LODGE's name was called). I have been requested to announce that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. MCCUMBER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER]. He being absent, I refrain from voting.

Mr. MCENERY (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PETTUS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. QUARLES (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. He is not here, and hence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY]. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea," and I assume that that Senator would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DRYDEN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. KEAN] is necessarily absent from the city.

Mr. BACON. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. CLAY] is unavoidably absent from the city. He is paired with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. HAWLEY] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. CLARK]. I shall make this announcement for the day.

Mr. SPOONER. I have a pair with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK], who is absent. I do not know how he would vote, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. GIBSON. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. KEARNS] to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Aldrich,	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger,	Mitchell,
Alger,	Cullom,	Gamble,	Nelson,
Allee,	Dolliver,	Hale,	Perkins,
Allison,	Dryden,	Hansbrough,	Platt, Conn.
Ankeny,	Fairbanks,	Heyburn,	Proctor,
Ball,	Foraker,	Hopkins,	Wetmore.
Bard,	Foster, Wash.	Kittredge,	
Burnham,	Frye,	Long,	
Burrows,	Fulton,	Millard,	

NAYS—15.

Bacon,	Dubois,	Mallory,	Overman,
Berry,	Gibson,	Martin,	Stone,
Cockrell,	Gorman,	Morgan,	Teller.
Daniel,	Latimer,	Newlands,	

NOT VOTING—42.

Bailey,	Depew,	McComas,	Quay,
Bate,	Dick,	McCreary,	Scott,
Beveridge,	Dietrich,	McCumber,	Simmons,
Blackburn,	Dillingham,	McEnery,	Smoot,
Burton,	Elkins,	McLaurin,	Spooner,
Carmack,	Foster, La.	Money,	Stewart,
Clapp,	Hawley,	Patterson,	Taliaferro,
Clark, Mont.	Hoar,	Penrose,	Tillman,
Clarke, Ark.	Kean,	Pettus,	Warren.
Clay,	Kearns,	Platt, N. Y.	
Culberson,	Lodge,	Quarles,	

So Mr. MORGAN's amendment was laid on the table.

GAS SUPPLY FOR HONOLULU, HAWAII.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 9643) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the maintenance and supply of fuel and illuminating gas and its by-products in Honolulu.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, that is one of the bills to which I called attention a few moments ago, and for which I asked present consideration.

I do not want to interfere with the business under consideration, but if Senators could agree to consider at the present time this bill, and the other which relates to an electric-light franchise, it would be a great accommodation to me.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator from Ohio permit a question?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes.

Mr. COCKRELL. This is a bill which has just come from the House. Has it been referred to the committee or has it been considered by the committee?

Mr. FORAKER. A similar bill was considered in the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and reported in the shape in which this bill has passed the House. It was originally reported without some amendments, but the committee afterwards instructed the member of the committee having the bill in charge to ask the Senate when it came up for consideration to make the same amendments that have been reported by the committee in the House. So both of these bills—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A Senate bill for this purpose has passed the Senate.

Mr. FORAKER. This particular legislation, in the form of a Senate bill, has passed the Senate. We reported it favorably from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico some weeks ago, and on the 6th day of April the Senate passed it without objection.

The other bill was considered in committee, and the same amendments that were made in the House were agreed upon in committee. So it would be a useless thing to refer the bill to the committee. That is the reason why I ask that there may be present consideration.

Mr. KITTREDGE. I will yield for the purpose indicated by the senior Senator from Ohio if it does not provoke discussion.

Mr. FORAKER. It will take some twenty or thirty minutes possibly to read the two bills, but there will be no discussion, I am quite sure. If there should be, I will withdraw the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read.

The bill was read the first time by its title and the second time at length.

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

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

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

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER. I move that the House be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3361) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the maintenance and supply of fuel and illuminating gas and its by-products in Honolulu.

The motion was agreed to.

ELECTRICITY FOR HONOLULU, HAWAII.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 7266) to ratify, approve, confirm, and amend an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the manufacture, distribution, and supply of electric light and power in the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. FORAKER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read.

The bill was read the second time at length; and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER. I move that the bill (S. 2401) to approve a special act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the manufacture, distribution, and supply of electric light and power on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

GOVERNMENT OF CANAL ZONE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (S. 5342) to provide for the temporary government of the canal zone at Panama, the protection of the canal works, and for other purposes.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, prior to the intervention of the business which has just been disposed of I voted against laying on the table the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. I want to say that I do not wish to be considered as committed to the proposition by reason of having voted against laying the amendment on the table. I should not find myself able, in voting directly upon the merits of that question, to vote for that amendment any more than I should find myself able to vote for the bill now before the Senate.

I stated after the ratification of the treaty for the building of this canal that I should in no manner interfere or attempt to interfere or obstruct the execution of that law. I do not intend to do so now, except to say that with the method of carrying on the government down there proposed by this bill and the method of constructing the canal, so far as the bill indicates how it is to be constructed, in my judgment it is not a bill we ought to pass.

Yet, Mr. President, I knew when the treaty was ratified that just such difficulties as met the committee in preparing a bill would meet them. I want to be frank enough to say that if I had been on the committee, I do not know that I could have drafted and I do not believe I could have drafted a bill that would not have been in violation of fundamental principles, if not constitutional provisions, for the purpose of carrying out what it is necessary to carry out if we build the canal under the treaty that was recently ratified.

Mr. President, I wish simply to enter my protest, so that I shall not feel any responsibility for this movement if it turns out badly, and to say if difficulties arise under it, and it strikes me they will, I at least am not to be charged with any responsibility in the matter. It is for the majority who ratified the treaty to provide for its execution, if they can do so consistently inside of constitutional laws. I think if they can not do that, it would be better for us that the canal scheme should fail.

But I know, Mr. President, that is not the sentiment of this body, and I doubt very much whether it is the sentiment of the country. I am very much inclined to believe that the public who are in favor of the canal would say, "We have got to build the canal; and if it is necessary to trample upon the Constitution or to infringe it in any way, we must do it." I saw a good deal of that sentiment when the treaty was under consideration, not simply in this body, but in the public press, doubtless speaking somewhat the sentiment of the people.

Now, Mr. President, I am not going to delay the passage of this bill by any opposition to it by designating what I think are the defects in it, because my experience here in this matter teaches me that it would be a waste of effort. No matter what I or anybody else might say, this bill will pass to its final conclusion and become the law of the land, so far as there is authority in Congress to enact this kind of legislation.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Colorado has expressed his disapprobation of the substitute I had the honor to offer to section 1 of the bill, I wish to make some statements about my views of what ought to be done and what we have a perfect right to do under the Hay-Varilla treaty in the control of a canal zone acquired by that treaty.

I look upon the acquisition of this little patch of ground there, and of the water, as being a purchase by the United States Government of a piece of property for certain purposes—that is to say, for the purpose of building, controlling, protecting, and operating an isthmian canal. It is just like the property we have acquired at Guantanamo, Cuba, from that Government.

We are not expected because we have certain rights of exclusive control at Guantanamo to institute what we call a civil or political government in that area. It is of considerable area, by the way, and a very important place to the United States and to Cuba.

In the treaty with Panama the purchase is distinctly announced. It is that of building a canal across the Isthmus.

If we should undertake to appropriate the Isthmus for the purposes of a penal colony or for any other purposes we might see proper, or for the purpose of establishing fortifications at either end of the canal or in the center of it to control that zone, so as to carry into effect the treaty of 1846, for instance, by protecting the transit; if we should abandon all idea, as I am afraid we shall be compelled by natural difficulties to abandon the work of constructing a canal there, it would be an act of extreme bad faith on the part of the United States to hold the property for a different purpose from that for which we acquired it. I think there is no Senator here who will not concur in that statement.

The purpose is, then, to acquire it for this particular public use, the governmental use of promoting our commerce and for defending our coasts on both the Pacific and the Atlantic side.

If these purposes were distinctly presented in this bill, as they are at Guantanamo, we would never contend that the object we had in view in the acquisition of this territory was to establish there what we call "civil government," or what may be better phrased "political government."

The first aspect of this question, as it strikes one who looks at it in the severe light of truth and who does not indulge in imagination or hope in respect of some future development of it as a seat of commerce or trade, is the fact that we make no arrangement whatever in this treaty in respect of the citizenship of the people who now occupy the canal zone. They are not citizens of the United States.

Their citizenship, whatever it may have been in other countries, whether in Panama or in any other foreign country, would be unaffected by this treaty, either at present or in future, for we put no provision in this treaty, as we have in all other treaties of annexation, that the people in the country annexed should have the opportunity to remain under their allegiance to the former government or to accept allegiance to the United States. In the treaty no notice is taken of their existence as a body politic.

We made no provision for their security and none for the protection of their rights, except under the laws of condemnation of property for public uses, and as to that we cut them off from all right of appeal or access to a judicial tribunal, and made the treaty itself, by its own terms, declare the absolute right of the Government of the United States to condemn the property first and then ascertain the damages afterwards by a commission.

As to the people situated in that zone, therefore, this treaty has not an element relating to their protection by a civil government. There is not one element in it, not a hint, as to their protection by civil government either through their own voting power or through the power of the Congress of the United States. It is, therefore, no more a violation of the Constitution of the United States that we should take supreme, absolute, arbitrary control there than it is that we should take like control at Guantanamo. Within the reservation at Guantanamo there are citizens living who owe their allegiance to Cuba. But what will become of them? For military purposes and at the dictation of the military authorities, and whenever military exigency may suggest the necessity for such a movement, we will move them out of that military reservation.

We will pay no respect at all to the laws of Cuba giving to them political rights. Do we violate the Constitution of the United States in thus acquiring territory over which our power is supreme, absolute, and undeniable? Not by any means. We do not acquire it for the purpose of civil government. Whenever in other cases we have acquired territory for the purposes of government, such as in Porto Rico, in Hawaii, in Alaska, in the Philippines, and elsewhere, we have come under national obligations, or, I might say, constitutional obligations, to extend the principles of our Government, with its limitations, to such countries, because we make a citizenship there and undertake to govern them.

Now, this canal zone is properly a reservation of the United States for governmental purposes. It is as much so as any other reservation that has ever been established by this Government.

In legislating for the canal zone we are going to be extremely embarrassed, if not put into a very unsafe condition, unless we exercise the powers to which I advert.

If a man can interfere with the operations of that canal by an injunction or by a writ of habeas corpus, or to secure for him a trial by jury, and by taking exceptions to the decisions of judges, and by bringing cases by appeal as far even as the Supreme Court of the United States, we are going to have a hard time with the operators and the lawyers who will assemble there for the purpose of interfering with that business.

If there is really no constitutional difficulty in the exercise of all the powers that are adequate for doing this work in the best possible way and with the least disturbance and with the greatest rapidity, we are bound, in my opinion, to adopt that course, or else we expose one of the greatest and most difficult works any government has ever engaged in to interference by private parties under conditions and circumstances that we can not possibly control, because we have tied our hands and paralyzed our efforts in making concessions to persons there that are of no advantage to them and are of extreme disadvantage to the Government of the United States.

It is a Government reservation, acquired as such and for that purpose, established in order to build a canal; and the laws that are enacted by Congress or by the local legislature there should have reference to the proper completion of this work and not to political rights or political government that may exist in other areas and differently situated.

That canal zone, although it is a mutilated zone, badly crippled and badly embarrassed by the provisions of the Hay-Varilla treaty, what there is left of it, ought to be exclusively the property of the United States. There ought to be no private ownership of property at all in that canal zone. There ought to be no man residing there who would have the right to say to the Government of the United States, "You are making a trespass upon my property by some order that your officers here have found necessary, either to preserve the health of the country or to conduct proper engineering operations by the building of the canal."

It has been one of the greatest difficulties in this canal project at Panama from the beginning that we have attempted to incorporate and include together the necessary powers that are in themselves properly absolute, with a political government or a judicial government there, which must necessarily be in conflict and at war with each other.

It was upon that hypothesis that I have framed the bill which I have intended to offer as a substitute for this bill. There is in this bill, for instance, a judge of the district court of the United States to whom is given certain powers of jurisdiction, and for the protection of the rights of people in the zone there is a long bill of rights which the judge must enforce.

I do not believe that you will ever get along with the building of this canal under any other regimen than such as I have indicated. The power to expel from that zone any person who is or who by the commission is suspected as being an injurious person, dangerous to the work or the health of the zone, ought to exist and ought to be complete; and the power to interrupt it by a writ of habeas corpus or by an injunction or by a jury trial, or any other method of intervention that is adapted to political government and not to the government of a reservation of the United States, ought not to exist.

My purpose is to free that canal zone as far as it is possible to do it from every possible difficulty in the way of a successful execution of this work.

My objection to the postponement of the completion of this treaty until we can get a contract with the New Panama Canal Company is based upon the ground that, under that treaty and under the pledges we have made to the people of the United States by proclaiming that treaty as a part of the supreme law of the land, it is our duty at once to enter upon that canal for construction purposes and to have it so governed that we will find no enemy there armed with a writ for the purpose of intercepting the powers of the canal commission.

We would not tolerate a thing of that sort in a military reservation or a military camp, and what is the difference between this and that, except one is a reservation for building a canal and the other is a reservation for the defense of the peace and, you may say, the honor of the country? What is the difference? They are both segregations of territory for governmental purposes—as much so as the territory on which the State, War, and Navy Departments rest. They are for governmental purposes, not for the protection of personal rights.

We have such reservations scattered all over the United States in different forms. Some Government reservations are for the preservation of cattle and sheep, the preservation of timber, a

water supply, and the like of that. The laws of those reservations enacted by Congress always apply to the character of the reservation, to the public use to which the reservation is dedicated. A dedication to governmental uses of a piece of property, whether made by treaty with a foreign country or by an act of Congress constitutionally enacted, makes that property the peculiar property of the Government of the United States, and an interference with it on the part of any person is a wrong against the Government which ought to be punished.

Now, these are the grounds upon which I have predicated my view of this question. Will my friends of the Democratic party believe that this long bill of rights here in section 4 ought to be a part of a canal construction? I do not see on what ground they can place it. I do not see the necessity for providing an officer of the Army or Navy, or an engineer employed there, or a surgeon, or any of his assistants with a bill of rights in order to enable him to make controversy with his chief when he receives orders to do or not to do a particular thing. That was not the purpose we had in view.

Now, suppose that labor organizations find their way into the Isthmus among the 25,000 or 40,000 people employed there from all the nationalities of the earth, and they order a strike at a certain time when in their judgment it will be of greatest service to them and greatest embarrassment to the Government? What provision do you make here? You put in the provision in section 9 of the bill that the commissioners may expel them, banish them. When before was there a provision in an act of Congress of the United States that one man might be banished from a part of the territory of the United States on the command of any particular officer?

Never was such a thing done where civil government prevailed. But who doubts that within the limits of a fortification or a military camp or any other reservation, where great powers are required, the officer in command there may lawfully banish, you may say, from that territory a person who is either interfering with the business proper to be carried on there or is suspected of an intention to do so at least.

When the commissioners give their order for the banishment of somebody, under section 9 of this bill, it makes no difference on what account, and he turns to the district judge there, and says to him, "This is not a proceeding by due process of law; this is not a proceeding by which I may be deprived of my liberty and right to remain here peacefully without the consent of a jury," or many of such objections, and a great many can be made. The judge is bound to hear him, and authority is at an end.

Section 9 of this bill gives the commissioners the right to banish a man who has certain views on the question or the doctrine of anarchy. If a man entertains certain views in respect of anarchy, whether he proposes to practice them or not, or whether he has ever practiced them or not, this commission is given power by this bill to banish him. I do not object to giving the power to the commission, but I do object to having a judge there who can issue a writ of habeas corpus and say to these commissioners, "Your decree of banishment contravenes and violates certain rights guaranteed to this man in this law."

I know that this provision in the bill is put in for the purpose of avoiding popular criticism; that it is supposed to be something the people of the United States will demand in favor of the people who are in Panama—not our citizens at all—and those people who may go there, for not 10 per cent of them will be our citizens until that canal is at least completed. The people are not deceived by matters of this kind. The people do not want a little government set up there for the purpose of paying a salary to a district judge and solicitors and the like of that, and having the empty pretenses of civil government therein. The people do not understand that we are acquiring this property for the purpose of establishing a colony there.

They understand that we are acquiring it for the purpose of building a canal, and that whatever power is necessary to be exercised by the commissioners in the building of the canal ought to be in the law. We can not cajole the people by making a false pretense of giving civil rights and guaranties of liberty to persons within that zone, when, in doing so, it will hamper and cripple the Government in respect of this work of the canal, and that it will be impossible for us ever to get through it successfully.

Mr. President, I do not believe that canal can be successfully built. If it is successfully built, it will be at the end of twenty years. That is a long time; and I want the powers of the Government of the United States that can be employed for the purpose of building this canal to be honestly and vigorously devoted to it. If our people have made a mistake in the location, they have got the bill to pay; but do not let us embarrass the work itself by putting into the law that is to obtain these provisions which of themselves must embarrass and must destroy the efficacy of the forces of the United States engaged in this great work.

I will devote just as much of my poor ability to the building of

a canal at Panama as if I had absolute faith that it could be accomplished, and accomplished within ten years. That is my duty as a Senator, and I do not shrink from it; but when I am brought, under circumstances and conditions that I oppose and lament, in contact with a new duty, which requires of me to favor the exercise of all those powers that I believe are essential to the success of this enterprise, then it is my right and duty to stand up and demand for this canal zone every possible facility that Congress can give to those who are to control it, so that the canal can be successfully completed, and within the time prescribed, if that is possible.

I should not have made this explanation but for the fact that the honorable Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], for whose opinion I have great respect, seems to think that the theory of the amendment which I offered here to-day was in some sense in contravention of the rights of Congress in making legislation for the control of all persons there who may be under and within reach of the authority of the United States.

The reading of the bill was resumed; and the Secretary read section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Isthmian Canal Commission, created by act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," is hereby empowered, subject to the direction and control of the President, to exercise on behalf of the United States all the rights and powers granted to and conferred upon the United States by said treaty for the control, use, occupation, and government of the canal zone for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of a ship canal on the Isthmus of Panama, and of the lands and waters without the limits of the canal zone which may be acquired by the United States or occupied under said treaty, including the powers granted to the United States in the cities of Panama and Colon and the harbors adjacent thereto, and also including the power to take or damage private property by said treaty conferred, as well as such other rights, privileges, and powers as may be hereafter granted in that behalf by any treaty or treaties supplementary to the treaty hereinbefore referred to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The section will be agreed to, if there be no objection.

The Secretary read section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. That the legislative power in and over the canal zone and other places over which the same may be rightfully exercised under said treaty shall be, and is hereby, vested, until Congress shall otherwise provide, in said commission, which said power shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the laws and treaties of the United States, so far as they may apply to said zone and other places; and the said power shall include the enactment of the sanitary ordinances of a preventive or curative character to be enforced in the cities of Panama and Colon provided for by article 7 of said treaty. Such legislative power shall also include the power to raise and appropriate revenues in said zone; and no taxes and customs duties levied and collected in said zone by or under the authority of said commission shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States, but the same shall be retained and disbursed by said commission for its proper purposes. The members of said commission to the number of four or more shall constitute a legislative quorum, and all laws and ordinances shall be enacted by said commission upon the Isthmus of Panama.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator in charge of this bill that a legislative quorum of four out of seven commissioners is not large enough. If four constitute a quorum, it is more than probable that on many occasions there will be a tie vote in that commission, and the power of the commission will be paralyzed. It ought to be an odd number; it ought to be three or it ought to be five. I suggest a change to that effect. Is the Senator from South Dakota willing to make the change?

Mr. KITTREDGE. Mr. President, the committee carefully considered that number, and concluded that four was right.

Mr. MORGAN. I shall not move to strike it out. I simply wanted to call attention to it.

There is another point in this section about which I want to ask an explanation:

SEC. 3. That the legislative power in and over the canal zone and other places over which the same may be rightfully exercised under said treaty shall be, and is hereby, vested, until Congress shall otherwise provide, in said commission, which said power shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the laws and treaties of the United States, so far as they may apply to said zone and other places.

That seems to mean that if the legislature there shall enact any law that is in conflict with the law of the United States it might apply in Panama or in any other place. Those words "and other places," in lines 19 and 20, ought to be stricken out.

So far as they apply to said zone and other places.

Does the Senator adhere to the text as it is?

Mr. KITTREDGE. We do, Mr. President.

Mr. MORGAN. I will not move to strike out those words, but I want to call the attention of the Senate to these matters as we go along. I have some responsibility connected with this bill, and I want to discharge it at least by the suggestion of these difficulties; but if Senators do not concur with me, of course I must simply abandon my proposition.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have no disposition to move to strike out the words referred to by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], but at the same time it appears to me a little singular that the words should have been inserted, because certainly it is not intended to give this commission any authority to make

regulations that shall be effective outside of the canal zone. Surely this power that they exercise must be limited to the place over which they have jurisdiction, and without that language their regulations will be supreme within their jurisdiction and null beyond it.

They could not make any law, if you call it that, but I prefer myself to call what the commission do a "regulation;" but certainly they could make neither a regulation nor a law that would be effective outside of or beyond their jurisdiction. Still the language used there does no harm, except to suggest the inquiry which the Senator from Alabama propounds, and that is, what is the use of it? Still I myself make no objection to it.

Mr. MORGAN. I will move to strike out, beginning in line 23 on page 3, down to line 4 on page 4, including the expression "for its proper purposes." I will read what I propose to strike out:

Such legislative power shall also include the power to raise and appropriate revenues in said zone; and no taxes and customs duties levied and collected in said zone by or under the authority of said commission shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States, but the same shall be retained and disbursed by said commission for its proper purposes.

It strikes me that that clause could not well be written in language that was more in conflict with the Constitution of the United States. To say that even a government duly organized, like the government of a Territory, shall have the authority to levy custom dues and collect money, and that the customs dues thus collected shall not go into the Treasury of the United States, but into the local treasury of that government, simply means a delegation of all the powers of Congress to that little government in Panama, to levy and collect dues and other taxes, which "shall be retained and disbursed by said commission" and shall not be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

I merely want to call attention to that. That is one among a number of difficulties in this bill which have occurred to me since we have been considering it in committee, and I will move to strike out those words.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 3, on page 3, line 23, after the word "treaty," it is proposed to strike out—

Such legislative power shall also include the power to raise and appropriate revenues in said zone; and no taxes and customs duties levied and collected in said zone by or under the authority of said commission shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States, but the same shall be retained and disbursed by said commission for its proper purposes.

Mr. KITTREDGE. I move that the amendment be laid upon the table.

Mr. MORGAN. It is not necessary to do that. We can take a direct vote on it.

Mr. KITTREDGE. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read section 4, as follows:

SEC. 4. That it is hereby expressly declared—

First. That no law shall be enacted by said commission which shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny to any person within the canal zone the equal protection of the laws. But this paragraph shall not apply to the taking or damage of private property by reason of the construction, maintenance, operation, or sanitation of the canal, nor the taking of or damage to rights or property in pursuance of article 7 of said treaty, but such taking or damage shall be discretionary with said commission, subject to the provisions of articles 6 and 15 of the treaty aforesaid.

Second. That in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to be heard by himself and counsel, to demand the nature and cause of the accusations against him, to have a speedy and public trial, to meet the witnesses face to face, and to have compulsory process to compel the attendance of witnesses in his behalf.

Third. That no person shall be held to answer for a criminal offense without due process of law; and no person for the same offense shall be twice put in jeopardy of punishment, nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself.

Fourth. That all persons shall, before conviction, be bailable by sufficient securities, except for capital offenses.

Fifth. That no law impairing the obligation of contracts shall be enacted.

Sixth. That no person shall be imprisoned for debt.

Seventh. That the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion, insurrection, or invasion the public safety may require it, in either of which events the same may be suspended by the President or by the commission whenever, during such period, the necessity for such suspension shall exist.

Eighth. That no ex post facto law or bill of attainder shall be enacted.

Ninth. That no person holding any office of profit or trust in the canal zone shall, without the consent of the Congress of the United States, accept any present, emolument, office, or title of any kind whatever from any king, queen, prince, or foreign state.

Tenth. That excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

Eleventh. That the right to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated.

Twelfth. That neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist in the canal zone.

Thirteenth. That no law shall be enacted abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the Government for redress of grievances.

Fourteenth. That no law shall be made or enforced respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and at the free

exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed.

Fifteenth. That no money shall be paid out of the treasury of said commission, except in pursuance of an appropriation by law.

Sixteenth. That the rule of taxation in the canal zone shall be uniform.

Seventeenth. That no law shall embrace more than one subject, and the subject shall be expressed in the title of the law.

Eighteenth. That no warrant shall issue except upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the person or things to be seized.

Nineteenth. That all moneys collected on any tax levied or assessed for a special purpose shall be treated as a special fund in the treasury of said government and paid out for such purpose only.

Provided, however, That nothing herein shall be construed to limit the power vested in said commission in section 9 of this act.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, in order to give point and meaning to the motion that I am going to make to strike out section 4 of this bill, I refer to the last proviso at the end of subdivision 19 of section 4, as follows:

Provided, however, That nothing herein shall be construed to limit the power vested in said commission in section 9 of this act.

The Senate has heard the reading of this bill of rights. Now, in that connection I will read section 9. It is as follows:

SEC. 9. That the said commission shall have power to exclude from the canal zone, and from all places without said zone which shall be from time to time occupied, controlled, and used by the United States under the provisions of said treaty, all idiots, insane persons, epileptics, paupers, criminals, professional beggars, persons afflicted with loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases, persons who have been convicted of a felony, or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or of all government, or of all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials, or whose purpose it is to incite or by any means promote insurrection against the Government of the Republic of Panama or of any neighboring republic, and such other persons as will for any reason by their presence within said zone tend, in the opinion of said commission, to create public disorder, endanger the public health, or in any manner impede the prosecution of the work of constructing, operating, sanitating, and protecting the canal, railway, and auxiliary works to be constructed or controlled on the canal zone by the United States.

And the said commission may cause to be expelled from the canal zone any person or persons of the classes above mentioned, and also such persons as may be embraced by any exclusion act passed by said commission, pursuant to the authority by this section conferred, who may enter the canal zone; and to this end said commission may enact all necessary laws, rules, and regulations. All acts and regulations enacted or made pursuant to the authority of this section shall be in force when the same shall have been approved by the President.

I call attention to the absolute incongruity and conflict between section 4 and section 9 of this bill—section 4 referring to section 9, the two can not stand together. The bill of rights secured by section 4, taken from the Constitution of the United States, utterly prohibits and prevents the exercise by that commission or by any person the power of banishment from that district.

You have either got to strike out section 9, leaving in section 4, or strike out section 4, leaving in section 9, because in these two sections we have come to the parting of the ways. In the adoption of section 4 we decree there civil government under the restraints that are found in the bill of rights of the Constitution of the United States, while under section 9—

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MORGAN. If you will let me get through the remarks I am making—

Mr. McCUMBER. I call attention to the fact that there was unanimous consent at 4 o'clock to take up the Calendar of unobjected pension bills, and if the Senator is going to speak for any length of time I should like to proceed with that order.

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator rises to a point of order, of course I will have to yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Alabama to the proviso at the end of section 4 to the effect—

That nothing herein shall be construed to limit the power vested in said commission in section 9 of this act.

It does not propose that both shall stand together when in conflict.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will proceed to the consideration of unobjected pension cases.

Mr. MORGAN. I will merely say before we take up that matter that those sections annul each other by their language and effect, and I do not see how we can give effect to a statute by putting in one—

Mr. MITCHELL. They are perfectly consistent, I will say to the Senator from Alabama, it seems to me, without conflicting.

Mr. MORGAN. Consistent! I do not know which path you are to take at the forks of the road there. You would have to take one or the other.

Mr. MITCHELL. If there is anything in conflict in the bill of rights as inserted here with section 9, then it shall not apply, but section 9 shall be enforced.

Mr. MORGAN. Very good. If section 9 applies, then what becomes of the bill of rights? It goes out of use and employment. You put in possession of a man the bill of rights under section 4; then you say in section 9 that this commission may deprive him of every one of those rights without even a trial by law.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think it does.

Mr. MORGAN. What is the use of putting it in there?

Mr. HOPKINS. Does not section 9 limit the power of the commission to certain specified individuals or classes, while the bill of rights relates to other persons than those who are described in section 9?

Mr. MORGAN. Section 9 gives to the commission the right "to exclude from the canal zone and from all places without said zone all idiots, insane persons," and people of that kind, including anarchists, people who have anarchistic sentiments, and people who in any wise violate or threaten to violate the public order.

The meaning of this is, Mr. President—it is all covered up, of course—that the committee was afraid to express that this commission shall have the power to expel "walking delegates." That is what it means. I am in favor of that power; but in order to conceal that they had to cover it up with a great many very different and difficult and unusual sorts of diseases and divisions of mankind, including those who are inclined to opinions of anarchy.

But I will not interfere with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I am much obliged to him for calling my attention to the special order.

CONSIDERATION OF PENSION BILLS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Secretary will state the first bill on the Pension Calendar.

STACY WILLIAMS.

The bill (S. 5076) granting an increase of pension to Stacy Williams was announced as first in order, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Stacy Williams, late of Company B, Third Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ALICE W. STOODLEY.

The bill (S. 538) granting an increase of pension to Alice W. Stoodley was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, to fill the blank before the word "dollars" by inserting "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Alice W. Stoodley, widow of Benjamin H. Stoodley, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JOHN WALDO.

The bill (S. 3335) granting an increase of pension to John Waldo was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "Volunteer," to strike out "Infantry" and insert "Heavy Artillery;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Waldo, late of Company E, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MICHAEL NELLIGAN.

The bill (S. 2399) granting a pension to Michael Nelligan was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "Battery," to insert the initial "E.;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Michael Nelligan, late of Battery E, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

CHADBOURNE H. WARREN.

The bill (S. 4417) granting an increase of pension to Chadbourne H. Warren was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Chadbourne H. Warren, late acting third assistant engineer, U. S. S. Alabama, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JOSEPH DICKINSON.

The bill (S. 5205) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Dickinson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "colonel" and insert "lieutenant-colonel and assistant adjutant-general;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Joseph Dickinson, late lieutenant-colonel and assistant adjutant-general, and brevet brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. GALLINGER. I know the difficulties that the Committee on Pensions have to overcome in considering these cases, and I am loath to interfere in the least degree with the conclusions they reach; but in this particular case I want to appeal to the chairman of the committee to allow a rate of pension in excess of what the committee have reported. This is for Brig. Gen. Joseph Dickinson, a man whom I visited only a few days ago in this city, who is living in poverty, and is on his sick bed, from which he probably will not recover, with a devoted wife and a nurse taking care of him. He has a very remarkable record. I will not stop to read it, but I will ask permission to put it in the RECORD.

The paper referred to is as follows:

Bvt. Brig. Gen. Joseph Dickinson was born in Philadelphia, Pa., December 25, 1830, being descended from a Pennsylvania ancestry distinguished for heroic patriotism in the old colonial days.

His maternal grandfather and four granduncles fought in the Revolutionary war under Washington. His father was in the war of 1812, and himself and nine others of the family entered the lists of the Union Army during the rebellion.

General Dickinson early in 1861 blew the bugle notes which assembled the Twenty-sixth Pennsylvania Infantry, which started for Washington wholly unequipped and unarmed and accompanied the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment in its memorable passage through Baltimore. The regiment was afterwards reorganized as the first of the three years' volunteers.

General Dickinson was mustered into the United States service as first lieutenant and adjutant, Twenty-sixth Pennsylvania Volunteers, to date from May 5, 1861; was commissioned by President Lincoln captain and assistant adjutant-general, United States Volunteers, August 22, 1861; major and assistant adjutant-general, August 22, 1862, and lieutenant-colonel and assistant adjutant-general, November 10, 1862. He was brevetted lieutenant-colonel, colonel, and brigadier-general for gallantry in battle; was assigned to duty as assistant adjutant-general and chief of staff on the staff of Gen. Joseph Hooker, August 22, 1861; was wounded at Williamsburg, Va., May 5, 1861; severely wounded at Fair Oaks, Va., June 1, 1862, and again severely wounded at the battle of Gettysburg, Pa., July 3, 1863.

His record in the adjutant-general's department, in the field, is without a parallel. Having originally entered the services as adjutant of his regiment, he successively became adjutant-general of brigade, division, corps, grand division, and of the Army of the Potomac.

When General Hooker took command of the Army of the Potomac he appointed him his adjutant-general, with the rank of brigadier-general, which he declined, much to his regret, for the reason that it would have kept him in camp when he (General Hooker) was on the field of battle. He participated in all of the great battles and skirmishes of the Army of the Potomac.

Upon the retirement of General Hooker from the command of the Army of the Potomac and the assumption of the command by Maj. Gen. George B. Meade, at the urgent personal solicitation of the latter, General Dickinson remained on duty on the staff.

While at Taneytown, Md., General Meade showed his great confidence and appreciation of General Dickinson's eminent military skill and ability by selecting him for the important duty of proceeding to Gettysburg on the eve of June 30 for consultation with Gen. John Buford, then holding the town with his cavalry, and determining the movements of the infantry column under Gen. John F. Reynolds. It was upon the judgment and conclusions of Generals Buford and Dickinson, after an earnest consideration of the situation until long after midnight, with the enemy's forces rapidly concentrating about the outskirts of the town, that a staff officer was dispatched with orders to General Reynolds to move his command to Gettysburg. Thus it was that General Reynolds received the orders from General Meade that resulted in that great battle. General Dickinson, having called on General Reynolds on his way up to Gettysburg and informing him of the nature of his duty and instructions, had prepared him for the receipt of any orders resulting therefrom.

It was General Dickinson who selected the position at the little farmhouse on the Taneytown road—almost the center of the field—for headquarters of General Meade during the battle which followed, and was himself severely wounded there on July 3.

In the fall of 1863, being incapacitated by wounds for service in the field, he was assigned for inspection duty at Washington.

He resigned January 24, 1864, and was "honorably mustered out of service on account of wounds received in action."

General Dickinson also greatly distinguished himself at the battle of Chan-

cellorsville, Va., where, during the battle, at great risk of life and capture, he rescued eighteen ladies and children from the burning Chancellor House, which was destroyed by the bursting shells.

Without including skirmishes, he participated in the following battles: 1862.—Yorktown, siege of, April and May; Williamsburg, Va., May 5 (wounded); Fair Oaks, Va., June 1 (wounded); advanced pickets, Virginia, June 25; Glendale, Va., June 30; Malvern Hill, Virginia, July 1; Malvern Hill, Virginia (retaking), August 4; Bristow Station, Va., August 27; Bull Run, Virginia, August 29 and 30; Chantilly, Va., September 1; South Mountain, Maryland, September 14; Antietam, Md., September 16 and 17; Fredericksburg, Va., December 11 to 16.

1863.—Kellys Ford, Va., March 17; Chancellorsville, Va., May 1 to 5; Brandy Station, Va., June 9; Aldie, Va., June 17; Middleburg, Va., June 19; Upperville, Va., June 21; Gettysburg, Pa., July 1 to 3 (wounded).

General Dickinson is receiving a general-law pension of \$30 per month on account of gunshot wound of left forearm and buckshot wounds of left breast, affecting heart, received in battle. He is 73 years of age and is now in a most deplorable physical condition, perfectly helpless and confined to his bed, requiring the constant care of a nurse. Because of his advanced age and the chronic character of his ailments, the probabilities are against his ever being able to support himself. He is in poverty and needs relief.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say from personal knowledge that General Dickinson never will be able to do any more work. I introduced the bill at \$100 per month. The committee, adhering to their rule, have reported it at fifty. I would appeal to the chairman to allow the rate to be \$70 or \$75, as I think the other House will agree to that amount under the circumstances.

Mr. COCKRELL. Put it at \$72 for total disability.

Mr. GALLINGER. Seventy-two dollars.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I think about a week ago, in the case of General McCook, the rate was raised to an even \$70, as I remember. This seems to be a case of the very same character, and I would have no objection; indeed, I think it would be perfectly appropriate to raise it \$20 above the amount reported by the committee, if that will be satisfactory to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment, to strike out "fifty" and insert "seventy."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

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

THADDEUS K. MILLER.

The bill (S. 4171) granting an increase of pension to Thaddeus K. Miller was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thaddeus K. Miller, late of Company A, Sixty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ADAM KOHLHAUFF.

The bill (H. R. 4157) granting an increase of pension to Adam Kohlhauff was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Adam Kohlhauff, late of Company D, Sixty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CHARLES W. BARRETT.

The bill (S. 5111) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Barrett was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles W. Barrett, late first lieutenant Company E, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JAMES L. DYER.

A bill (S. 1808) granting a pension to James L. Dyer was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James L. Dyer, late of Com-

pany B, Sixty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM H. HESS.

The bill (S. 4937) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hess was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William H. Hess, late of Company B, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JOHN R. M'MANNOMY.

The bill (S. 3008) granting an increase of pension to John R. McMannomy was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, before the word "lieutenant," to insert "first;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John R. McMannomy, late first lieutenant Company B, Sixty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

OSCAR F. BARTLETT.

The bill (S. 9245) granting an increase of pension to Oscar F. Bartlett was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Oscar F. Bartlett, late surgeon Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JAMES W. CARRIER.

The bill (S. 3666) granting an increase of pension to James W. Carrier was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "Volunteer," to strike out "Corps;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James W. Carrier, late of Company B, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JAMES STOUT.

The bill (S. 5265) granting an increase of pension to James Stout was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James Stout, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

CLARISSA ANN LAPOINT.

The bill (S. 2396) granting a pension to Clarissa Ann La Point was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Clarissa Ann Lapoint, widow of Battice Lapoint, late of Captain Knowlton's company, Wisconsin Volunteers, war with Mexico and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Clarissa Ann Lapoint."

WILLIAM H. IJAMS.

The bill (S. 2803) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ijams was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "Company," to strike out "of;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William H. Ijams, late captain Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

ANDREW A. KELLEY.

The bill (S. 3304) granting an increase of pension to Andrew A. Kelly was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "late," to strike out the name "Kelly" and insert "Kelley;" in the same line, before the word "Company," to strike out "of" and insert "captain;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Andrew A. Kelley, late captain Company F, Thirty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Andrew A. Kelley."

SAMUEL R. SHANKLAND.

The bill (S. 4679) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Shankland was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, before the word "Volunteer," to strike out "Colorado" and insert "California;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Samuel R. Shankland, late of Company A, Second Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. GAMBLE subsequently said: I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 4679) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Shankland was ordered to a third reading and passed.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. GAMBLE. In line 8, before the word "dollars," I move to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "thirty." This amendment is agreeable, I think, to the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CYRENIUS DENNIS.

The bill (H. R. 7477) granting an increase of pension to Cyrenius Dennis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Cyrenius Dennis, late of Company C, Seventy-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer In-

fantry, and to pay him a pension of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MARGARET H. BOOTH.

The bill (H. R. 9633) granting a pension to Margaret H. Booth was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Margaret H. Booth, widow of Henry Booth, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

JULIUS KRAG.

The bill (H. R. 4631) granting an increase of pension to Julius Krag was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Julius Krag, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ROSE MACFARLANE.

The bill (S. 4340) granting an increase of pension to Rose MacFarlane was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "captain;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Rose MacFarlane, widow of James MacFarlane, late captain Company E, One hundred and seventy-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

ELLEN R. OSTRANDER.

The bill (S. 5270) granting an increase of pension to Ellen R. Ostrander was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, after the word "late," to insert "second lieutenant and;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "fifteen;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Ellen R. Ostrander, widow of William A. L. Ostrander, late second lieutenant and quartermaster, Seventy-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$15 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

JOHN DALY.

The bill (H. R. 9030) granting an increase of pension to John Daly was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Daly, late captain Company I, One hundred and fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES KELEHER.

The bill (H. R. 5391) granting an increase of pension to James Keleher was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James Keleher, late of Company G, Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE B. FAIRHEAD.

The bill (H. R. 8410) granting an increase of pension to George B. Fairhead was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George B. Fairhead, late of Company D, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE A. MILLER.

The bill (S. 5034) granting a pension to George A. Miller was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George A. Miller, late of Company G, Second Regiment, and second lieutenant Company F, Thirtieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

EUGENE SCHILLING.

The bill (S. 3989) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Schilling was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "captain;" in line 7, before the word "Volunteer," to strike out "Veteran;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eugene Schilling, late captain Company K, One hundred and second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM P. JACKSON.

The bill (S. 4223) granting an increase of pension to William P. Jackson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "forty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William P. Jackson, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

DAVID H. THOMPSON.

The bill (H. R. 3836) granting an increase of pension to David H. Thompson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of David H. Thompson, late of Company D, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HIRAM FLINT.

The bill (H. R. 8022) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Flint was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hiram Flint, late of Companies D and H, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM Y. M. WILKERSON.

The bill (H. R. 4987) granting an increase of pension to William Y. M. Wilkerson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William Y. M. Wilkerson, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM H. COOPER.

The bill (H. R. 12352) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cooper was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William H.

Cooper, late of Company I, Eightieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

DAVID L. MILLER.

The bill (S. 2183) granting an increase of pension to David L. Miller was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "Pennsylvania," to strike out "Volunteers" and insert "Volunteer Infantry;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of David L. Miller, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

RICHARD E. BOULDIN.

The bill (S. 493) granting an increase of pension to Richard E. Bouldin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Richard E. Bouldin, late captain Company C, Seventh Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES H. WESTON.

The bill (H. R. 6911) granting an increase of pension to James H. Weston was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James H. Weston, late of Company F, Third Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MARSHALL HOWELL.

The bill (H. R. 6088) granting an increase of pension to Marshall Howell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Marshall Howell, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM H. SEIP.

The bill (S. 5161) granting an increase of pension to William H. Seip was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "Cavalry," to insert "and lieutenant-colonel First Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Cavalry;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William H. Seip, late captain Company H, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and lieutenant-colonel First Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM H. COLVILLE.

The bill (S. 73) granting an increase of pension to William H. Colville was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty-six;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William H. Colville, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

BENJAMIN F. BARRETT.

The bill (H. R. 3670) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Barrett was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Benjamin F. Barrett, late of Company I, Third Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES P. HURST.

The bill (H. R. 12297) granting a pension to James P. Hurst was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James P. Hurst, late second lieutenant Company M, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry.

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

LIBERTY B. WALTERS.

The bill (H. R. 12623) granting an increase of pension to Liberty B. Walters, alias Liberty B. Watters, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Liberty B. Walters, alias Liberty B. Watters, late of Company A, Forty-second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SUSAN D. LOVELL.

The bill (H. R. 13448) granting an increase of pension to Susan D. Lovell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Susan D. Lovell, widow of James A. Lovell, late of Company K, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

JOHN F. BURROWS.

The bill (H. R. 11524) granting a pension to John F. Burrows was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John F. Burrows, late of the East Tennessee Bridge Burners, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month.

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

RACHEL J. SMITH.

The bill (H. R. 12664) granting an increase of pension to Rachel J. Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Rachel J. Smith, widow of William C. Smith, late colonel First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and to pay her a pension of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

HENRY M'QUERTER.

The bill (H. R. 7472) granting an increase of pension to Henry McQuarter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry McQuarter, late of Company K, Thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM JOHNSON.

The bill (H. R. 4897) granting an increase of pension to William Johnson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William Johnson, late of Company H, Thirty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

RACHEL TYSON.

The bill (H. R. 5406) granting a pension to Rachel Tyson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Rachel Tyson, widow of Jacob Tyson, alias Jacob Stafford, late of Capt. William Jones's company, North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, Cherokee Indian disturbances, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

SUSAN LAUGHERTY.

The bill (H. R. 5431) granting a pension to Susan Laugherty was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place

on the pension roll the name of Susan Laugherty, widow of Thomas J. Laugherty, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

JOHN M. BAILEY.

The bill (H. R. 11403) granting a pension to John M. Bailey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John M. Bailey, late unassigned, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month.

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

MARY DEWIRE.

The bill (H. R. 2194) granting a pension to Mary Dewire was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mary Dewire, widow of John Dewire, late of Company I, Second Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

HENRY ARMSTRONG.

The bill (S. 4341) granting an increase of pension to Henry Armstrong was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Henry Armstrong, late of Company L, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

EDNA STEVENS.

The bill (S. 2116) granting an increase of pension to Edna Stevens was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "first lieutenant;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Edna Stevens, widow of Charles Stevens, late first lieutenant Company C, Third Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

FRANCES E. PLUMMER.

The bill (S. 3616) granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Plummer was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, before the word "late," to strike out "deceased;" in line 8, before the word "Infantry," to insert "Volunteer;" and in the same line, before the word "and," to strike out "Volunteers;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Frances E. Plummer, widow of James M. Plummer, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM G. TOMPKINS.

The bill (S. 4187) granting an increase of pension to William G. Tompkins was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William G. Tompkins, late captain Company A, Seventy-first Regiment New York State Militia Infantry, and Com-

pany A, Seventy-first Regiment New York National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ADELINE BALLARD.

The bill (H. R. 9428) granting an increase of pension to Adeline Ballard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Adeline Ballard, widow of John Ballard, late of Company C, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

JOHN C. HAMLY.

The bill (H. R. 9429) granting an increase of pension to John C. Hamly, alias George Garnett, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John C. Hamly, alias George Garnett, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ANTOINETTE R. SMITH.

The bill (H. R. 4110) granting an increase of pension to Antoinette R. Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Antoinette R. Smith, widow of Abner Smith, late of Company E, First Regiment Georgia Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

MARY A. V. COOK.

The bill (H. R. 626) granting a pension to Mary A. V. Cook was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mary A. V. Cook, widow of James S. Cook, late of Captain Hicklin's company, Georgia Volunteers, Florida Indian war, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

MARY McLEAN WYLLYS.

The bill (S. 1243) granting a pension to Mary McLean Wyllys was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary McLean Wyllys, daughter of James McLean, late a private in the companies of Capts. John Chester, Elijah Wright, and William Mills in Col. Samuel Wyllys's regiment, Connecticut troops, war of the Revolution, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JOHN RYAN.

The bill (H. R. 721) granting an increase of pension to John Ryan, alias John Connell, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twelve" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Ryan, alias John Connell, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM O. WHITE.

The bill (S. 5125) granting an increase of pension to William O. White was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William O. White, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CHARLES A. TARBOX.

The bill (H. R. 908) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Tarbox was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles A. Tarbox, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

THOMAS B. FORGAN.

The bill (H. R. 13746) granting a pension to Thomas B. Forgan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas B. Forgan, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry.

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

PENELOPE A. DEXTER.

The bill (H. R. 4580) granting a pension to Penelope A. Dexter was announced as the next business in order on the Calendar.

Mr. McCUMBER. Since the report was made in this case I am informed that the claimant has died. I therefore move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

JAMES W. WHITNEY.

The bill (H. R. 2107) granting an increase of pension to James W. Whitney was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James W. Whitney, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HENRY S. HAMILTON.

The bill (H. R. 731) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Hamilton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry S. Hamilton, late musician, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

RENEL W. TRASK.

The bill (H. R. 3297) granting an increase of pension to Renel W. Trask was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Renel W. Trask, late of Company B, Third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CHARLES BOWEN.

The bill (H. R. 12845) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bowen was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles Bowen, late of Company F, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE R. HANSON.

The bill (H. R. 6868) granting an increase of pension to George R. Hanson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George R. Hanson, late of Company G, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

OSCAR A. PHETTEPLACE.

The bill (H. R. 11574) granting an increase of pension to Oscar A. Phetteplace was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Oscar A. Phetteplace, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ONSLow N. McINTIRE.

The bill (H. R. 6502) granting a pension to Onslow N. McIntire was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to

place on the pension roll the name of Onslow N. McIntire, helpless and dependent son of Sylvanus McIntire, late third assistant engineer, United States Navy, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

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

GEORGE W. MARSH.

The bill (H. R. 7219) granting an increase of pension to George W. Marsh was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George W. Marsh, late commissary-sergeant, Thirty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

DANIEL W. GRAHAM.

The bill (H. R. 13284) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Graham was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Daniel W. Graham, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

FYANNA E. MYERS.

The bill (H. R. 11187) granting an increase of pension to Fyanna E. Myers was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Fyanna E. Myers, widow of Andrew J. Myers, late acting assistant paymaster, United States Navy, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

THOMAS SMITH.

The bill (S. 5180) granting a pension to Thomas Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Thomas Smith, late of Captain Jacob Rhodes's company, Oregon Volunteers, Oregon Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ALONZO GARDNER.

The bill (S. 5179) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Gardner was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alonzo Gardner, late of Company C, One hundred and fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN B. SALSMAN.

The bill (H. R. 6000) granting an increase of pension to John B. Salsman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John B. Salsman, late first lieutenant Company H, Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

AARON BAYLES.

The bill (H. R. 10480) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Bayles was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Aaron Bayles, late second lieutenant Company D, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HANNAH HILL.

The bill (H. R. 13653) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Hill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hannah Hill, widow of Calvin C. Hill, late of Company C, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

ALONZO SABIN.

The bill (H. R. 5685) granting a pension to Alonzo Sabin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alonzo Sabin, late of Company H, Fifty-second Regiment New York National Guard Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

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

GEORGE W. GYGER.

The bill (H. R. 6334) granting an increase of pension to George W. Gyger was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George W. Gyger, late of Company B, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ELIZABETH C. WAY.

The bill (S. 5191) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Way was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "colonel" and insert "major and lieutenant-colonel;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Elizabeth C. Way, widow of William B. Way, late major and lieutenant-colonel Ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM P. VOHN.

The bill (S. 5282) granting an increase of pension to William P. Vohn was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William P. Vohn, late of Company B, Thirty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JAMES N. CULTON.

The bill (S. 3890) granting an increase of pension to J. N. Culton was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James N. Culton, late of Company D, Third Regiment, and first lieutenant Company D, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to James N. Culton."

BENJAMIN F. BOLLINGER.

The bill (S. 3915) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Bollinger was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "late," to insert "alias Benjamin Bell;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Benjamin F. Bollinger, alias Benjamin Bell, late of Company L, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Bollinger, alias Benjamin Bell."

AMANDA M. MORSE.

The bill (H. R. 6503) granting an increase of pension to Amanda M. Morse was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Amanda M. Morse, widow of David A. Morse, late assistant surgeon, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$17 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

THOMAS AUDAS.

The bill (H. R. 8014) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Audas was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas Audas, late chaplain Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES W. SWORDS.

The bill (H. R. 8316) granting an increase of pension to James W. Swords was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James W. Swords, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM L. RUTTER.

The bill (H. R. 7752) granting a pension to William L. Rutter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William L. Rutter, late of Company C, Fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Emergency Militia Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

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

JOHN H. M'BRAYER.

The bill (H. R. 6595) granting an increase of pension to John H. McBrayer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John H. McBrayer, late captain of Company K, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ALFRED HOWSER.

The bill (H. R. 5996) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Howser was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alfred Howser, late of Company K, Sixty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ELIZABETH F. CHAMPLIN.

The bill (H. R. 6170) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Champlin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elizabeth F. Champlin, former widow of George W. Johnson, late of Company H, Twenty-first Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

FREDERICK C. WICKHAM.

The bill (H. R. 6090) granting an increase of pension to Frederick C. Wickham was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Frederick C. Wickham, late commissary-sergeant One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN WOODS.

The bill (H. R. 5314) granting an increase of pension to John Woods was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Woods, late

of Company C, Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

NOAH MINNICH.

The bill (H. R. 11033) granting an increase of pension to Noah Minnich was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Noah Minnich, late of Company G, Sixty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MICHAEL CRIBBINS.

The bill (H. R. 2804) granting an increase of pension to Michael Cribbins was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Michael Cribbins, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM C. SCOTT.

The bill (H. R. 11647) granting an increase of pension to William C. Scott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William C. Scott, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MINNIE C. WILKINS.

The bill (H. R. 11877) granting an increase of pension to Minnie C. Wilkins was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Minnie C. Wilkins, widow of Joseph S. Wilkins, late captain and paymaster, United States Army, and to pay her a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor children of said Joseph S. Wilkins until they reach the age of 16 years.

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

ADAM SHIRIA.

The bill (H. R. 12388) granting an increase of pension to Adam Shiria was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Adam Shiria, late of Company H, One hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES M. HOWE.

The bill (H. R. 3166) granting an increase of pension to James M. Howe was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James M. Howe, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HATTIE M. MATHESON.

The bill (H. R. 4626) granting a pension to Hattie M. Matheson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hattie M. Matheson, widow of Alexander R. Matheson, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

CHARLES GOCHHEY.

The bill (H. R. 4933) granting an increase of pension to Charles Gochey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles Gochey, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILSON SNIDER.

The bill (H. R. 4056) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Snider was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes

to place on the pension roll the name of Wilson Snider, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LOUIS P. ANSCHUTZ.

The bill (H. R. 3460) granting an increase of pension to Louis P. Anschutz was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Louis P. Anschutz, late of Company K, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ROBERT WHITMAN.

The bill (H. R. 2150) granting an increase of pension to Robert Whitman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Robert Whitman, late of Company I, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LAWRENCE COOK.

The bill (H. R. 2148) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence Cook was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lawrence Cook, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

EMELINE SIMMONS.

The bill (H. R. 5198) granting a pension to Emeline Simmons was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Emeline Simmons, widow of Francis Simmons, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

ALLEN CAMPBELL.

The bill (H. R. 5193) granting an increase of pension to Allen Campbell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Allen Campbell, late second lieutenant Company D, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

REBECCA AUMEN.

The bill (S. 5349) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Aumen was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "first lieutenant" and insert "of;" in line 7, after the word "Pennsylvania," to strike out "Volunteers" and insert "Volunteer Infantry;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Rebecca Aumen, widow of John Aumen, late of Company F, Two hundred and ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

ROSALINE V. CAMPBELL.

The bill (S. 3432) granting an increase of pension to Rosaline V. Campbell was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Rosaline V. Campbell, widow of Alberto Campbell, late of Company A, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM L. JOHNSTON.

The bill (S. 433) granting an increase of pension to William L. Johnston was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William L. Johnston, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

PHILIP J. HARLOW.

The bill (H. R. 685) granting an increase of pension to Philip J. Harlow was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Philip J. Harlow, late of Company K, and hospital steward, Eighty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE W. FITZGERALD.

The bill (H. R. 2969) granting an increase of pension to George W. Fitzgerald was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George W. Fitzgerald, late of Company K, Sixty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN MIDDLETON.

The bill (H. R. 14152) granting an increase of pension to John Middleton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Middleton, late of Company G, Sixty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

EUPHAMA A. YOUNG.

The bill (H. R. 13147) granting an increase of pension to Euphama A. Young was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Euphama A. Young, widow of Henry Young, late of Company E, Two hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

AUGUST HENNING.

The bill (H. R. 11793) granting an increase of pension to August Henning was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of August Henning, late of Battery I, First Regiment United States Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ELIZABETH BANKS.

The bill (H. R. 12964) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Banks was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elizabeth Banks, widow of Ephraim N. Banks, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

FRANCIS F. ROGERS.

The bill (H. R. 13657) granting an increase of pension to Francis F. Rogers was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Francis F. Rogers, late of Company B, Seventeenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, Companies A and D, Third Battalion, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and Company M, Fiftieth Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES W. GRIFFITTS.

The bill (H. R. 5690) granting an increase of pension to James W. Griffiths was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James W. Griffiths, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volun-

teer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

The bill (H. R. 4996) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Robertson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alexander Robertson, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CHARLES W. ABBOTT.

The bill (H. R. 9116) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Abbott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles W. Abbott, late lieutenant-colonel Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MARY A. DENSTON.

The bill (H. R. 4241) granting a pension to Mary A. Denston was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mary A. Denston, widow of Benjamin P. Denston, late of Company K, First Regiment Eastern Shore Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

ABRAM YOUNG.

The bill (H. R. 10502) granting an increase of pension to Abram Young was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Abram Young, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN F. ROCKEY.

The bill (H. R. 10790) granting an increase of pension to John F. Rockey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John F. Rockey, late of Company D, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES H. ENGLISH.

The bill (H. R. 7701) granting an increase of pension to James H. English was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James H. English, late of Company E, Fifty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOSEPH S. WRIGHT.

The bill (H. R. 5338) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Wright was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph S. Wright, late of Company D, Twenty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SAMUEL D. SATTERLY.

The bill (H. R. 5971) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Satterly was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel D. Satterly, late of Company E, First Regiment Pennsylvania Rifles, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MARSHALL COX.

The bill (H. R. 12456) granting an increase of pension to Marshall Cox was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Marshall Cox, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer

Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM H. H. CHESTER.

The bill (H. R. 8074) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Chester was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William H. H. Chester, late of Company L, One hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ROBERT H. LONG.

The bill (H. R. 6558) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Long was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Robert H. Long, late major, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

THOMAS J. CANNON.

The bill (H. R. 7366) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Cannon was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas J. Cannon, late of Company F, and first lieutenant Company I, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HENRY J. POTTER.

The bill (H. R. 5973) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Potter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry J. Potter, late of Company F, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ADONIJAH RICHARDS.

The bill (H. R. 8122) granting a pension to Adonijah Richards was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Adonijah Richards, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month, the same to be paid to him under the rules of the Pension Bureau, as to mode and times of payment, without any deduction or rebate on account of former alleged overpayments or erroneous payments of pension.

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

JESSE W. M'GAHAN.

The bill (S. 5372) granting an increase of pension to Jesse W. McGahan was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the words "Company G," to strike out "Seventy-first" and insert "One hundred and seventy-first;" and in line 7, after the word "Ohio," to insert "National Guard;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jesse W. McGahan, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-first Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

THEODORE J. WIDVEY.

The bill (S. 5213) granting an increase of pension to Theodore J. Widvey was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "Company," to strike out the letter "B" and insert "K;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Theodore J. Widvey, late

captain Company K, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

JOHN D. INGER.

The bill (S. 5230) granting an increase of pension to John D. Inger was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the name "John D.," to strike out "Juger" and insert "Inger;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John D. Inger, late of Company B, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to John D. Inger."

DARIUS W. OWENS.

The bill (S. 405) granting an increase of pension to Darius W. Owens was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Darius W. Owens, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

LEWIS Y. FOSTER.

The bill (S. 5101) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Y. Foster was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Lewis Y. Foster, late of Company M, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JASPER N. JENNINGS.

The bill (S. 2730) granting an increase of pension to Jasper N. Jennings was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "Infantry," to insert the words "and captain Company F, Second Regiment North Carolina Mounted Volunteer Infantry;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jasper N. Jennings, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and captain Company F, Second Regiment North Carolina Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

PETER BAKER.

The bill (S. 5289) granting an increase of pension to Peter Baker was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Peter Baker, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

DANIEL W. WORKING.

The bill (S. 1564) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Working was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Daniel W. Working, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN E. WHITE.

The bill (H. R. 6713) granting an increase of pension to John E. White, alias Patrick White, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John E. White, alias Patrick White, late of Company D, Eighty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CHARLES VON LUKOWITZ.

The bill (H. R. 7064) granting an increase of pension to Charles Von Lukowitz was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles Von Lukowitz, late of Company H, One hundred and eighty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LEWIS MONJAR.

The bill (H. R. 7678) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Monjar was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lewis Monjar, late of Company A, Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM JOHNSON.

The bill (H. R. 6048) granting an increase of pension to William Johnson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William Johnson, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ANN JONES.

The bill (H. R. 11452) granting a pension to Ann Jones was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ann Jones, widow of Henry E. Jones, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

SAMUEL G. H. WHITLEY.

The bill (H. R. 2810) granting an increase of pension to Samuel G. H. Whitley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel G. H. Whitley, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ISAAC N. WILLHITE.

The bill (H. R. 2687) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Willhite was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Isaac N. Willhite, late of Company E, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CATHERINE BOWSHER.

The bill (H. R. 2606) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Bowsher was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Catherine Bowsher, widow of Jesse Bowsher, late captain Company F, Fifty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

REUBIN W. BARTRAM.

The bill (H. R. 8394) granting an increase of pension to Reubin W. Bartram was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Reubin W. Bartram, late of Company A, Eighty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN H. BRODRICK.

The bill (H. R. 11662) granting an increase of pension to John H. Brodrick was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John H. Brodrick, late of Company D, One hundredth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ISOM R. NEW.

The bill (H. R. 11976) granting an increase of pension to Isom R. New was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Isom R. New, late of Company D, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

DENNIS SPURRIER.

The bill (H. R. 11937) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Spurrier was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Dennis Spurrier, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ALEXANDER D. RAMSEY.

The bill (H. R. 2567) granting an increase of pension to Alexander D. Ramsey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alexander D. Ramsey, late of Company I, Twentieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

INA D. BURDICK.

The bill (H. R. 5867) granting a pension to Ina D. Burdick was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ina D. Burdick, helpless and dependent daughter of Ira D. Burdick, late captain Company C, Thirty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

MARK F. HOLDERMAN.

The bill (H. R. 690) granting an increase of pension to Mark F. Holderman, alias Michael Holderman, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mark F. Holderman, alias Michael Holderman, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN A. M'CONNELL.

The bill (H. R. 4908) granting an increase of pension to John A. McConnell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John A. McConnell, late commissary-sergeant Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

DELOS VAN DEUSEN.

The bill (H. R. 6327) granting an increase of pension to Delos Van Deusen was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Delos Van Deusen, late lieutenant-colonel Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ANDREW SULLENBERGER.

The bill (H. R. 3653) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Sullenberger was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Andrew Sullenberger, late of Company D, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LEWIS JOHNSON, JR.

The bill (H. R. 809) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Johnson, jr., was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lewis Johnson, jr., late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

IRA STOUT.

The bill (H. R. 3319) granting an increase of pension to Ira Stout was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ira Stout, late of Company F, Fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

PAULINE N. PEARSON.

The bill (H. R. 6962) granting an increase of pension to Pauline N. Pearson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Pauline N. Pearson, widow of Parker Pearson, late second lieutenant Company B, Eighteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

JOHN F. CUMMINS.

The bill (H. R. 13935) granting an increase of pension to John F. Cummins was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John F. Cummins, late of Company E, Ninety-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LEWIS R. GATES.

The bill (H. R. 4756) granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Gates was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lewis R. Gates, late of Company B, First Regiment Dakota Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

FREDERICK FRICK.

The bill (H. R. 605) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Frick was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Frederick Frick, late of Company A, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN LATTY.

The bill (H. R. 197) granting an increase of pension to John Latty was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Latty, late captain Company C, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LUCINA HEATH.

The bill (H. R. 2450) granting a pension to Lucina Heath was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lucina Heath, helpless and dependent daughter of George C. Heath, late of Company H, Twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

HARRY F. THOMPSON.

The bill (H. R. 10973) granting a pension to Harry F. Thompson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Harry F. Thompson, late of Company B, First Regiment South Dakota Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain.

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

GRANVILLE H. BISHOP.

The bill (H. R. 5279) granting an increase of pension to Granville H. Bishop was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Granville H. Bishop, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and thirtieth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MICHAEL O'BRIEN.

The bill (H. R. 614) granting a pension to Michael O'Brien, alias Michael Clifford, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Michael O'Brien, alias Michael Clifford, late unassigned recruit, New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$8 per month.

Mr. COCKRELL. In view of the report in this case and the statements quoted in the report, which I think are most wonderful, I ask that the bill may go over.

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

Mr. COCKRELL. I call the special attention of the chairman of the committee who made the report to the statements made in the report, which stand without any verification, so far as I can see. It seems to me most wonderful that the things which are alleged here could have occurred in the United States. It does not appear to me that it is possible such occurrences as this man relates could have actually taken place. He admits that they were paid a local bounty of \$750 and expected \$300 from the United States. I think the case is worth looking into a little further.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will state to the Senator that the matter came up in the committee, and it was looked into quite thoroughly at the time. The bill was held in committee for a considerable period before it was acted upon. However, I have no objection to the bill going over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over.

JOHN M. SAVOREE.

The bill (H. R. 12607) granting an increase of pension to John M. Savoree was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John M. Savoree, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ANNA S. CHRISTOPHERSON.

The bill (H. R. 9775) granting a pension to Anna S. Christopherson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Anna S. Christopherson, helpless and dependent daughter of Ole Christopherson, late of Company K, Twenty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

SIMON P. RITTENHOUSE.

The bill (H. R. 12850) granting an increase of pension to Simon P. Rittenhouse was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Simon P. Rittenhouse, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HENRY HENWOOD.

The bill (H. R. 2045) granting an increase of pension to Henry Henwood was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry Henwood, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HENRY B. SPARKS.

The bill (H. R. 10261) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Sparks was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry B. Sparks, late of Company C, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOSEPHINE F. ANDERSON.

The bill (H. R. 1565) granting an increase of pension to Josephine F. Anderson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Josephine F. Anderson, widow of Albert R. Anderson, late captain Company K and major Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Albert R. Anderson until he reaches the age of 16 years.

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

ALEXANDER HARDY.

The bill (H. R. 6916) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Hardy was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alexander Hardy, late first lieutenant Twenty-fourth Battery Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, in line 8, before the word "dollars," I move to strike out "thirty-six" and to insert "forty." This is a very meritorious case. Mr. Hardy is now 79 years of age. He served as a second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and captain of the Twenty-fourth Battery, Indiana Light Artillery, from November 29, 1862, to August 3, 1865, when he was honorably discharged. He is now pensioned under the general law at \$25 per month on account of nearly total deafness of the right ear, severe deafness of the left ear, and rheumatism. All his disabilities were contracted while he held the rank of first lieutenant. He can do no physical labor, and is incapacitated by reason of defective hearing from doing any other. He took part in all the battles in which his regiment was engaged. He served honorably for nearly three years, and under the circumstances the increase should be allowed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment moved by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 8, before the word "dollars," strike out "thirty-six" and insert "forty."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ANN DAWSON.

The bill (H. R. 6051) granting an increase of pension to Ann Dawson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ann Dawson, widow of Holt Dawson, late of Company G, Sixty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Maggie Dawson, helpless and dependent daughter of said Holt Dawson, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Ann Dawson the name of said Maggie Dawson shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Ann Dawson.

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

LEWIS KIMER.

The bill (H. R. 3244) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Kimer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lewis Kimer, late of Company H, Twenty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ALEXANDER J. HOOD.

The bill (H. R. 2005) granting an increase of pension to Alexander J. Hood was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alexander J. Hood, late of the Sixth Battery Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MAGGIE DU BOIS.

The bill (H. R. 6317) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Du Bois was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Maggie Du Bois, widow of Samuel T. Du Bois, late captain Company C, Third Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

JOHN B. TUCKER.

The bill (H. R. 5734) granting an increase of pension to John B. Tucker was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John B. Tucker, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

THOMAS MURRAY.

The bill (H. R. 8213) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Murray was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas Murray, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JACOB DODD.

The bill (H. R. 10579) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Dodd was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jacob Dodd, late of Company I, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CEPHAS KENDAL KNOX.

The bill (H. R. 1910) granting a pension to Cephas Kendal Knox was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Cephas Kendal Knox, late landsman U. S. S. *Alliance*, United States Navy, and to pay him a pension of \$8 per month.

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

SARAH F. BURNET.

The bill (H. R. 14181) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Burnet was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sarah F. Burnet, widow of James C. Burnet, late acting master's mate, U. S. S. *Robb*, United States Navy, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

JOHN K. WHITED.

The bill (S. 5244) granting an increase of pension to John K. Whited was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, before the word "war," to strike out "Mexican;" in the same line, before the word "and," to insert "with Mexico;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John K. Whited, late of Company H, Arkansas Mounted Volunteers, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

ALEXANDER D. TANYER.

The bill (S. 103) granting an increase of pension to A. D. Tanyer was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 5, after the words "name of," to strike out the letter "A." and insert the name "Alexander;" and in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "captain;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Alexander D. Tanyer, late

captain Company H, Fifty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Alexander D. Tanyer."

WILLIAM D. WOODWORTH.

The bill (S. 741) granting an increase of pension to William D. Woodworth was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William D. Woodworth, late of Companies B and C, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

EDWARD G. HORNE.

The bill (S. 4606) granting an increase of pension to Edward G. Horne was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Edward G. Horne, late of Company B, Battalion Mississippi Riflemen, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

GEORGE W. FOSTER.

The bill (S. 3203) granting an increase of pension to George W. Foster was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George W. Foster, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN W. COMER.

The bill (H. R. 13438) granting an increase of pension to John W. Comer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John W. Comer, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN B. CALHOUN.

The bill (H. R. 10824) granting an increase of pension to John B. Calhoun was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John B. Calhoun, late of Company D, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CHRISTIAN KLOEPPPEL.

The bill (H. R. 4604) granting an increase of pension to Christian Kloeppel, alias Christian Knupple, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Christian Kloeppel, alias Christian Knupple, late of Company C, Third Regiment Missouri Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

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

JAMES R. GIBSON.

The bill (H. R. 3734) granting an increase of pension to James R. Gibson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James R. Gibson, late of Company D, Third Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM C. MONTGOMERY.

The bill (H. R. 701) granting a pension to William C. Montgomery was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William C. Montgomery, late of Captain Sims's company, Texas Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

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

JOHN P. WEBB.

The bill (H. R. 3445) granting an increase of pension to John P. Webb was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John P. Webb, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ELIZABETH HOPPER.

The bill (H. R. 6307) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hopper was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elizabeth Hopper, widow of Andrew Hopper, late second lieutenant, Hutchinson Guards, Minnesota State Militia, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

MARY CORNELIA HAYS ROSS.

The bill (S. 3935) granting a pension to Mary Cornelia Hays Ross was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Cornelia Hays Ross, widow of Henry Schuyler Ross, late first assistant engineer and captain, United States Navy, retired, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary Cornelia Hays Ross."

ANDREW W. SWITZER.

The bill (S. 4690) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Switzer was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, before the name "Switzer," to insert the letter "W.;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Andrew W. Switzer, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Andrew W. Switzer."

MARY HEANEY.

The bill (H. R. 13850) granting an increase of pension to Mary Heaney was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "sixteen" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Heaney, widow of Hubert Heaney, alias Feaghey, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

SARA A. WARDELL.

The bill (S. 5233) granting a pension to Sara A. Wardell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sara A. Wardell, daughter of

Eliakim Wardell, a private in Hunt's company, Wessenfel's regiment, Army of the American Revolution, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

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

JOHN M. SULLIVAN.

The bill (H. R. 13507) granting an increase of pension to John M. Sullivan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John M. Sullivan, late first lieutenant and adjutant, Battalion First Missouri Militia Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HEDWIG A. MAASS.

The bill (H. R. 3246) granting a pension to Hedwig A. Maass was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hedwig A. Maass, dependent mother of Clara Louise Maass, late hospital nurse, United States Army, and to pay her a pension of \$13 per month.

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

ELLA HATFIELD.

The bill (H. R. 7595) granting a pension to Ella Hatfield was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ella Hatfield, helpless and dependent daughter of David Hatfield, late major First Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$13 per month.

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

AUGUST STRICK.

The bill (H. R. 4369) granting an increase of pension to August Strick was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of August Strick, late of Battery I, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOSEPH WHITMAN.

The bill (H. R. 9021) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Whitman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph Whitman, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

EDWIN J. JAGGER.

The bill (H. R. 14203) granting an increase of pension to Edwin J. Jagger was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Edwin J. Jagger, late of Company F, Fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE H. OTIS.

The bill (H. R. 13236) granting an increase of pension to George H. Otis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George H. Otis, late captain Company C and major Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SAMUEL A. SMITH, JR.

The bill (H. R. 13310) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Smith, jr., was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel A. Smith, jr., late captain Company F, Twenty-eighth Regiment New York National Guard Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES JOHNSON.

The bill (H. R. 12133) granting an increase of pension to James Johnson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James Johnson, late captain Company N, Seventy-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volun-

teer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HEZEKIAH KEPNER.

The bill (H. R. 13413) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah Kepner was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hezekiah Kepner, late of Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM M. MORRISON.

The bill (H. R. 5327) granting an increase of pension to William M. Morrison was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William M. Morrison, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CATHERINE DARR.

The bill (H. R. 11796) granting a pension to Catherine Darr was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Catherine Darr, widow of Joseph Darr, late lieutenant-colonel First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$30 per month.

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

JAMES H. TOWNSEND.

The bill (H. R. 6564) granting an increase of pension to James H. Townsend was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James H. Townsend, late of Company L, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

KATE M. A. MORTENSEN.

The bill (H. R. 7062) granting a pension to Kate M. A. Mortensen was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Kate M. A. Mortensen, widow of Erick Mortensen, late of Company B, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

NICHOLAS CORRELL.

The bill (H. R. 7473) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Correll was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Nicholas Correll, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

FRANCIS VAN AERNAM.

The bill (H. R. 6746) granting an increase of pension to Francis Van Aernam was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Francis Van Aernam, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

REBECCA C. NEVIN.

The bill (H. R. 6927) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca C. Nevin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Rebecca C. Nevin, widow of David R. B. Nevin, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and captain Company K, One hundred and ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate adjourn. The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 14, 1904, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 13, 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.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE SERVICE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following; which was read:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, April 11, 1904.

SIR: Having recently been appointed on the Committee on Public Lands, I find it impracticable to devote the required time to the work before the Committee on Claims, of which I am also a member. I therefore respectfully resign from the said Committee on Claims.

Very respectfully,

JOHN LIND, M. C.

Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Representative from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] will be relieved from further service on the Committee on Claims. The Chair hears no objection.

The Chair announces the appointment of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. EMERICH, to fill the vacancy on the Committee on Claims.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. R. 8. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to negotiate with John T. Dolan, of Portland, Oreg., for purchase of original manuscript copy of "Order Book of Gen. Arthur St. Clair."

S. 3944. An act for the relief of G. F. Tarbell;

S. 2547. An act for the relief of the owners, master, and crew of the schooner *Ella M. Doughty*; and

S. 2515. An act to extend the United States pension laws to the participants in the battles of New Ulm and Fort Ridgely, Minn., in the Sioux war of 1862.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 14750. An act authorizing the county of Itasca, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a wagon and foot bridge over the Mississippi River, in section 22, township 55 north, range 27 west of the fourth principal meridian:

H. R. 12687. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the opening of certain abandoned military reservations, and for other purposes," approved August 23, 1894; and

H. R. 12685. An act for the reappraisal and sale of the undisposed lands within the Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation, in the State of Washington.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore had appointed Mr. MARTIN one of the conferees on the bill (H. R. 12220) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes, in place of Mr. TILLMAN, excused.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13350) conferring jurisdiction upon United States commissioners over offenses committed in a portion of the permanent Hot Springs Mountain Reservation, Ark.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 13521. An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1974) amending the act of Congress approved January 26, 1895, entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to correct errors where double allotments of land have erroneously been made to an Indian, to correct errors in patents, and for other purposes."

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report the bill (H. R. 15054) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The bill was twice read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to reserve all points of order on this bill, and further to present the views of the minority of the committee, which I ask may be printed with those of the majorities.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] reserves all points of order on this bill, and also present.

the views of the minority of the committee, to be printed with those of the majority.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I desire to give notice that if possible this bill will be called up to-morrow, immediately after reading the Journal.

Mr. MADDOX. I demand the regular order.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT OF PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. DALZELL. I am directed by the Committee on Rules to present a privileged report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution of the House No. 319, have had the same under consideration, and ask leave to report the same with amendments and the recommendation that the House do agree to it as amended:

"Resolved, That immediately after the adoption of this resolution the bill (H. R. 14823) to amend an act approved July 1, 1902, entitled 'An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes,' and to amend an act approved March 8, 1902, entitled 'An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes,' and to amend an act approved March 2, 1903, entitled 'An act to establish a standard of value and to provide for a coinage system in the Philippine Islands,' and to provide for the more efficient administration of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, shall be taken up for consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole, and general debate may be had on said bill until 1 o'clock p. m. on Thursday, the 14th instant, at which hour, or earlier if said general debate shall cease earlier, a vote shall at once be taken upon pending committee amendments and on the bill to its final passage without intervening motion or appeal."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the previous question on the adoption of this resolution.

The SPEAKER (having put the question on ordering the previous question). The yeas seem to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I call for a division.

The question being again taken, there were—yeas 142, noes 113.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think we had better have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 133, nays 114, answered "present" 11, not voting 123, as follows:

YEAS—133.

Adams, Pa.	Davidson,	Hull,	Parker,
Adams, Wis.	Davis, Minn.	Humphrey, Wash.	Payne,
Alexander,	Dayton,	Jackson, Md.	Porter,
Babcock,	Deemer,	Jackson, Ohio	Powers, Mass.
Bartholdt,	Dixon,	Jenkins,	Reeder,
Bates,	Douglas,	Jones, Wash.	Scott,
Bede,	Dunwell,	Kennedy,	Sherman,
Bingham,	Dwight,	Ketcham,	Sibley,
Birdsall,	Esch,	Kyle,	Slemp,
Bishop,	Evans,	Knapp,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bonyne,	Fordney,	Lacey,	Smith, Pa.
Boutell,	Foss,	Landis, Frederick	Snapp,
Bowersock,	Foster, Vt.	Lanning,	Spalding,
Brandegee,	French,	Lawrence,	Stafford,
Brief,	Gaines, W. Va.	Lilley,	Steenerson,
Brooks,	Gardner, Mass.	Littauer,	Sterling,
Brown, Wis.	Gardner, N. J.	Longworth,	Stevens, Minn.
Brownlow,	Gibson,	Loud,	Sulloway,
Buckman,	Gillett, Cal.	Lovering,	Tawney,
Burkett,	Gillett, Mass.	McCreary, Pa.	Thomas, Iowa
Burleigh,	Goebel,	McLachlan,	Tirrell,
Butler, Pa.	Graff,	McMorran,	Townsend,
Calderhead,	Greene,	Mahon,	Van Voorhis,
Capron,	Hamilton,	Mann,	Volstead,
Castor,	Haskins,	Marsh,	Wanger,
Cooper, Pa.	Hemenway,	Marshall,	Warnock,
Cooper, Wis.	Henry, Conn.	Martin,	Weems,
Cromer,	Hepburn,	Miller,	Wiley, N. J.
Crumpacker,	Hill, Conn.	Moon, Pa.	Wilson, Ill.
Currier,	Hinshaw,	Morgan,	Wright,
Curtis,	Hitt,	Murdock,	Young.
Cushman,	Hogg,	Nedham,	
Dalzell,	Howell, N. J.	Otis,	
Daniels,	Huff,	Overstreet,	

NAYS—114.

Adamson,	Garner,	Lindsay,	Russell,
Bartlett,	Gillespie,	Little,	Ryan,
Bassett,	Goulden,	Livernash,	Scarborough,
Beall, Tex.	Granger,	Livingston,	Shackleford,
Benny,	Gregg,	Lucking,	Sheppard,
Benton,	Griffith,	McLain,	Sherley,
Bowers,	Gudger,	McNary,	Shull,
Brantley,	Hamlin,	Macon,	Sims,
Breazale,	Harrison,	Maddox,	Slayden,
Burgess,	Hay,	Maynard,	Smith, Ky.
Burleson,	Henry, Tex.	Meyer, La.	Smith, Tex.
Byrd,	Hitchcock,	Moon, Tenn.	Snook,
Candler,	Hopkins,	Padgett,	Stanley,
Cassingham,	Houston,	Patterson, N. C.	Stephens, Tex.
Clark,	Hughes, N. J.	Patterson, Tenn.	Sullivan, Mass.
Cochran, Mo.	Humphreys, Miss.	Pierce,	Sulzer,
Cockran, N. Y.	Hunt,	Pou,	Swanson,
Cowherd,	Johnson,	Pujo,	Thayer,
Davey, La.	Jones, Va.	Rainey,	Underwood,
De Armond,	Kehoe,	Randell, Tex.	Van Duzer,
Denny,	Keliber,	Ransdell, La.	Wade,
Dinsmore,	Kitchin, Claude	Reid,	Wallace,
Emerich,	Klutz,	Rider,	Webb,
Field,	Lamar, Fla.	Rixey,	Williams, Ill.
Finley,	Lamar, Mo.	Robertson, La.	Williams, Miss.
Fitzgerald,	Legare,	Robinson, Ark.	Wilson, N. Y.
Flood,	Lever,	Robinson, Ind.	Wynn.
Foster, Ill.	Lewis,	Rucker,	
Garber,	Lind,	Ruppert,	

	ANSWERED "PRESENT"—11.		
Brundidge,	Kline,	McCleary, Minn.	Talbot,
Gardner, Mich.	Landis, Chas. B.	Small,	Zenor.
Gilbert,	Lloyd,	Smith, Iowa	
	NOT VOTING—123.		
Acheson,	Draper,	Lamb,	Robb,
Aiken,	Dresser,	Lester,	Roberts,
Allen,	Driscoll,	Littlefield,	Rodenberg,
Ames,	Fitzpatrick,	Lorimer,	Scudder,
Badger,	Flack,	Loudenslager,	Shiras,
Baker,	Fowler,	McAndrews,	Shober,
Bankhead,	Fuller,	McCall,	Smith, Ill.
Beidler,	Gaines, Tenn.	McCarthy,	Smith, N. Y.
Bell, Cal.	Gillet, N. Y.	McDermott,	Smith, Samuel W.
Bowie,	Glass,	Mahoney,	Southall,
Bradley,	Goldfogle,	Metcalf,	Southard,
Broussard,	Gooch,	Miers, Ind.	Southwick,
Brown, Pa.	Griggs,	Minor,	Sparkman,
Burke,	Grosvenor,	Mondell,	Sperry,
Burnett,	Hardwick,	Morrell,	Spight,
Burton,	Haugen,	Mudd,	Sullivan, N. Y.
Butler, Mo.	Hearst,	Nevin,	Tate,
Caldwell,	Hedge,	Norris,	Taylor,
Campbell,	Hermann,	Olmsted,	Thomas, N. C.
Cassel,	Hildebrant,	Otjen,	Trimble,
Clayton,	Hill, Miss.	Page,	Vandiver,
Connell,	Holliday,	Palmer,	Vreeland,
Conner,	Howard,	Patterson, Pa.	Wachter,
Cooper, Tex.	Howell, Utah	Pearre,	Wadsworth,
Cousins,	Hughes, W. Va.	Perkins,	Warner,
Crowley,	Hunter,	Pinckney,	Watson,
Darragh,	James,	Powers, Me.	Weisse,
Davis, Fla.	Kinkaid,	Prince,	Wiley, Ala.
Dickerman,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Rhea,	Williamson,
Dougherty,	Knopf,	Richardson, Ala.	Woodyard.
Dovener,	Lafean,	Richardson, Tenn.	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. CASSEL with Mr. GOOCH.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS with Mr. TATE.

Mr. HUNTER with Mr. RHEA.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania with Mr. DICKERMAN.

Mr. DAYTON with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.

Until further notice:

Mr. FULLER with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. SPERRY with Mr. ROBB.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. SOUTHALL.

Mr. DOVENER with Mr. TRIMBLE. (Except river and harbor.)

Mr. HEDGE with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. ZENOR.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama.

Mr. METCALF with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. TALBOTT.

Mr. KNOPF with Mr. WEISSE.

Mr. LORIMER with Mr. MAHONEY.

Mr. HOLLIDAY with Mr. MIERS of Indiana.

Mr. GROSVENOR with Mr. LESTER.

For balance of week:

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. HARDWICK with Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

Mr. POWERS of Maine with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.

Until April 21:

Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. THAYER.

Until Thursday:

Mr. CONNELL with Mr. KLINE.

Mr. PERKINS with Mr. LLOYD.

Until Friday a. m.:

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia with Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina.

On this vote:

Mr. CAMPBELL with Mr. WILEY of Alabama.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. BUTLER of Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. SCUDDER.

For this day:

Mr. ACHESON with Mr. JAMES.

Mr. FLACK with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. AMES with Mr. AIKEN.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. BADGER.

Mr. BURTON with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. DRAPER with Mr. BELL of California.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. BAKER.

Mr. HILDEBRANT with Mr. BURNETT.

Mr. LAFEAN with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. MINOR with Mr. COOPER of Texas.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. CROWLEY.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. CLAYTON.

Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee.

Mr. HERMANN with Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

Mr. NORRIS with Mr. DOUGHERTY.

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. GLASS.

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. HEARST.

Mr. PRINCE with Mr. HILL of Mississippi.
 Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. SULLIVAN of New York.
 Mr. CONNER with Mr. SPARKMAN.
 Mr. MCCALL with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.
 Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH with Mr. BOWIE.
 Mr. DARRAGH with Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota with Mr. GILBERT.
 Mr. COUSINS with Mr. VANDIVER.
 Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. LAMB.
 Mr. SHIRAS with Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. SHOBER.
 Mr. WARNER with Mr. PAGE.
 Mr. WILLIAMSON with Mr. SPIGHT.
 Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. PINCKNEY.
 Mr. WILEY of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I just came from the Committee on Pensions as my name was called. I ask permission to vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, under the rule, can not admit the request.

Mr. WILEY of Alabama. I was detained.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the bill referred to in the pending resolution is a bill reported by the Committee on Insular Affairs, and relates to the amendment of several sundry acts heretofore passed relative to the civil government in the Philippine Islands. I shall not stop to discuss the merits of the bill at all, nor to more than point out the operation of this rule. If the rule be adopted, the House will enter at once upon the consideration of the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole, and continue general debate until 1 o'clock to-morrow, at which time a vote is to be taken without any intervening motion upon the bill and upon the amendments proposed by the committee. Having said this much, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill. This rule cuts off all power of amendment by the House, whether it be an amendment to be offered by a gentleman on this side or an amendment to be offered by a gentleman on that side of the Chamber. This is one of the many successive indications of the fact that the Speaker and the Committee on Rules (Republicans) are afraid of the Republican Members of this House when it comes to matters of legislation—afraid to give them a free hand.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield nine minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND]. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is perhaps a sample of what we may have repeated frequently before this session closes. It is indicative of the ideas of those who control legislation as to how necessary it is to "rehabilitate" the House. The Speaker informed the country in the close of the last session, correctly and truthfully, that the House had been losing in power and influence, as compared with the other constituent bodies making up our complex Government. This is one of the means of restoring the House, so far as it is possible for one small measure to do, to something of its pristine glory, and clothe it again with something of its lost power! It is done by providing that the House shall forego what has heretofore been regarded as an inherent right of each Member, and of the body collectively, to offer and consider amendments to pending propositions.

The House shall grow in importance and commend itself to the country by adopting a rule which deprives it of the right not only of voting upon an amendment, but of offering an amendment! The Speaker of the House and his associates on the Committee on Rules have determined that this bill, with the amendments to be offered by the committee reporting it, is so good that the risk must not be taken of getting into it anything that would be harmful, or that could lessen any of its superb excellence. Not only are Members on this side to be absolutely denied the right to offer amendments, but Members upon the other side, with a rare dash of impartiality, are to be deprived in a like way of the right to offer any amendment. Members of the House, until the time to vote comes, may be excused to attend the races, or to do anything else, or nothing else. They have nothing to do here. No amendments are to be offered. No amendments are to be considered unless "O. K.'ed" by the committee.

Now, that is a strange way to rehabilitate the House! It is a novel suggestion to the country that this body of nearly 400 Members, itself really constituting one of the coordinate branches of this Government, is something more than a formal recording machine, to make known in authentic form the will of the Senate; that it is something more than an instrument for recording the suggestions of the President or the dictation of the Speaker of the House. Upon this side we are powerless to prevent the adoption of such a rule, because we are numerically too weak. Upon the other side you have the power to prevent its adoption; but I suppose it would be a species of party treason to assert any

independence and individually to discharge individual representative duty by voting against it.

It is not a matter, gentlemen, for you to decide whether there ought to be amendments offered or considered. That has been decided for you by the Speaker of the House and his associates on the Committee on Rules. It is not a question for you whether amendments should be offered or amendments should be considered; whether amendments should be adopted or rejected. You are relieved of all duties and all responsibilities and all mental worry and wear and tear in regard to such matters by the kind interposition of the Committee on Rules. That committee has determined that you need not think about it; that you need not frame any amendment; that you need not be put into any anxiety about being called upon to vote upon any amendment.

Just simply look at the blackboard; notice the legend written there; follow the copy; obey the command of your present master, and your duty, according to the conception which now prevails here, shall have been fully performed. The fact that you were sent here by an independent constituency to represent that constituency, to be here free representative Members of this House, that fact is immaterial. The suggestion of it is irrelevant, if not impertinent. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You have been entirely relieved of those duties which your constituents cast upon you, and which you assumed when you took your oath of office; completely absolved from those duties which your constituents cast upon you when they elected and sent you here as a Member of this body; you have ceased to be their representative in reference to this matter, and you are now simply the representative of the Speaker, who has declared to you what ought to be done.

He has said this to you in kindness and benevolence—has thought this out for you: "I have determined what you should do, and to relieve you from any anxiety and prevent the possibility of any disturbance in the calm sea of your tranquil minds I will not give you an opportunity to vote upon anything!"

Nothing shall be suggested, nothing shall be offered or proposed which by any possibility could occasion the least ripple of excitement, the least disturbance as to "plain duty." "Plain duty" is to vote as the Speaker says! "Plain duty" is to make yourselves just as nearly ciphers as you can do, and put a dot in front of the ciphers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, I am somewhat surprised at this. I recall how the Speaker, stirred when he was a Member, and a leading Member, here upon the floor, how when the Senate had held him up and when he felt constrained to yield to the Senate, as before he had yielded often and as later on he will yield often again, when he came with righteous indignation, forgetting for the time being that it was his duty to submit and obey, rebelling for the time being and concluding that a Representative of his district ought to stand up for the powers and rights of a Representative here upon the floor, gave us some very good doctrine; and now we have the fruits of it.

Then he was not in a position where he could make his views control absolutely. Now he is, and here we have them! Here we have the concrete, here we have the result, and the House now will be "elevated." [Applause on the Democratic side.] The country will soon understand that this is a deliberative body—the Speaker deliberates! That it is an acting body—the Speaker acts! [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] That it is a submissive body—the Speaker wishes, and his cohorts upon the other side calmly, peacefully, and cheerfully obey. When will the House be brought back to its pristine glory by that process? I see that the Speaker's gavel is about to fall, indicating that I will not have time to tell when [applause], but it will be a long time. [Loud and continued applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to use any time?

Mr. DALZELL. How much time has the gentleman from Mississippi remaining?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have ten minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. I prefer to close the debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thought perhaps you had two speakers in reserve. If you have, I wish you would put in—

Mr. DALZELL. How much time do you expect to occupy now?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am going to yield ten minutes—the balance of my time—to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DALZELL. You yield your ten minutes and I will take my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Are you going to have two speakers or one? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman is entitled to one conclusion, but not to two.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is one of considerable importance—a bill that is calculated to further develop the American policy of administration in the Philippine Islands. It is a bill that is recommended by those connected with our ad-

ministration, who have devoted to the subject a great amount of time, thought, and investigation.

The bill was carefully investigated and thoroughly wrought out by the members of the Committee on Insular Affairs. It was reported to the House. It is a bill that ought to pass both branches of Congress at this session, and the rule under consideration provides for what seems to me to be ample time for the proper discussion of the measure, in view of its character. It provides that there shall be a vote upon the bill at 1 o'clock to-morrow. The criticism has been made by gentlemen on the other side that the rule does not permit amendments to be offered to the measure. That is true, but when it is considered in the light of the dissenting views of the minority of the committee it is not unusual or unjust. The minority members of the Committee on Insular Affairs submitted their dissent in writing, and they offer no substitute for the bill. They suggest no amendments. They point out no particular wherein the bill ought to be corrected, and, therefore, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the minority side of the House is practically foreclosed upon the question of amendments. They say in the course of their dissenting views:

While opposed to the whole of the bill reported by the committee as one calculated to further bind the United States to an unwise, impolitic, and unpatriotic scheme of colonization, we especially and most earnestly dissent and record our protest against certain features of the bill.

They say it is all bad, but possibly some of its features may be worse than others. Again, the minority views state as follows:

The government which seeks this legislation at the hands of Congress is in no sense representative of the free and untrammelled thought and aspiration of the inhabitants of the islands. It is an American-imposed, force-maintained oligarchy—the blending of a military despotism and a civil autocracy—exercising military and civil powers, and making and administering the laws under which are governed 7,500,000 people. Those who are to bear the additional burdens of taxation to be imposed by these proposed railroad subsidies have not been and are not to be consulted.

The attitude of the minority, Mr. Speaker, in relation to this question is one of opposition to the policy that the Administration adopted some years ago and is attempting to consummate by the pending legislation. The only question involved in the consideration of this bill is the wisdom of the policy of this Government in administering the affairs of the islands. It is not a question of the right to amend, change, or alter, because the Democratic minority of the committee make no such suggestion in their dissenting views. They impliedly say that if the policy that has already been inaugurated is correct, this bill is a proper one to be enacted into law.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to his colleague?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Leaving out the partisan question, what does the gentleman say about section 7 passing without amendment?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I beg my colleague's pardon, but I have so little time that I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. So, Mr. Speaker, the only issue presented by the rule is whether or not the Congress will stand by the policy that has already been inaugurated in the Philippine Islands, and that question can as well be determined under the force of this rule as by the most ample opportunity to alter or amend.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has fourteen minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct attention to the fact, and emphasize it, that this rule not only prevents a proper consideration of a bill of immense importance and one far-reaching in its effects, but that it also cuts off all opportunity to amend it in any particular. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] has paid the minority a compliment by reading extensively from their views. He declares the minority, in the views filed by them, have pointed out no particular in which the bill needs to be amended. He surely does not wish to be so understood. He can not have overlooked, and therefore he should have read, that portion of the minority report which specifically mentions the sections of the bill which are most objectionable and which points out at considerable length and with much particularity their most obnoxious features. The minority declare in their report that the fourth and fifth sections should both be stricken out of the bill and give their reasons therefor at considerable length.

The gentleman also neglects to inform the House that in committee there were separate votes as to striking out each of those sections, and he entirely omits to state to the House, which I shall do—and I trust that I am not disclosing any of the secrets of the committee when I do so—that one of those sections was retained in this bill by a tie vote in the committee, the vote being taken, too, at a time when there were only two of the six Democratic

members of that committee present. A motion was made to strike out the fifth section, a most important, and, in my estimation, one of the most objectionable sections of the bill, and the gentleman knows that it was retained in the bill because there was a tie vote, only two Democrats being present. Therefore, gentlemen on that side of the Chamber will understand that this bill comes before the House with a section of the utmost importance in it, which was only retained there by a vote which showed that less than a majority of the committee favored it. In other words, Mr. Speaker, there are seventeen members of that committee and only four of them voted to retain this section in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels constrained to call the attention of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] to the fact that it is directly in the teeth of the rule for a Member in debate to refer to what has occurred in the committee, as, for instance, to state any vote had there. It seems to the Chair that this rule is a wise one, because its violation must lead to discussion of matters not before the House.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I scarcely need assure the Chair that it was not my intention to violate any rule of the House; and I have not referred to the votes of any individual members of the committee. But the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] has undertaken to criticize the minority of the committee for not having pointed out in their report, as he says, the sections of the bill to which they objected. Although that report states that the minority disapprove the whole scope and purpose of the measure, it further sets forth with particularity and definiteness that the minority is unequivocally and unalterably opposed to the two most important sections of the bill and gives the reasons therefor.

I want to call attention, especially the attention of the Republican Members of this House, to one or two of the provisions of the bill. It not only authorizes the Philippine government to guarantee 5 per cent interest upon capital to be invested in railroads in the Philippine Islands, but it also provides that all material carried into the Philippine Islands to be used in the construction and equipment of railroads therein shall be admitted free of duty. This exemption from customs duty, I will say to my Republican friends, is not confined to material shipped from the United States. It includes that which will, without doubt, be shipped from Australia. It embraces, of course, engines, locomotives, and the steel rails, and other products of the steel trust.

Mr. TAWNEY. In the discretion of the Philippine government.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Yes; in the discretion of the Philippine government. And the 5 per cent guaranty is also in the discretion of the Philippine government. But the gentleman knows as well as I do that when the authority to exercise this discretion is given to the Philippine government there will not be one dollar of American capital invested in those islands unless the Philippine government shall so exercise the discretion thus conferred by Congress by subsidizing the railroads and also by admitting free of duty such articles as I have named. For what other purpose is Congress asked to confer the authority?

If the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs, does not believe the Philippine Commission will exercise the authority for which they ask, and which from his remarks I infer he does not think they should exercise, why is he not willing to vote with the minority to withhold that most dangerous authority and discretion?

In this connection I call attention to the fact that during the last calendar year there was imported into the Philippine Islands more than \$12,000,000 worth of rice, upon every pound of which customs duty was paid, in order to save from actual starvation tens of thousands of the impoverished people of the islands. It is now proposed by the Republican party to admit free of duty the products of the steel trust in order to aid the capitalists of this country, who, it is understood, will build the railroads in the Philippines, and who are to be guaranteed 5 per cent interest upon the capital which they may so invest.

In order to help railroad syndicates you gentlemen propose to admit free of duty into the Philippine Islands the products of the steel trust, whilst you continue to impose a tariff tax upon the millions of pounds of rice which an impoverished, plague-stricken, and starving people, in their dire necessity, are forced to import. [Applause.]

I will further call the attention of the House to the fact that only one year ago Congress appropriated \$3,000,000 for the aid of these starving people. Nearly a million and a half of that money has been expended in buying rice to be distributed to starving Filipinos, and upon every pound of that rice a customs duty was paid. Such of the people of the Philippines as have been required to pay back the cost to the Government of that rice have had added to that cost the customs duties paid by the Government. What excuse can you offer for taxing food purchased by starving people to keep body and soul together and then admitting, for the benefit of railroad syndicates, free of taxation, the products of the steel trust?

I call attention to these facts in order that gentlemen may see how important are some of the sections of this bill, and I wish to express my sincere belief that if an opportunity were given to strike this section out of the bill there would be found few Republicans who would not vote with a solid Democratic minority to strike it out. Yet, Mr. Speaker, neither Republicans nor Democrats, under the operation of this cruel rule, are to be permitted to offer for the consideration of the House any such amendment. The fifth section of the bill to be considered under this rule does not, I firmly believe, command the approval of a single Republican in this House and is earnestly opposed by the solid membership of the Democratic party. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to what has been said on the other side in opposition to the adoption of this rule, but I have not heard any plausible argument made against it. The gentleman from Missouri was entertaining and amusing, as he always is, and was thoroughly appreciated by his friends upon that side of the House, and I have no doubt appreciated on this side also.

Now, what is the situation? The Committee on Insular Affairs, after mature deliberation, has brought into this House a bill that represents the Republican policy with reference to the Philippine Islands. The bill was framed after hearing the testimony of witnesses, and after receiving the suggestions made by the Secretary of War and by the Philippine Commission, the parties most familiar with the subjects to which the bill relates.

Now, complaint is made that the right to offer amendments is cut off from the other side, after gentlemen on the other side have put in print and given notice that they will not have this bill in any shape or form. I read from the last paragraph in the views of the minority:

We are opposed to the theory upon which the bill is framed, opposed to its whole scope and purpose, which is to tax the people of the Philippine Islands without their consent and to superimpose upon them the burdens of large bonded indebtedness and guaranties for profits of private enterprise, all of which are repugnant to our ideas of right and fair dealing, as well as inimical to the best interests of the Philippine people and subversive of the first and plainest principles of government.

We have, then, a bill satisfactory to this side of the House, and a bill that in no instance, amended or unamended, will meet the views of the other side of the House. Why not, in these the expiring hours of this session, put the bill through in accordance with the will of the majority? That is all that the bill proposes to do.

I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi demanded a division.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 142, noes 129.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me that we had better have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 137, nays 113, answered "present" 8, not voting 123, as follows:

YEAS—137.

Adams, Wis.	Dayton,	Jackson, Md.	Payne,
Alexander,	Deemer,	Jackson, Ohio	Porter,
Ames,	Dixon,	Jones, Wash.	Powers, Mass.
Babcock,	Douglas,	Kenedy,	Prince,
Bartholdt,	Dunwell,	Ketcham,	Scott,
Bates,	Dwight,	Kinkaid,	Sherman,
Bede,	Esch,	Knapp,	Sibley,
Bingham,	Evans,	Kyle,	Slemp,
Birdsall,	Fordney,	Lacey,	Smith, N. Y.
Bonyng,	Foss,	Landis, Frederick	Smith, Pa.
Boutell,	Foster, Vt.	Lanning,	Snapp,
Bowersock,	French,	Lilley,	Southard,
Brandege,	Gaines, W. Va.	Littauer,	Spalding,
Brick,	Gardner, N. J.	Longworth,	Steenerson,
Brooks,	Gibson,	Loud,	Sterling,
Brown, Pa.	Gillett, Cal.	Lovering,	Stevens, Minn.
Brownlow,	Gillett, Mass.	McCreary, Pa.	Sulloway,
Buckman,	Goebel,	McLachlan,	Tawney,
Burke,	Graff,	McMorran,	Thomas, Iowa.
Burkett,	Greene,	Mahon,	Tirrell,
Butler, Pa.	Hamilton,	Mann,	Townsend,
Campbell,	Haskins,	Marsh,	Van Voorhis,
Capron,	Haugen,	Marshall,	Volstead,
Castor,	Hemenway,	Martin,	Vreeland,
Cooper, Pa.	Henry, Conn.	Miller,	Wanger,
Cooper, Wis.	Hepburn,	Minor,	Warnock,
Cromer,	Hermann,	Mondell,	Weems,
Crumpacker,	Hill, Conn.	Moon, Pa.	Wiley, N. J.
Currier,	Hinshaw,	Morgan,	Williamson,
Curtis,	Hitt,	Murdock,	Wilson, Ill.
Cushman,	Hogg,	Needham,	Wright,
Dalzell,	Howell, N. J.	Otis,	Young.
Daniels,	Huff,	Otjen,	
Davidson,	Hull,	Overstreet,	
Davis, Minn.	Humphrey, Wash.	Parker,	

NAYS—113.

Adamson,	Flood,	Legare,	Scarborough,
Badger,	Gaines, Tenn.	Lever,	Shackleford,
Baker,	Garber,	Lewis,	Sheppard,
Bartlett,	Garner,	Lind,	Sherley,
Bassett,	Gillespie,	Lindsay,	Shober,
Beall, Tex.	Glass,	Little,	Shull,
Benny,	Goldfogle,	Livingston,	Sims,
Benton,	Goulden,	Lucking,	Slayden,
Bowers,	Granger,	McNary,	Smith, Ky.
Brantley,	Gregg,	Macon,	Smith, Tex.
Breazeale,	Gudger,	Maynard,	Snook,
Burgess,	Hamlin,	Meyer, La.	Southall,
Burleson,	Harrison,	Moon, Tenn.	Stanley,
Byrd,	Hay,	Padgett,	Stephens, Tex.
Caldwell,	Henry, Tex.	Patterson, N. C.	Sullivan, Mass.
Candler,	Hitchcock,	Pierce,	Sulzer,
Cassingham,	Hopkins,	Pou,	Swanson,
Clark,	Houston,	Pujo,	Underwood,
Cochran, Mo.	Hughes, N. J.	Rainey,	Van Duzer,
Cockran, N. Y.	Humphreys, Miss.	Randell, Tex.	Wade,
Cowherd,	James,	Reid,	Wallace,
Davey, La.	Johnson,	Rider,	Webb,
De Armond,	Jones, Va.	Rixey,	Wiley, Ala.
Denny,	Kehoe,	Robinson, Ark.	Williams, Ill.
Dinsmore,	Kelher,	Robinson, Ind.	Williams, Miss.
Emerich,	Kitchin, Claude	Rucker,	Wynn.
Field,	Kluttz,	Ruppert,	
Finley,	Lamar, Fla.	Russell,	
Fitzgerald,	Lamar, Mo.	Ryan,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Gardner, Mich.	Kline,	Loudenslager,	Thayer,
Howard,	Landis, Chas. B.	Small,	Zenor.

NOT VOTING—123.

Acheson,	Dresser,	Littlefield,	Richardson, Tenn.
Adams, Pa.	Driscoll,	Livernash,	Robb,
Aiken,	Fitzpatrick,	Lloyd,	Roberts,
Allen,	Flack,	Lorimer,	Robertson, La.
Bankhead,	Foster, Ill.	McAndrews,	Rodenberg,
Beidler,	Fowler,	McCall,	Scudder,
Bell, Cal.	Fuller,	McCarthy,	Shiras,
Bishop,	Gardner, Mass.	McCleary, Minn.	Smith, Ill.
Bowie,	Gilbert,	McDermott,	Smith, Iowa
Bradley,	Gillet, N. Y.	McLain,	Smith, Samuel W.
Broussard,	Gooch,	Maddox,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Brown, Wis.	Griffith,	Mahoney,	Southwick,
Brundidge,	Griggs,	Metcalfe,	Sparkman,
Burleigh,	Grosvenor,	Miers, Ind.	Sperry,
Burnett,	Hardwick,	Morrell,	Spight,
Burton,	Hearst,	Mudd,	Stafford,
Butler, Mo.	Hedge,	Nevin,	Sullivan, N. Y.
Calderhead,	Hildebrandt,	Norris,	Talbot,
Cassel,	Hill, Miss.	Olmsted,	Tate,
Clayton,	Holliday,	Page,	Taylor,
Connell,	Howell, Utah.	Palmer,	Thomas, N. C.
Conner,	Hughes, W. Va.	Patterson, Pa.	Trimble,
Cooper, Tex.	Hunt,	Patterson, Tenn.	Vandiver,
Cousins,	Hunter,	Pearre,	Wachter,
Crowley,	Jenkins,	Perkins,	Wadsworth,
Darragh,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Pinckney,	Warner,
Davis, Fla.	Knopf,	Powers, Me.	Watson,
Dickerman,	Lafean,	Ransdell, La.	Weisse,
Dougherty,	Lamb,	Reeder,	Wilson, N. Y.
Dovener,	Lawrence,	Rhea,	Woodyard.
Draper,	Lester,	Richardson, Ala.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. HUNT, from April 13 to April 25.

For the day:

Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania with Mr. LIVERNASH.

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts with Mr. MCLAIN.

Mr. FLACK with Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana.

On this vote:

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. MADDOX.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. SCUDDER.

Mr. GILLET of New York with Mr. GRIFFITH.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that there ought to be some agreement as to the control of the time. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] be allowed to control the time for the minority and that I have control upon this side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the time shall be controlled respectively by himself and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES], the time to be equally divided. Is there objection?

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is there on a side?

The SPEAKER. It is impossible to tell. The Chair can not tell what time the House will adjourn.

Mr. SULZER. When do we take a vote on it?

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, at 1 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

[Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that a majority, or even a considerable portion, of the membership of

this House realizes the importance of this measure. The bill covers more than twenty pages and relates to subjects of vital interest to 9,000,000 people, to say nothing of the American interests directly and indirectly involved. I had hoped that when the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, addressed the House he would have devoted at least a part of his speech to a discussion of the provisions of this most important measure.

Let me say just here that nothing has been said as to the ability and character of the Secretary of War, who for four years was the civil governor of the Philippine Islands, that I do not most heartily indorse, and yet I trust I shall be pardoned if I express the opinion that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] would have contributed more toward the information of the House if he had taken up less time in eulogizing the Secretary of War and devoted more to answering the objections set forth in the views of the minority. I feel sure that many Members on that side of the Chamber regret, as I do, that he did not devote some time to a careful analysis and explanation of the provisions of this bill. The gentleman admitted just before concluding his remarks that the section relating to the guaranty by the Philippine Government of interest upon capital invested in railroads in the islands was the most important feature of the bill, and yet he devoted, I think, less than two minutes to its consideration.

In view of this, may I not indulge the hope that Members will read the bill for themselves, and also that they will read the printed views of the minority? The rule under which the House is operating does not afford me the time in which to explain many of its provisions. It is impossible in a brief time to discuss thoroughly even a few of them. Although the rule denies to the minority the opportunity to offer amendments to the bill, and unreasonably and unjustly limits debate, it does not, I am thankful to say, expressly provide that no member of the majority shall read the minority views, and I hope, therefore, they will at least avail themselves of this opportunity to acquire that knowledge of this measure which it would seem to be the studied purpose of those in charge of it not to afford them. The failure of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] to explain the provisions of his bill can be accounted for in only one other way, and that is that he can not do so.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I have followed his advice and have looked at the views of both the minority and majority—

Mr. JONES of Virginia. And I hope the gentleman will do in this instance as he says he has done in the past.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. And I find a very important change in this bill from the suggestion made on both sides of the House a couple of years ago, that you have changed your silver certificates, the largest denomination, from 10 pesos, \$5. to 500 pesos, \$250, and I fail to find any reason given in either report for making that change, and—

Mr. JONES of Virginia. There is no reason attempted in the minority report.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I suppose there was some reason why it was done.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I think it was done because the Secretary of War and the Philippine Commission recommended it.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Well, why?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Just why they recommended it I shall not undertake to explain. Nor do I think I ought to be expected to give the reasons which influenced the Secretary of War in making this recommendation. I might be tempted to offer a theory of my own if I had more than sufficient time in which to set forth my objections to what I regard as the more important sections of the bill.

Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee. Let me suggest to my colleagues that we are in favor of giving them our coinage.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Is it not an argument in favor of American currency, which the gentleman from Virginia and I advocated two years ago?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I think it is an admission that the gentleman from Connecticut and myself were right two years ago.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] stated that this bill has the support of the Secretary of War and of the Philippine Commission, and he laid much stress upon the fact that one of the members of the commission is a Democrat. The Philippine Commission is composed of five American citizens and three Filipinos, and according to the chairman of the Insular Affairs Committee this bill has the undivided support and indorsement of five American citizens, three Filipinos, and the Secretary of War. Four Republicans, one Democrat, and three Filipinos are therefore all that are behind this momentous measure. So far as I know to the contrary, and so far as we have been informed, there is not another human being who favors this bill, if we except, of course, the railroad syndicates which are to receive the interest

guaranty upon the capital which they are expected to invest in these subsidized railroads.

The hearings before the Insular Affairs Committee were begun, I think, on the 10th of February last and continued up to the very last day of March, and during all that time the Secretary of War, who until recently was the civil governor of the Philippines, was the only person heard in favor of this legislation. No one was heard in opposition. No representative of the Philippine people has ever been given an opportunity to be heard as to a single proposition of this bill. It has the support, as we have been told, of four Republicans, one Democrat, and three Filipinos.

How many of the millions who inhabit the Philippine Islands and who must contribute the taxes to pay the railroad subsidies provided for in this bill have been consulted we do not know. If there is any Filipino who favors mortgaging the islands for the benefit of the railroad syndicates of the United States, I am not aware of it. I except, of course, the three who are members of the commission. Under legislation enacted by the last Congress the Philippine government has issued and sold certificates of indebtedness to the amount of \$6,000,000. That government was authorized to issue certificates to the amount of \$10,000,000, in order to secure a gold fund with which to maintain its new currency at a parity with gold, and of that amount, as I have said, six million has been issued.

The same act of Congress authorized the Philippine Commission to issue and dispose of bonds to the amount of \$7,000,000 for the purpose of buying the friar lands. Those bonds, every dollar of them, have been issued and sold, and the lands have been acquired. By that same act the city of Manila was authorized to incur a bonded indebtedness of \$4,000,000. That obligation has also been incurred, making a total of \$21,000,000.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Those bonds have not been issued, and Secretary Taft says—

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Oh, that is all right. I will explain that. The gentleman need not get up.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But I am up.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Congressional authority is given to sell bonds of the city of Manila to the amount of \$4,000,000, and Secretary Taft stated before the committee that, although the bonds had not been actually sold, the indebtedness which they are to be sold to meet had been incurred and it was absolutely necessary that they should be issued and sold. So I am entirely justified in considering this as an indebtedness of \$4,000,000. Authority is given the Philippine Commission to sell these bonds. The indebtedness has been incurred and the bonds must and will be sold. The credit and faith of the city has been pledged, and, as Secretary Taft very frankly said, we might consider the transaction as having taken place. Congress, then, has heretofore authorized the Philippine government to incur a public indebtedness of \$10,000,000 to maintain its silver currency at a parity with gold and seven million with which to purchase the friar lands. It has also authorized the city of Manila to incur a debt of \$4,000,000, in all, the sum of \$21,000,000.

Aside from the two sections which I regard as particularly objectionable and which I shall presently discuss, there is another section of this bill, section 2, which authorizes the Philippine Commission to sell \$5,000,000 worth of bonds in order to obtain money with which to provide for certain internal improvements. So that, aside from the indebtedness which it is proposed the islands shall assume on account of railroad construction, if this bill is passed there will be a total indebtedness of \$36,000,000, including that of the city of Manila. A recent assessment shows that the taxable values of the city of Manila do not exceed \$45,000,000, and yet, as I have shown, it has, under the authority of Congress, incurred an indebtedness of \$4,000,000, nearly 10 per cent of all the taxable values of the city.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will ask the gentleman if he does not understand that personal property is not assessed for taxation in Manila?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I do understand that personal property is not taxed in the Philippine Islands. The taxable values there are the real estate values. I understand that perfectly, and nothing I have said could be construed to the contrary.

Personal property is not taxed; and I do not know of any proposition to tax personal property in the Philippine Islands. Indeed, I imagine such a tax would not yield a great deal.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying when interrupted that the bonded indebtedness of the city of Manila amounts practically to 10 per cent of its total taxable values. What is the policy of the United States with reference to the Territories? For years it has been

the well-established policy of Congress that the legislature of no Territory shall authorize any municipality to incur an indebtedness exceeding 4 per cent of its taxable values. Territorial legislatures are forbidden to authorize a municipal debt in excess of 4 per cent of the taxable values of the municipality; and yet, under legislation heretofore enacted by Congress, the city of Manila has incurred an indebtedness equal to about 10 per cent of its whole taxable values.

I now come to what I regard as the most indefensible section of this bill.

The fourth section authorizes the Philippine Commission, for the purpose of aiding in the construction and equipment of railroads, to guarantee an income of as much as 5 per cent upon the capital invested in the construction and equipment of such roads, only limiting the annual liability of the Government on this account to the sum of \$1,500,000.

One million five hundred thousand dollars is the interest upon \$30,000,000 at 5 per cent; or, in other words, a 5 per cent income of \$1,500,000, if capitalized, would be \$30,000,000.

If, therefore, this bill becomes a law, the public indebtedness of the Philippine Islands, including that of the city of Manila, instead of being \$21,000,000, as it now is, will be \$56,000,000 if we capitalize the annual interest to be paid upon the money invested in railroads.

But is it necessary, in order to secure the capital with which to construct railroads in the Philippines, that the Government shall guarantee an income of 5 per cent upon that capital? Admitting that railroads would contribute immensely toward the prosperity and civilization of the islands, is it a fact that they will not be built unless those who furnish the money with which to build them are guaranteed a 5 per cent income upon their investment? But before entering upon the discussion of this proposition I wish to direct attention to the fact that the people of the Philippine Islands are even less able at this time to incur an additional public indebtedness than they were a year ago.

The customs duties of the islands, which constitute much the larger part of all the public revenues, were less last year than they were the year previous. For the year 1903 they were \$8,587,535, whilst for the year 1902 they were \$8,921,739. The annual revenues of the Government from all other sources do not exceed \$5,000,000, and in all probability are not now more than \$4,000,000. The total value of all the trade and commerce between the United States and the Philippine Archipelago for the year 1903, exclusive of gold and silver coin and United States Government supplies, was less than \$17,000,000. Of that amount \$3,837,100 represented the value of all American products imported into the Philippines, less by some \$300,000 than the amount shipped to the islands from the United States in 1902.

Think of it! The total value of the commerce between this country and the Philippine Islands amounted to less than \$17,000,000 last year, and our total shipments to the islands were worth less than \$4,000,000.

It may be remarked, too, that of the commodities going to make up the something less than four millions in value of imports into the islands from the United States, that which was third in rank, or third in value, was beer in bottles. Taken together, the beer and distilled spirits shipped from the United States into the Philippine Islands last year exceeded in value every other important item of trade save that alone of wheat flour.

So that gentlemen will observe that the Philippine Islands have proven but a poor market for the products of America. They will also note that the revenues of the Philippine government are falling off rather than increasing, thus lessening its ability to meet obligations already incurred.

Last year the expenditures of the Philippine government exceeded the total revenues of the islands. Shall we, under these circumstances, give to the Philippine Commission the authority and power to fasten upon the Philippine people for the period of thirty years a debt of a million and a half dollars a year in order to guarantee against loss American capitalists who would exploit the islands for their own advantage?

Conditions in the Philippines have perhaps never been worse than they are to-day. The crop failures throughout the islands have been unprecedented, resulting in a shortage of food supplies which has been most distressing. Rinderpest, drought, and locusts have combined to reduce the inhabitants of the islands almost to a condition of starvation, and we are officially informed in a report from the Secretary of War that at least a hundred thousand Filipinos have succumbed to the ravages of the cholera, to say nothing of the deaths resulting from the plague and other diseases.

Members will remember that only one short year ago the Congress of the United States was called upon to appropriate \$3,000,000 to be expended in the purchase and distribution of farm implements, farm animals, supplies, and the necessities of life to the people of the Philippines. Of that sum, the Philippine Commission has had to take \$1,448,000, in round numbers, with

which to purchase rice for distribution to the starving poor of the islands.

Rice is the principal food product of the Philippines; but so widespread and so universal has been the failure of that crop that last year rice to the value of \$12,552,882 was imported, most of it from China and the French East Indies, and more than two-thirds as much was imported the year previous.

Thus it appears that by far the larger part of all the importations into the Philippine Islands during the last twelve months, and even during the last two years, has been the rice with which to relieve the necessities of an impoverished and starving people. And yet the Congress of the United States is told that the only way to bring about prosperity in the Philippines is to guarantee interest upon capital to be invested in railroads there.

This brings me to the question as to whether or not it is possible to build other than subsidized railroads in the Philippines.

The Secretary of War expressed the opinion, when testifying recently before the Insular Affairs Committee, that American capital could not be induced to go into the Philippines and build the railroads needed there unless guaranteed 5 per cent interest on the capital invested. As bearing upon this statement permit me to call attention to another, made by Secretary Taft about two years ago—a statement which shows that the Secretary of War entertains now a very different opinion from that held by him at that time.

On the 27th day of February, 1902, Secretary Taft, who was then civil governor of the Philippine Islands, made a statement before the Insular Affairs Committee upon this very subject. At that time, I will say by way of explanation, he was urging Congress to pass the Philippine civil government measure which became a law on the 1st day of July, 1902, an act which conferred upon the Philippine Commission the right to grant franchises in the islands.

He was then urging the committee to report a bill which would empower the commission of which he was the head to grant franchises to build railroads in the Philippine Islands. I hold in my hand a copy of his statement. This is what he said:

There is great pressure, both from American capitalists who desire to build and from the people of the island who desire to build. I think I have already spoken of a Filipino company, not now formed, because there is no authority to form it, who desire to build a road from Lucina to Tayabas, with a view of going over the mountains and finally coming up to Manila. So it is in Cebu and in Negros. There is a proposition now to build a railroad along this valley where the rich sugar plantations are to a very good part in the northern part of the island.

Two years ago Civil Governor Taft believed that if Congress would confer upon his commission the authority to grant railroad franchises the money—both American and Filipino—would be promptly forthcoming. Capitalists were then pressing for franchises and not asking for subsidies.

I also hold in my hand the last report of the Philippine Commission, and I desire to call the attention of the House especially to what the commission say upon this subject. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] told us that the Philippine Commission approved this bill and favored the granting of subsidies to railroad syndicates. Let me read for the benefit of Members, especially those on the other side of the Chamber, these lines from this report:

The commission is strongly desirous of encouraging American capital to come here, but it should be noted that if American capital declines to come, English, Belgian, and other foreign capital is merely awaiting the franchises which are requested for railroad and other constructive enterprises, and that it will be the duty of the commission to grant such franchises for the benefit of the islands. The owners of English capital already invested in the Manila and Dagupan Railway have accepted two franchises granted for the construction and operation of branches for that railway, and are very anxious to secure other franchises extending their railway in other directions.

This is contained in the very last report of the Philippine Commission, a report brought down to last December and an official document, the statements of which should be binding upon the Philippine Commission and Secretary Taft, who was, when it was written, the civil governor of the islands.

The report says—and I want to emphasize it—that unless American capitalists come forward at once and build these railroads, English and Belgian capitalists, who are waiting and anxious to build them, will be permitted to do so. The commission will be forced to grant franchises to foreign capitalists if American capitalists neglect to take advantage of such golden opportunities.

Can it be possible that Governor Taft and the commission were mistaken in believing that English and Belgian capital was only awaiting the consent of the commission to build railroads in the Philippines? If not, what has caused them to change their opinion? Somebody surely ought to inform the House as to this. If English capital will build these railroads without Government aid, it would be a crime against the Philippine people to make them guarantee the interest upon American capital employed in a like purpose.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Virginia permit a question?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I will permit a question; certainly. Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In view of the fact that you now say that capital is so anxious to go into the islands to build railroads, will you please explain paragraphs 2 and 3 of the minority report, wherein you say:

Second. That it has been impossible to attract private capital to the islands to engage in railroad construction, and the fact has been demonstrated that capital will not go there, finding other fields more inviting and conditions for investment more favorable.

Third. It is the last and desperate resort to vindicate the predictions and promises made by the Republican party that capital would be attracted to the Philippine Islands and that an era of railroad construction and improvement would set in, and that the development of the islands would be rapid, resulting in benefit to the people and advantage to the home Government.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How do you explain that statement?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I explain it in this way, Mr. Speaker. That statement was based upon the recent testimony of the Secretary of War. It was based, as we had a right to base it, upon the testimony given by Secretary Taft before the Insular Affairs Committee. We assumed the facts to be as Secretary Taft stated them. I am not now contending that he did not correctly state them. I am merely showing that he expressed a different opinion only a few months ago. It is for the gentleman from Wisconsin to reconcile the two statements.

This bill confers authority upon the Philippine Commission to grant railroad subsidies. This is, of course, upon the theory that the railroads will not be built unless the subsidies are granted. What is said upon this subject in the views of the minority is based upon this assumption. If, however, Secretary Taft was right in saying as he did in his report of December last that English and Belgian capitalists would build the Philippine railroads without Government aid, it unquestionably is legitimate for those who oppose this measure to argue therefrom that Government aid is not an absolute prerequisite. But whatever may be the attitude of capitalists upon this question, we are unalterably opposed to taxing the Philippine people to build railroads.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman—

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Wait a minute. But this measure is not really the bill of the committee; it is the bill of the War Department, sent to the committee to be by it reported to the House. The testimony before the committee shows this to be the case; but—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Wait one moment. The railroad sections of this bill are framed upon the theory that capital unaided will not build railroads in the Philippines. That is the view now entertained by Secretary Taft and the view accepted by the majority of the Insular Affairs Committee. I do not say it is not the correct view. I only wish the House to understand that very recently the Secretary of War expressed a very different view, and I think that this should be made clear to the House.

It is entirely proper, I take it, for the minority to argue from either of two statements emanating from the same high authority. I take it that the gentleman from Wisconsin has never seen that statement before—at least, if so, the gentleman—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am perfectly familiar with it.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I accept the gentleman's statement that he is familiar with it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Secretary Taft testified about it before the committee, as the gentleman from Virginia well knows.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Secretary Taft did testify about it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Of course he did.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Of course he did; and yet I have in my hand a report written by him, signed by him, and, for that matter, by every member of the commission, only four short months ago, in which he distinctly says that English and Belgian capital is eager to build these railroads, and that unless American capitalists consent to do so the franchises will be granted to English and Belgian capitalists. I for one, having in mind only what I conceive to be the best interests of the people of the Philippine Islands, would rather see these railroads built by English than by American capital if the Filipino people are to be required to guarantee the interest upon the American capital.

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

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman has called attention to what appears to be an inconsistency in the statement of the Philippine Commission and the testimony of Secretary Taft before this committee. I would be glad to ask him whether the attention of Secretary Taft was called to the apparent discrepancy, and, if so, how he reconciles the statement which he made with what he said three months ago?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I will say, in reply to the gentleman, that so far as I know Secretary Taft's attention was never called

to it when before the committee, and I myself had never read this report until after the hearings had been concluded. Those who support this bill have not offered any explanation for Secretary Taft, and certainly I can not speak for him.

If he was not mistaken in the belief that English and Belgian capitalists stood ready to build the railroads, it must be that he believes that they should be built by American capital, even if it be necessary to extend Government aid. If this be his idea—and I can account for his present attitude upon no other theory—I can only say that I do not agree with him. There are many millions of English money invested in railroads in the United States, and I know of no objection to its investment in railroads in the Philippine Islands.

There is another feature of this question to which I now invite the attention of the House. If Congress shall authorize the granting of subsidies by the Philippine government to railroad syndicates, the United States will, in my opinion, become morally, if not legally, responsible for their payment. The Philippine government will, of course, be primarily responsible; but there will be an ultimate moral, if not legal, liability upon the Government of the United States.

The act of Congress under which the Philippine Commission enacts legislation for the Philippine Islands declares that all laws passed by that commission shall have this enacting clause: "By authority of the United States, be it enacted by the Philippine Commission."

Mr. LANNING. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. LANNING. I would like to know what page or what report by Secretary Taft says that. Where did you find the statement that the English and Belgians were ready to furnish capital to build railroads?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I have not said that the English had furnished capital.

Mr. LANNING. Were ready to furnish it.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I said they were ready to furnish it, according to the report of Civil Governor Taft, and if the gentleman will read what is said upon this subject in the Fourth Annual Report of the Philippine Commission, 1903, Part I, he will find on page 56, under the heading "The effect of labor on investment of capital," the words which I have quoted and which I shall be very glad to read again for his information.

Mr. LANNING. Now, do you say—

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I will read it.

Mr. LANNING. But you stated that the report, as I understood you—

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I stated what?

Mr. LANNING. As I understood the gentleman he stated the report was signed by Governor Taft and the other members of the commission. Is that the fact?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. That is the fact, I think.

Mr. LANNING. I do not find it to be the fact. This is a report of Governor Taft to the commission. The report signed by Governor Taft and the commission precedes what you have referred to and ends on page 11.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Well, if that be true—and I see, having turned to the end of it, it is signed "William H. Taft, civil governor"—then it is the report of Civil Governor Taft to the Philippine Commission, of which he was then a member and the head. That it is signed by Governor Taft and not by the individual members of the Philippine Commission is not, however, a matter of the slightest moment. It is embodied in a report of the Philippine Commission and is as much a part of the report as if every member had signed it. But it is enough for me to know that it was written and signed by the same high official who now recommends the legislation embodied in this bill, and to which I most seriously object. Whether or not the report is signed by the commission has not the slightest bearing upon my argument, and the gentleman must see that there is no force in what he says. Perhaps he merely desired to discover if my statement was literally correct—

Mr. LANNING. My only purpose was to find out where it was.

Mr. JONES of Virginia (continuing). And if that be so I am obliged to him. I found the statement which I have quoted in the last annual report of the Philippine Commission, and in what I have said I may have given the impression it was signed by the individual members of the commission as well as by the civil governor.

When the gentleman interrupted I was under the impression that it was for the purpose of drawing in question the accuracy of Governor Taft's statement as read by me.

Mr. LANNING. Not at all. Let me make myself clear by saying the gentleman referred to a statement as being contained in a report signed by the governor and by the other members of the commission, and I could not find it and I did not know where it was, and it was for that reason I asked the gentleman the question.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the report which accompanies this bill is supposed to be the report of the Committee on Insular Affairs, and yet were I to analyze the vote in committee it would astonish gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber who have been made to regard it as a party measure. I will only say that if permitted to move to recommit this bill, with instructions to the committee to report it back to the House with sections 4 and 5 stricken out, that motion would receive the support of quite a number of the Republican Members of this body.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. If the gentleman desires to ask a question—for no other purpose.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman know that the vote to which he referred a while ago was not on the railroad section at all; that the railroad section passed by unanimous vote of the Republicans who were present? If he does not I will so inform him. But I do not want him by innuendo to attempt to mislead the House.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I resent the statement that I have undertaken to mislead the House. And since the gentleman has volunteered to say what took place in committee, I feel that the House will bear with me if I give the exact facts in connection with this matter.

There are two sections of the bill which relate to the building of subsidized railroads. The fourth section provides for a guaranty of 5 per cent interest on the capital invested. The fifth section, which I think some Republicans upon this floor will regard as indefensible and which I shall discuss later on, provides that all railroad material coming into the Philippine Islands, no matter whence it comes, shall be admitted free of duty. Upon that section the vote was a tie, and out of a committee membership of seventeen only four Republicans voted for that proposition. One or more declined to vote and two voted with the two Democrats present to strike out the section. I further state—and the records of the committee will bear me out—that the fourth section only received about six votes. These are the facts. I give them because the gentleman has sought to create the impression that my reference to the action of the committee was misleading.

Mr. Speaker, when interrupted by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LANNING] I was attempting to show that whilst the Philippine government was primarily responsible for the railroad subsidies provided for in this bill the United States would be held to be morally responsible. If Congress authorizes this guaranty of interest, the enacting clause of the Philippine act which gives it will be in these words: "By authority of the United States, be it enacted by the Philippine Commission."

But, Mr. Speaker, if there was ever room for doubt as to the moral obligation of the United States—and many honest and intelligent people have entertained doubt upon this subject—I think there can no longer be any. Governor Taft was asked when before the committee whether or not the United States would be morally or legally responsible for these bonds. Now, mark what he said:

Not at all, except that Congress authorizes the issue. I suppose that investors have assumed that that fact would lead Congress to assume the obligation to them if the government ever became bankrupt. I only know that banking houses are entirely willing to take the bonds without a guaranty by the government, and the rate at which the bonds sold is an indication that the shadow of the United States in the background is very valuable.

In other words, the investors will be very willing to take the bonds if they are only authorized by the Government of the United States, for they regard "the shadow of the United States in the background as very valuable."

Although Secretary Taft is an accomplished lawyer, there is even higher legal authority for my contention than is to be found in his utterances. The Acting Attorney-General of the United States has given at least two official opinions, in both of which he holds that the United States is morally liable for Philippine bonds authorized and issued under circumstances and conditions precisely similar to those which will surround those provided for in this bill.

This is what he wrote the Secretary of War:

The entire transaction is to be negotiated under the auspices of the United States and by its recognition and aid.

Again, in a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury upon the same subject, the Acting Attorney-General said:

Although the loan is not legally guaranteed by the United States, the issue is obviously made over its faith and credit and by its aid and recognition. The bonds are offered to the public under the auspices of the United States by the direction of the Secretary of War and the authority of the government of the Philippine Islands, founded upon the act of Congress.

Mark that language—"made over its faith and credit." The United States are not to guarantee in so many words the interest which is to be paid the railroad syndicates under this bill, but we are told by the highest law officer of the Government that the guaranty of interest will be "made over its faith and credit,"

which can mean nothing other than that the United States will be morally bound to pay this interest in the event the revenues of the Philippine Islands shall prove to be inadequate. For one I do not doubt but that if the Philippine people are made to assume the payment of this interest, it will eventually fall upon and be paid by the United States.

The bonds and certificates of indebtedness heretofore sold by the Philippine government under the authorization of Congress have all borne the signatures of the Secretary of War or of the Chief of the Insular Affairs Bureau, acting for the Secretary of War, and it is undeniable that the purchasers of these evidences of the indebtedness of that government regard the United States as ultimately responsible for their payment.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Philippine revenues are now insufficient to meet the ordinary expenses of the government, and that those revenues are falling off rather than increasing; in view of the pitiable condition of the people throughout the islands as the result of drought, famine, and disease, it seems to me to be impossible to avoid the conclusion that the United States will be called upon to meet the interest payments provided for in this bill.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me a brief statement?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I can not yield except for a question; I have not the time.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the gentleman know who is the attorney for these railroads?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I do not.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, I saw it stated in a New York newspaper that ex-Secretary of War Elihu Root, of New York City, is their attorney.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. It may be true, as the gentleman states, that the ex-Secretary of War is the attorney of the capitalists who are to receive the subsidies provided for in this bill. I have no knowledge on that subject.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I saw it in a New York newspaper.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. It may be true; I know nothing about it. But I am not now concerned as to who is their attorney. The Philippine Commission tell us that they are being urged to grant franchises to English and Belgian capitalists to build these roads without a guaranty of interest, and I submit that nothing could be more unjust than for Congress to authorize the payment of railroad subsidies to American capitalists under these circumstances, even if the revenues of the Philippine government were most redundant and its treasury overflowing. To do so when the people of the islands are in an impoverished and starving condition is the very refinement of cruelty. I have dwelt upon this because I wish Members to understand what it is they are asked to do.

Now, a few words as to the fifth section of the bill, the one as to which the chairman of the Insular Affairs Committee has admitted that the committee was equally divided. That section provides for exempting from duty all the material which enters into the construction of these subsidized railroads. I use the word "subsidized" because if the authority to grant subsidies is conferred upon the Philippine government, it is clear that only such railroads as are "subsidized" will be built. The Secretary of War in effect admitted this much.

Under this section the iron and steel products of the United States Steel Corporation, the most gigantic and oppressive trust in existence, will be admitted free of duty into the Philippine Islands, whilst rice, which only last year was imported in vast quantities to avert starvation, is subject to a high customs duty.

The minority, as is stated in their report, would be glad to vote for a measure providing for absolute freedom of trade between the United States and the Philippine Islands. But we are not prepared to indorse or to vote for a measure that will admit free of duty into the Philippine Islands the products of the steel trust to be used in the construction of subsidized railroads when every other commodity, including food and other necessities of life, must pay three-fourths of the Dingley tariff rates.

Last year there was imported rice to the value of \$12,552,382, every pound of which paid a tariff tax, although a considerable portion of it was imported by the Government and distributed free to a starving people. This bill embodies a species of "tariff reform" which the minority can never indorse. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This is not the Democratic idea of tariff reform. It is the Republican idea of laying tariff duties—an absurd, unjust, and absolutely indefensible idea. It is Republican protectionism run mad.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON. I should like the gentleman to state, if he can, what reasons the Republicans give for taking the tariff off of materials that are to be used in constructing railroads in the Philippines. Is it to help the Filipinos or is it to help the ship-

pers of materials? According to the theory of our Republican friends, the foreigner pays the tax. Now, is this for the benefit of the people who sell materials or the people who buy them?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I am not in a position to answer the gentleman's question. I presume the theory is that to admit these materials free of duty will tend to promote the building of railroads in the Philippine Islands. But it will tend to promote the building of "subsidized" railroads and none other. It will have the effect of admitting the products of the steel and other trusts into the Philippine Islands free of duty.

Mr. JOHNSON. If the people of the Philippine Islands are to be helped by the remission of these duties, would not the same kind of thing help us?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I think the inquiry of the gentleman is entirely pertinent; but just here let me say a word to those of my friends from the Northwestern States who have recently manifested so much interest in Alaska. I heard a distinguished Representative from the State of Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] bewailing a day or two ago the refusal of Congress to appropriate \$250,000 for the construction of a military road in Alaska.

This House recently refused to appropriate the inconsiderable sum of \$250,000 for a military road in territory of the United States which has contributed within the past few years more toward the wealth and prosperity of the United States than the Philippine Islands in all human probability will contribute in the next hundred years. I merely refer to this to show how inconsistent the Republican party can be upon occasion.

It seems to me that the Republican party owes a debt of gratitude to the people of Alaska, which it ill repaid in refusing to construct a wagon road from the coast to its gold fields, for to the gold production of Alaska is due in large degree the success of the gold-standard policy of that party.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Will the gentleman allow a question? The gentleman opposed that appropriation, did he not?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. What authority has the gentleman for saying that I opposed it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I simply asked the gentleman whether he did or not.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I did not vote upon the proposition. I was paired and could not vote.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Most of your side voted against it.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. It may be true that most of them voted against it, but it is also true that every one of them will vote against this bill. Most of your side voted against the Alaskan proposition, and yet I doubt not that most, if not all, of your side will now vote for the pending measure, which provides for subsidizing railroads in the Philippines. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] applauds that statement, and well may he do so, for when his rule was under consideration he expressed an unwillingness to discuss the merits of this measure, contenting himself with the declaration that it was a Republican measure, designed to carry into effect the well-established policy of the Republican party as to the Philippine Islands, and therefore deserving the support of every Republican Member. It must be consoling to Members on the other side of the Chamber to reflect that, although so able and resourceful a leader as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] can not defend the propositions embodied in this bill, they at least have his assurance that it is a genuine Republican measure and is but intended to carry out a policy already inaugurated.

If it be a humiliating admission, it is none the less a candid one. If all of the Republican legislation for the Philippine Islands has been in keeping with this, I can only say, "God help the Republican party." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HAMLIN. And God help the Philippine people!

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Yes; and, as a friend by me suggests, "God help the poor Philippine people." [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Speaker, although there are thousands of well-informed and intelligent Filipinos; men learned in the law, in medicine, and in the sciences; men thoroughly informed as to the needs and resources of their country, not one of them has been consulted, so far as I have been able to discover, as to this proposed legislation. Not one of them was invited to appear before the committee which reports this bill.

There is nothing in the suggestion that it merely confers authority upon the Philippine government to guarantee interest upon railroad investments, and does not make it obligatory upon it to do so. The Philippine Commission is the Philippine government and is composed of five Americans and three Filipinos, all of whom are appointed by the President of the United States. Nor can the acts of this commission have the effect of law in the Philippines until they have received the approval of the Secretary of War. In other words, the Philippine people are governed from the city of Washington and have no voice in the selection of their rulers. If, therefore, Congress authorizes the subsidization of railroads in the Philippines, they will be subsidized.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the revenues of the Philippine Islands be able to bear this denial of tax revenues?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I answer that question by saying that the revenues of the Philippine Islands have fallen short of the expenditures during the last year.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will this not cut off a great deal of revenue that could be turned into the Philippine treasury?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Necessarily so; and I may add in this connection that only a few weeks ago the Secretary of War received a telegram from Governor Wright, of the Philippine Islands, which was in these words:

Our customs receipts for the past six months have fallen off nearly 25 per cent.

Now, gentlemen, those of you who have done me the honor to listen to this brief, and to me most unsatisfactory, explanation of some of the more important provisions of this bill must agree that this is most questionable legislation. I verily believe, as I have already said, that if a motion to recommit this bill with instructions to strike out the two railroad sections were permissible, we upon this side could count upon enough votes on that side to send it back to the committee.

Those who direct the course of legislation in this House knew full well that there were features of this bill which would not commend themselves to thoughtful and honest Republicans, and they realized that as independent propositions they could never receive the indorsement of a majority of its Members. Knowing this they provided in a special rule that no amendments should be considered and that no motion to recommit with instructions should be entertained. Republicans who disapprove these indefensible sections must be satisfied with the assurance that it is a Republican measure. Under these circumstances to follow the dictates of judgment and conscience would, of course, be party treason.

Mr. Speaker, we are told—and there seems to be a notion to that effect abroad in the country—that the rules of this House were adopted for the purpose of preventing filibustering and other dilatory tactics and in order to expedite and facilitate the orderly transaction of business in this body. There never was a more mistaken and misleading idea than this. On the contrary, the rules were framed for the express purpose of preventing legislation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No legislation other than appropriation bills and other privileged matters can get before the House under these rules.

Necessarily, then, they exclude from consideration many bills and resolutions of the utmost interest to Republicans as well as the Democrats. They exclude, too, and that is the important thing, those Democratic measures which the Republican leadership is unwilling, for purely partisan reasons, to have considered. Those measures which the Republican leaders wish passed, and which under the rules of the House are not privileged, and therefore can not secure consideration, are taken care of under special rules provided for the occasion and made to order by the Committee on Rules—the great Republican triumvirate.

Thus it is that the standing rules of this body keep out all matters that are not strictly of a privileged character or which are not reported from committees dominated by Republicans, whilst other Republican measures are brought before the House and disposed of with little or no consideration under special rules ingeniously framed to meet the exigencies of the case. No bill embodying Democratic policy is ever reported from a committee.

The only other way by which legislation can be had is by unanimous consent. A great many bills are considered by unanimous consent, but it must be remembered that "recognitions" go by favor, and that no Member is recognized by the Speaker to ask for unanimous consent unless the Speaker approves his bill and wishes to see it passed. Even then a single objection prevents consideration. Now, I wish to say to the Democrats of this House that there is but one way by which they can secure any measure of fair treatment at the hands of a Republican majority. That way is to object to any and all requests for unanimous consent, whether made by Republicans or Democrats.

If this course is pursued and persisted in, the Republican leaders upon this floor will realize that in order to secure consideration for their own measures, all of which they can not get through by bringing in special rules, they will have either to change their standing rules or else to make some concession by which Democrats can secure consideration for at least a few of their important bills. No one Democrat can be expected to perform so personally disagreeable and thankless a task as that which I have suggested. It should be made a party matter.

The Democratic minority in this House should determine that hereafter no measure shall be considered here by unanimous consent until the Republican majority is made to understand that the minority have some rights which must be respected. In this way, and only in this way, in my judgment, can there be brought about a change of the rules of this House.

This bill, brought before the House under a special rule which does not permit a fair discussion of its provisions, and which expressly excludes any effort at amendment, not only vitally affects the material interests of 9,000,000 Filipinos, but deeply concerns the honor and faith of the American people. It was only reported from the Committee on Insular Affairs within the past few days. There are probably not a half dozen Members of this House, outside of the committee membership, who have read a section of the bill, and yet you Republicans are expected to and probably will vote for it because you are told to do so.

I appeal to such of you as care to vote intelligently and conscientiously upon this bill to at least do yourselves the justice to read and examine its various provisions. You owe this much to your country, to your constituencies, and to yourselves. I beg that you will also read the printed views of the minority, so that when on to-morrow you shall come to vote upon the bill you will have some knowledge as to its contents and be informed as to the objections urged to it.

Few, if any, measures of equal importance have been before this Congress. To many of far less importance days have been given for discussion, and every opportunity afforded for amendment. I have endeavored to make it plain to the House that it is an ill-considered, unnecessary, and most indefensible measure. If it shall be enacted into law, I predict it will bring financial disaster upon the Philippine people and dishonor upon the American name. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Before the gentleman commences, I wish to ask, Mr. Speaker, how much time I have occupied?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has occupied eighty-three minutes.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. How much time was consumed by the gentleman from Wisconsin?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Eighty-five minutes. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, for the last month or six weeks I have given considerable time and thought to the investigation of the subjects covered by the pending bill, and I am heartily in favor of all of its provisions.

The Republican party several years ago outlined its policy in relation to the administration of the affairs of the Philippine Islands. That policy is expressed in certain laws enacted for the raising of revenue and for political and administrative purposes there. Experience has demonstrated that perhaps some mistakes were made, that some amendments of those laws ought to be made, and that some legislation was omitted at that time that it is the duty of this Government now to supply.

The bill under consideration is supplementary and amendatory. It undertakes to supply legislation that should have been enacted several years ago and to amend some provisions of the laws that were then made that experience has demonstrated to be necessary.

The policy of the Republican party in the Philippine Islands is to develop the material resources and to upbuild the social and the political life of the inhabitants of the archipelago. We are there for their benefit, for our own benefit, and for the benefit of the entire civilized world. It is a trust in a sense, a sacred trust that this Government has to administer, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, I am entirely within the bounds of truth when I say the Republican party has performed that responsible trust to the entire satisfaction of the people of this great country.

The policies of the party, as expressed in laws enacted in the past and which were opposed by gentlemen on the other side of the aisle more strenuously than they oppose the pending measure, have all been approved at elections since their adoption by overwhelming majorities of the voters at the polls. The country knows the policy of the Republican party and approves it, and let no man on this side of the House hesitate to support this measure, because it is simply in furtherance of that policy so generally accepted by the people. My friend from Virginia [Mr. JONES], who recently addressed the House, worked himself up to such a frenzy of opposition I am persuaded that he really believes that the bill does contain some bad features. He indignantly declared that the bonds of the Philippine Archipelago would not command the attention of the financial world unless they had the moral support of the United States, and in making that statement he paid as high a compliment to the Republican policy of administration out there as it is possible for him to pay.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I would ask the gentleman, just in that connection, if he indorses all the features of this bill?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I am stating my indorsement now, if the gentleman pleases. I undertake to say, Mr. Speaker, that if bonds were issued by an independent government of the people

of the Philippine Islands—the kind advocated by the gentleman from Virginia and his political associates—they would not command the respect and confidence of the financial world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

They would go begging in all the financial markets of the world. But the affairs of the islands are being administered by the United States, and that is guaranty enough that they will be safely, honestly, and economically administered, that no obligations will be permitted there behind which there are not sufficient assets to take care of them at the proper time, and therefore investors of capital throughout the country have no hesitancy in putting their money in Philippine bonds. That is the kind of moral support they have, and that is all. There is no liability upon the part of this Government for their payment. The gentleman referred to the debt-ridden archipelago! The debt-ridden archipelago!—when there is not a single dollar of indebtedness in any proper sense upon the general government of the islands.

My colleague, the chairman of the committee, has fully and well explained the character of the outstanding certificates represented by the parity fund in the treasury and the issue of bonds for the purchase of the 420,000 acres of fertile farming land from the friars. The Philippine government has no authority to create a debt for general purposes, or for internal or external improvements. But the revenues have been such that out of the current income of the government several millions of dollars have been expended for port improvements, for the construction of roads, the building of schoolhouses, bridges, and other works of a general permanent character. We provide in the first section of this bill that bonds issued by the Philippine Islands shall be nontaxable, a most wise provision, Mr. Speaker, and a very necessary one.

If they were made subject to taxation in this country, who would be the purchasers? Would the trust companies, would the insurance companies, would those institutions that have command of large amounts of money for investment but which are compelled to exhibit to the tax collector all of their assets, buy them? Nobody would purchase Philippine bonds under those circumstances except the tax dodger, and not a single dollar of taxes would be paid upon them. We want the bonds to come to the United States and show themselves, to come to the surface and be used for any legitimate purpose for which they may be available. Neither the Government here nor the government there loses a single dollar in the way of taxes by this provision. If they were taxable bond brokers would make it a pretext to insist upon a higher rate of interest and then hide the bonds away from the reach of the tax collector.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; for an inquiry.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] says it is true; and if so, why are you exempting the duty on steel rails and railroad material to be shipped to the Philippines to build this road when you consider the bankrupt condition of the Philippine Islands now and a year ago?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will get to that question. I have not reached the railroad bridge yet.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The authority to create debt for permanent improvements is a proper one, and a limitation of \$5,000,000 is fixed upon the government of the islands, and the money is to be used for general improvements, for the construction of trunk highways, bridges, permanent buildings and structures, and general improvements in the archipelago.

Why, Mr. Speaker, our policy has been avowedly one of development. It has been an aggressive commercial, educational, and political policy. Those islands have been known to civilization for four hundred years. They cover a comparatively small area. They are in the highway of the world's commerce, and yet there are resources in those islands—fertile valleys and rich forests that have never been witnessed by civilized man. There are twenty different dialects spoken in the island of Luzon alone. There is complete social, intellectual, and commercial isolation of some of the communities.

The policy of this Government is and has been to create political solidarity in the archipelago, to bring about a national spirit, to create a common language and a common literature, and thereby establish the basis of independent self-government some time in the future, a thing about which our Democratic friends have been talking so much. This can be done only by the construction of highways, of railroads, of schoolhouses, of telephone and telegraph lines, and other facilities for intercourse. Under the administration of the Republican party the capital of the archipelago is connected by telegraph and cable lines with the capital of every province in the islands, numbering some twenty-nine or thirty.

Every foot of telegraph and cable line is owned and operated

by the government of the Philippine Islands. That government has expended millions of dollars in the way of permanent improvements, and they need authority now to incur an indebtedness not exceeding \$5,000,000 at any one time—a comparatively small indebtedness—for the purpose of still further advancing the splendid policy of development that has been established and administered so well.

I come next to the railroad section, and that I conceive to be the most important section of the entire bill, one that seems to be little understood even by gentlemen on the other side who are members of the Insular Committee. My friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] had much to say in criticism of that proposition, and he made the assertion that Secretary Taft, while governor of the archipelago, informed American capitalists that unless they came forward with money to invest in railroads and other enterprises with greater alacrity the franchises and rights would be granted to Belgian and English capitalists, who were standing ready to put their money in enterprises of that kind, and the gentleman drew the conclusion that if this bill were not adopted at all all of the railroads that are contemplated under the operation of its provisions would be constructed without subsidy, without guaranty, by Belgian and English capital.

Is that true? Does the history of the bill in its evolution justify any such an inference as that? The gentleman read from the report of the Philippine Commission, on page 56, the letter of Governor Taft to the commission, embodied in its report to the Secretary of War. Governor Taft was undertaking to assure American investors that labor conditions in the islands were not as bad as they were represented to be.

He said there was no doubt that the iteration and reiteration of the deficiency in the supply of labor in the Philippine Islands have had the effect of frightening American investors of capital from coming into the islands.

In that connection he said that English and Belgian capitalists were better acquainted with the oriental laborer than the Americans, and they knew of his capacity and reliability and were willing to invest money in enterprises of this character, depending altogether on local labor. It was nothing more than a note of warning to American capitalists and an assurance from him that Philippine labor could be depended upon to carry out and conduct these great enterprises. In that same connection he said: "The commission is strongly desirous of encouraging American capital to come here." Ought it not to be? Ought it not to give preference to American capital?

Is it not our policy to Americanize the islands, and are not capital and commerce two of the greatest agencies known to promote the civilization of a people? How can we better Americanize and civilize, according to American standards, than by investing American capital under American control in the archipelago? He gives preference to American capital! I hope my friends do not criticize him on that account. He says, also:

But it should be noted that if American capital declines to come that English, Belgian, and other foreign capital is merely awaiting the franchises which are requested for railroad and other constructive enterprises, and that it will be the duty of the commission to grant such franchises for the benefit of the islands.

Secretary Taft testified before the Committee on Insular Affairs, and his testimony is printed in the hearings, that there were certain short lines of railroad out of the city of Manila that would pay dividends from the beginning, and they could be constructed without any guaranty or subsidy whatever. He also said that an English company was operating the Manila and Dagupan Railway, and that English capital sought franchises for one or two other short lines out of Manila into thickly settled provinces adjoining.

But the kind of roads contemplated by this measure are trunk lines extending into the interior, that go from Manila to the northeast and the northwest corners of Luzon and to the southeast corner, railroads that will open up and develop a country that is isolated now by natural barriers and is difficult, if not impossible, of access.

There is no question that there could be franchises granted for two or three lines of railroad 30 or 40 miles in length, extending out of Manila into the thickly populated territory in that vicinity; and English and Belgian capitalists are standing ready to accept franchises of that kind; but those short lines will be used as inducements for the extension of trunk lines along the coasts and into the valleys so as to connect the remote parts of the island with the capital city. That is the situation.

Now, I ask what could better promote the political unity, the educational advancement, and the economical welfare of the citizens of those islands than the construction of railroads from the city of Manila into the fertile valleys that it is so desirable to develop. Contemplate what was done by the transcontinental railroad lines across this country. Empires of land were given away in order that we might develop the great West. In the early

sixties all the political parties of this country declared in favor of using substantial portions of the public domain in order that the Atlantic and Pacific coast might be connected by railroad lines. Millions of acres were donated for that purpose. And look at the results to-day. A grand empire of power and wealth has been the result of that policy.

But the experience of this country has taught us that it is better in promoting railroads to make gifts or subsidies in the form of a guaranty than to vote away public lands in such large quantities. Lands which are practically worthless at the time they are granted because of their inaccessibility become highly fertile and valuable when developed. In granting lands it is impossible to estimate the value of the grant.

It was the judgment of the Committee on Insular Affairs that it would be better if the Philippine government should be authorized to make a guaranty of a dividend upon cash capital actually invested in the construction of the railroads and allow the people of the islands to have the benefit of the development—the enormous increase that must come in the value and productivity of the lands to be developed. Keep the lands for the people.

It is proposed to guarantee a dividend exceeding 5 per cent upon the cash capital actually invested. The bill contains adequate safeguards to prevent abuses, and whenever a railroad earns 1 per cent or 2 per cent of dividends the guaranty is reduced correspondingly. And when conditions are such that the railroads, properly and fairly administered, partly by directors appointed by the Government itself, when the conditions become such that the roads can pay 5 per cent dividends on their capital, the liability of the Government under its guaranty absolutely ceases. We provide in the bill for the repayment ultimately of the money that may be paid under the guaranty.

Now, I ask gentlemen of the House to read carefully and critically section 4 of this bill and say whether or not it does not contain adequate safeguards to prevent abuses. The guaranties are limited to thirty years' duration at the outside, and the aggregate liability is limited to one and a half million dollars a year. With railroads extending into the northeast and the northwest and down into the southeast, the revenues of the Government as the result of the railroad construction and the development attending it will be increased more than a million and a half annually, upon a conservative estimate.

Think of the enormous resources that will be made accessible by such development. It will be money in the treasury of the government, wealth in the pockets of the people. It is a wise and judicious investment of a million and a half of dollars derived from taxation paid into the common treasury.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Philippine people are to be taxed to pay a guaranty on the earnings of these roads, why should they not own the railroads themselves?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, if the gentleman knows of any way of buying a railroad by guaranteeing dividends for a few years—any satisfactory, practical way—I should be glad to adopt it. If we can get a railroad by a simple guaranty of a 5 per cent dividend for a few years, it would be cheap enough.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is well understood that the Government can borrow and has borrowed money at about 3 per cent or less; and if it can borrow money at 3 per cent for other matters, why can it not be borrowed for the construction and operation of railroads?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. A proposition of that kind was submitted to the committee, but the committee with entire unanimity voted it down.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Why?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. We had before us the experience of England in India and of all countries that have undertaken to build railroads and operate them. Government ownership and management of railroads in the Orient has been uniformly unsatisfactory. It creates enormous government patronage, is subject to abuses and scandals, it is expensive, and the standard of the service is always low. England now leases most of the lines she owns in India to private companies. There was no member of the committee who believed in the wisdom of government ownership. [Applause.] That question was considered for several days, and after being carefully thought over was repudiated by the committee.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will not the gentleman give us some instances in detail and some statistics?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have not the time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the House ought to be enlightened on this subject by a presentation of the experience of other countries. There has been absolutely no showing of that kind in the record here.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. There is a showing in the hearings. If the gentleman will examine the hearings he will find reference

to correspondence with capitalists and railroad builders and a statement from Sir William Van Horn as to the experience of England in India, and of other European nations that have undertaken to develop colonies. If the gentleman will go to the hearings he will get the testimony upon the question. I have no more time to give to its discussion.

Now, we are carrying out in the Philippine Islands a better policy than that which the people of the United States with practical unanimity applied to their own affairs thirty-five or forty years ago. We are applying a wiser and more prudent policy. The Philippine government gets the benefit of our experience. We are pursuing a policy for them that is infinitely better than that we applied in our own country. In the Philippine Islands no guaranties are to be paid when the railroads earn dividends, and the government has a hand in the control and management of their affairs and finances as long as they claim guaranties. It supervises finances and expenses in the way of maintenance and operation, so that economy and efficiency will be insured.

Now, in relation to the question of admitting free of duty the material to go into railroad construction, that is a matter of policy to further promote railroad building, and if it is worthy of the consideration we give it in authorizing the guaranty of 5 per cent dividends, it is certainly worthy of the further consideration which we give it of undutiable material for construction and equipment.

There is another section of this bill to which I wish to call attention briefly, and that is the immigration provision. The bill provides that the Philippine government shall be authorized to administer the immigration laws and to collect the head tax or whatever tax is imposed.

Originally the government there did administer the immigration laws, but when we extended the Chinese-exclusion law during the last Congress a provision was put into it making it applicable to the Philippine Islands. Another law put all the immigration matters under the control of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. It created divided responsibility in Philippine administration between two Departments of this Government. It has always been our policy to concentrate the entire administration of that archipelago under one responsible head here—the Secretary of War. The section of the bill to which I refer restores the control of the immigration features to the Philippine government, to be administered under the Secretary of War, as it was formerly done.

There is one other thing this bill does, and that is it authorizes the Philippine government to modify or repeal the tonnage tax in Philippine ports.

The existing tax was imposed by the Philippine government, and by an act of Congress it was approved and confirmed, and practically made a law of Congress. I believe the tax is 6 cents a ton, but it is imposed upon net tonnage capacity, and it necessarily discriminates against large vessels.

A 10,000-ton vessel would have to pay as much tax on entering a Philippine port carrying a hundred tons of cargo as it would if it carried and discharged 10,000 tons of cargo. It would have to pay ten times as much tax on a hundred-ton cargo as a hundred-ton boat would have to pay on the same cargo. It discriminates against large boats and practically drives them out of Philippine ports, and it is the desire and the hope of the Philippine government that they may so readjust this tonnage tax as not to discriminate against but to encourage the entrance of large vessels, because the sea between the islands and the Asiatic Continent is a difficult and dangerous one to navigate.

Six months in the year the monsoons blow from the northeast, and the other six months from the southwest, and the sea is rough at all seasons of the year. A two, three, or four hundred ton boat coming across from Asia meets a peculiarly difficult condition of navigation, on a rather shallow sea. It is in the trough and on the crest of the waves alternately. The best boat running between Manila and the Asiatic continent—the largest one running regularly—is called the *Rolling Rosa*, because of its tendency to toss and rock about on the sea. That is the reason for that section of the bill.

There is not a section or provision in this bill that has not been carefully thought out. There is not one, in my judgment, that is not wise and prudent, and every one of them ought to be enacted into law.

Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will, for a question.

Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee. Does the gentleman approve of that section of the bill which admits free of duty to the Philippine Islands the material to be used in the construction of railroads there?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do now. I did not in the committee, I will say. I voted against it in the committee, but the judgment of the committee was that it ought to be in the bill, and I accept

the judgment of my colleagues and am supporting the bill in all of its features and details. If I have any time remaining, Mr. Speaker, I surrender it back to the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will give his reasons for objecting to that.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Virginia consume some part of his time now?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Is it the purpose to go on after 5 o'clock?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I understand it is the purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Is it expected to get through with it to-day or not?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I understand that we are to go until half past 5.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I would like to know if the rule fixes 1 o'clock to-morrow as the time of the vote upon the bill?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. It does. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] wants to speak on our side also. I desire to get in a half an hour more on this side this evening.

Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour in the evening, when Members in attendance are necessarily somewhat fatigued, I will not care to take up all the time that is accorded me by the leader of the minority on this side. I will say in the beginning that if this bill that has been proposed by the majority of the Committee on Insular Affairs means anything it means that our possession of the Philippine Islands has been a failure up to this time.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman of the committee, is very fond of giving Governor Taft as his authority for any and all subjects which are discussed in regard to the Philippine Islands. I know of no man, Mr. Speaker, that I have a higher admiration for personally than Governor Taft. I believe that he is a sincere man, and I believe that he is a very able man. The present governor of the Philippine Islands is from the city in which I reside. I know him very well. I know of no man of higher character or more sterling worth or greater ability than Luke E. Wright, who succeeded Governor Taft as civil governor of those islands. But, Mr. Speaker, neither Governor Taft, earnest and sincere as he is, nor his successor, Governor Wright, able as he is, has been able to bring order out of chaos in the Philippine Islands, or to bring to pass any of the promises and prophecies made by the Republican side when we took forcible control of the people of those unhappy islands. The main features of this bill have been pointed out in the exceedingly strong and able speech delivered by the gentleman from Virginia, the leader of the minority side.

I want to say that that discussion has been so full that possibly I can add nothing to it. As to the necessity, real or supposed, for this bill, it but accentuates the Democratic position in the very beginning, that we were engaging upon a dangerous experiment in entering upon the possession of these distant colonies and that we were making from every standpoint a serious mistake. Time has demonstrated the incorrectness of Republican prophecies, but time has also demonstrated the correctness of every prophecy made by the Democratic party in regard to these islands.

What is the situation to-day, Mr. Speaker? The United States Government has sent to the Philippine Islands only about \$4,000,000 worth of goods a year. As pointed out by the gentleman from Virginia, the third largest class of goods sent to those islands by this country is wine, beer, and spirituous liquors, and all of the importations from the Philippine Islands to the United States only amounted to a little over \$13,000,000. For this paltry sum we have shed the blood of thousands of Filipinos; we have seen our own soldiers dying with disease or at the hands of a lurking foe, and for these results we have contributed, according to any fair estimate, the enormous sum of over \$750,000,000.

One of the propositions, Mr. Speaker, contained in this bill strikes me with peculiar force, and that is the proposition to admit free of duty in the Philippine Islands the material to be used in the construction of subsidized railroads. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] answered me that the Insular Affairs Committee had no jurisdiction on the tariff, so far as it applies to the Philippine Islands; and yet when it comes to the matter of railroad construction there, that committee has jurisdiction or it has assumed it, and this monstrous proposition is presented to this House.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], it seems to me, is placed in a rather peculiar and awkward attitude. He acknowledges on the floor that he was not in favor of this provision of the bill, but that he now is, for the powers that be have put this bill before the House with this provision in it, and the gentleman from Indiana, receding from his own views, is now willing to accept it, and gentlemen on that side of the Chamber are not allowed to either approve or disapprove of that provision

in the bill. They must take all or nothing. Think of it! A people whose liberty we have destroyed and encompassed, a people who only last year were starving by thousands, unable to make their crops, that we were compelled to send \$3,000,000 from the United States Treasury to buy rice to prevent starvation, and yet the Philippine people had to pay the tariff upon the rice which was imported there to keep them from starving.

Every food product, every agricultural implement of any kind whatsoever, is taxed when it goes into the Philippine Islands. The food that makes the brawn and the muscle and sustains the life of those people is taxed; and yet this railroad material, coming as it does from the great trusts of the country, is admitted free of duty. Who is there upon that side of the Chamber who will dare say that this is wise, that this is beneficent, that this is just legislation? I am opposed to keeping the Philippine Islands. I was opposed to ever acquiring the Philippine Islands. But if we must keep them, let us act by them in justice and in fairness. Let us be true to ourselves, and let us deal out to these poor people some meed of justice and right. Why, if we have to hold these islands, gentlemen, we ought to give them free trade such as obtains between the States and all the Territories.

If we hold these islands, I agree with my distinguished friend the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] that we ought to give them our money. They are a part of us and yet not a part of us. If we want to develop those islands, the first step for their development is free trade between the islands and this country, which has built up our own great country, and the fact that we are so strong and so prosperous to-day is owing more than any other cause to the fact that trade is free and unrestricted between the States and Territories of the United States. We can spend the people's money in a better cause than railroad subsidizing in the Philippine Islands. We have this year no public-buildings bill reported from that committee; we have this year reported by the chairman of the River and Harbor Committee the pitiful sum of \$3,000,000 to improve all the rivers and all the harbors in this country, a sum equal in amount to the sum we sent to the Philippine Islands to buy rice. How long will the American people stand this vast and continued outlay for military expenses and military equipment in the Philippine Islands, and agree that our own great schemes of internal improvement shall be relegated in favor of these enormous expenses?

This is no fanciful picture; it is a fact. The money of the country is going there, instead of being spent at home. Take this beautiful city, in which we all take so much pride, and which we hope to see the most beautiful city in all the world. The business of this Government can not be carried on with the present accommodations, and yet all of this has to go by, all river improvements, all public buildings everywhere, in order that we may spend many millions of dollars every year in the Philippine Islands, and for what? For trade; and for how much trade? A trade of not quite \$4,000,000 from this country and a little over \$13,000,000 from the archipelago to the United States. Why, gentlemen, there are one hundred, I should say possibly two hundred, individual firms in the city of New York, who do a larger business every year than the whole trade of the Philippine Islands, importations and exportations, all amounts to. I want to read, with the permission of the House, and I shall only take now a few minutes, what a very distinguished gentleman has said in regard to colony holdings. He says:

At best, the inhabitants of a colony are in a cramped and unnatural state. At the worst, the establishment of a colony prevents any healthy public growth.

Then he goes on to speak with reference to Canada and the English rule in Canada, and he states that the Englishman looks down on the Canadian with contempt, because the Canadian is not on an equal footing with the British subject, but is only a colonist. Then he goes on to say:

Under the best of circumstances, therefore, a colony is in a false position. But if the colony is in a region where the colonizing race has to do its work by means of other inferior races the condition is much worse. From the standpoint of the race little or nothing has been gained by the English conquest and colonization of Jamaica. Jamaica has merely been turned into a negro island with a future, seemingly, much like that of San Domingo. British Guiana, however well administered, is nothing but a colony where a few hundred or a few thousand white men hold the superior positions, while the bulk of the population is composed of Indians, negroes, and Asiatics. Looked at through the vista of the centuries, such a colony contains less promise of true growth than does a State like Venezuela or Ecuador. The history of most of the South American republics has been both mean and bloody; but there is at least a chance that they may develop, after infinite tribulations and suffering, into a civilization quite as high and stable as that of such a European power as Portugal.

Now, I find that this book is entitled "American Ideals," and that the author of it is the Republican candidate for President, Theodore Roosevelt. It is pretty good Democratic doctrine, is it not? Have you any exception or question to make as to this doctrine? It is what we have been preaching all along, that colony holding was wrong. England is a monarchy and may hold colonies. This country is a republic and can not and ought not to hold them. What do we expect to do in the Philippine Islands now? Do we expect any white man to go there to make a home?

What white man has ever gone to the Philippine Islands to make that his home? Who has gone there except the adventurer or the official? Who will go there except the adventurer and the official? Who is going to leave this country with its magnificent possibilities, with the opportunities that he has here, to go to that sickly pestilential climate? Why, these Filipinos to-day are worse off, according to the admission of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, so far as the matter of taxation at least is concerned, than they were under Spanish rule.

We want to do our best, I admit, with the people of these islands, but the best is a failure, and you can not ever make anything else but a failure in the Philippine Islands. This candidate for President, who is already nominated, according to gentlemen on the other side, tells us that the problem can not be worked out; that it never has been worked out. If it can not be worked out and never has been worked out, then why are we trying now to work it out? What do you expect over there? You expect now to develop those islands by subsidized railroad enterprise. That proposition suggests two things. First, that capital will never go to those islands to build railroads. I scarcely agree with the opinion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] that either Belgian or English capital will go there to build railroads. I believe in order to get capital there that a subsidy is necessary, so that no loss can possibly be sustained, and who would not invest where no loss can be sustained and where there is a hope of profit?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman just permit me to interrupt him to say that I did not express the opinion that it would go there, but I said that the report of the Philippine Commission stated that it would. I expressed no opinion myself as to whether it would or not.

Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee. I misunderstood the gentleman and I wish to make that correction. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Governor Taft is too fair a man and too honest a man to ask this Congress to subsidize a railroad if he believed that capital of any character would ever build a railroad in those islands; and while I am not as well acquainted with Governor Taft as I am with Governor Wright, I do not believe Governor Wright would ever make that recommendation if he believed that capital from anywhere would ever go into those islands for the purpose of railroad construction.

So, as a last resort, in order to construct railroads there, this great subsidy of 5 per cent upon the amount is asked by this Congress to be devoted. I believe if this bill were before this House in such a way that Republican Members could vote upon it according to their ideas of right and according to their consciences this provision would never go into the bill. I believe that the majority of the Republicans would follow the opinion of the gentleman from Indiana that to admit these trust-made articles free of duty for railroad construction is inimical, not only to the best interests of this people, but a wrong to the people of those islands, who must pay with their taxes, wrung by their toil, poor as they are, every dollar of these subsidies fastened upon them unwillingly by the majority of the Committee on Insular Affairs.

This brings me to another consideration, without at all criticizing Governor Taft. While I agree with the gentleman in his admiration for him, yet I believe Governor Taft is just as fallible as other men are, and the proposition is presented to this House, the Secretary of War alone making the recommendation to Congress. It was well said by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES]:

Although there are thousands of Filipinos who are enlightened and intelligent, among them lawyers of distinction and physicians of skill, not one of the 9,000,000 of inhabitants of those islands was called before this committee; but the committee, without exercising the power of independent action or investigation, sat there and deliberately registered the will of one man.

I had great sympathy, Mr. Speaker, for the magnificent address made in this Chamber the other day by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]. I do not agree with him, however, that the power of this House is going to be always lost and destroyed as it has been in some instances. I believe there has always been trouble of this kind in our Government, but it is not of so recent a date as the gentleman's remarks would imply. But I protest, and every man in this House ought to protest, against executive legislation, whether Governor Taft, able and honest as he is, controls alone the situation, or whether any other arm of the executive does it. And this great representative body of the people, coming as it does from forty-five States of the American Union, should not sit here without the power of investigation, without the right to express individual views, to blindly vote for this or any other bill at the direction and the behest of the Secretary of War, and under the lash of the Committee on Rules.

Many hard things have been said about persons who are opposed to this colonial policy. Very many unkind remarks have been made about them. I remember that the President of the United States at Arlington had some very unkind remarks to make, just as he had in his address at Chicago on the "Strenuous life." Yet here is the opinion of your candidate for President that the Democratic

position is right and that your position, his present position, is wrong. But we do not need the word of Theodore Roosevelt to tell us what is right. We know what is right, and what is fair, and what is just. If we can not get out of those islands, but must keep them, let us give them free trade, and let us give them our coinage laws. If we can get away honorably, then the duty of this Government is plain, and that is to let those people work out their own destiny in their own way; and whether that destiny is good or bad it will be their destiny and their will, and not our will, which will control them. [Loud applause.]

Now, gentlemen, I know the time is getting late, and I will not trespass further upon your patience and attention. I yield back the floor to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know how much time was consumed by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. Twenty-eight minutes.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I should be glad if the gentleman from Virginia would dispose of four minutes of his time this evening, in order that the time may be equally divided to-morrow.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I would gladly do so, but there is nobody here now on our side who would like to speak for four minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Here is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is certainly able to occupy four minutes, I know. [Laughter.]

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I do not think it makes much difference which side has the extra four minutes to-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4609. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint a deputy collector of customs at Manteo, N. C.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 7266. An act to ratify, approve, confirm, and amend an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the manufacture, distribution, and supply of electric light and power on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii; and

H. R. 9643. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the maintenance and supply of fuel and illuminating gas and its by-products in Honolulu.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3361) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the maintenance and supply of fuel and illuminating gas and its by-products in Honolulu.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 1924. An act authorizing the recorder of the General Land Office to issue certified copies of patents, records, books, and papers;

H. R. 10007. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to transmit original papers to be used as evidence;

H. R. 13738. An act to authorize Frank P. Harman to bridge the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River near Delorme, in Mingo County, W. Va., where the same forms the boundary line between the States of West Virginia and Kentucky;

H. R. 14110. An act to authorize the donation of a certain unused and obsolete gun now at Chickamauga Park, Ga., to Phil Kearny Post of the Grand Army of the Republic, at Nelsonville, Ohio;

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution for the acceptance of a statue of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, to be presented to the United States by the Polish-American citizens; and

H. R. 6937. An act for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth S. Cushing.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 2515. An act to extend the United States pension laws to the participants in the battles of New Ulm and Fort Ridgely, Minn., in the Sioux war of 1862—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4609. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint a deputy collector of customs at Manteo, N. C.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 2547. An act for the relief of the owners, master, and crew of the schooner *Ella M. Doughty*—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3944. An act for the relief of G. F. Tarbell—to the Committee on Claims.

S. R. 8. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to negotiate with John T. Dolan, of Portland, Oreg., for purchase of original manuscript copy of "Order book of Gen. Arthur St. Clair"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT.

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. 2010. An act for the relief of the heirs of John A. Dolan;
H. R. 9135. An act for the relief of F. R. Lanson;
H. R. 12460. An act granting a pension to Annie M. Powell;
H. R. 7474. An act granting an increase of pension to Fannie C. Morey; and

H. R. 9985. An act providing for the donation of lots A, B, K, and L, in block 39, in Fort Dalles military addition to The Dalles, Oreg., as shown on the plat of the city of The Dalles and surroundings, and filed in the local land office at The Dalles, Oreg., to the Oregon Historical Society.

RETURN OF A SENATE BILL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resolution of the Senate; which was read:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3361) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the maintenance and supply of fuel and illuminating gas and its by-products in Honolulu.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the request of the Senate will be granted.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

VALIDATION OF HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. STEENERSON. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 13009) to validate certain original homestead entries and extend the time to make final proof thereon.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I think it is too late in the evening to consider a matter of that kind.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to: and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a petition of the Alaska Chamber of Commerce praying for the purchase of a site and the construction of a capitol building at Juneau—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Anna J. Saunders, G. B. Thornton, jr., administrator of estate of M. Lon. Thornton, and F. P. Poston, administrator of estate of Mary Trezevant, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting the Tenth Special Report of the Commissioner of Labor—to the Committee on Labor, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting the Eleventh Special Report of the Commissioner of Labor—to the Committee on Labor, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. POWERS of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14533) to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2445); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14944) establishing a regular term of the United States circuit and district courts at Lewisburg, W. Va., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2447); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10006) to provide against entering into a contract by any officer of the Govern-

ment of the United States of America for products of convict labor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2448); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 114) to extend the provisions of the act of March 3, 1885, relative to officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2449); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRANTLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3117) to expedite business in the district court of the United States for the district of Oregon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2450); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13472) to bridge the Newark Bay, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2451); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14826) to amend the homestead laws as to certain unappropriated and unreserved lands in Nebraska, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2452); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13886) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Mahers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2376); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14573) granting an increase of pension to Alexander P. Nelson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2377); 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. 14640) granting an increase of pension to Caroline McGinsey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2378); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14611) granting a pension to William L. Beverly, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2379); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 487) granting a pension to Mary J. Waugh, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2380); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 698) granting a pension to William M. Crow, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2381); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4379) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Adams, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2382); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4584) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Butler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2383); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pension, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14531) granting an increase of pension to P. A. Gatchell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2384); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14308) granting a pension to A. C. Fisk, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2385); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14201) granting an increase of pension to James H. Smith, reported the same

without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2386); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14521) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Phillips, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2387); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14524) granting a pension to Jennie A. Brown, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2388); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13490) granting an increase of pension to Henry Good, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2389); 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. 14511) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Keys, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2390); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12861) granting an increase of pension to Bartlett Mingus, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2391); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4572) granting a pension to Peter Lander, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2392); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3131) granting a pension to Andrew Cooksey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2393); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10846) granting an increase of pension to Heinrich Erbstoesser, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2394); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9623) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Betts, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2395); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LUCKING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9773) granting an increase of pension to Absolom Shiltz, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2396); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11086) granting a pension to Charles W. Crary, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2397); 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. 11013) granting an increase of pension to William Flaig, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2398); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7497) granting a pension to Emma A. Webster, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2399); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9107) granting a pension to Margaret F. Randolph, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2400); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6338) granting a pension to Antoinette I. Sawyer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2401); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7085) granting an increase of pension to William Spiegelberg, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2402); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7145) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose L. Hendee, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2403); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5565) granting a pension to Eliza Workman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2404); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13273) granting a pension to Delana A. Lynch, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2405); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14894) granting an increase of pension to John Gideon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2406); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13391) granting an increase of pension to Garret I. Post, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2407); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6537) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hawthorne, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2408); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6718) granting an increase of pension to James E. Phillips, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2409); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10285) granting a pension to Henry McCreary, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2410); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12197) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Candor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2411); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12177) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Waters, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2412); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6111) granting a pension to Edward A. Morris, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2413); 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. 2794) granting a pension to Lizzie J. Hoadley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2414); 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. 14204) granting a pension to John B. Hobday, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2415); 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. 9354) granting an increase of pension to John Richmond, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2416); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10284) granting a pension to Elizabeth Broomall, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2417); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12629) granting a pension to Ida Diamond, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2418); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13173) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Houghton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2419); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12702) granting an increase of pension to Margaret G. Howarth, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2420); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which

was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14631) granting a pension to William T. Spencer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2421); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14153) granting an increase of pension to P. C. Wood, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2422); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6182) granting a pension to J. C. Horton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2423); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4602) granting an increase of pension to Helim Thompson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2424); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2577) granting an increase of pension to Harmon P. Cole, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2425); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14578) granting a pension to Edward Taylor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2426); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 940) granting a pension to Oscar M. Parsons, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2427); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4018) granting an increase of pension to James Gunn, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2428); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5210) granting an increase of pension to William L. Beach, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2429); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5078) granting an increase of pension to Asa Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2430); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2367) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Mergel, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2431); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3151) granting an increase of pension to Hayden M. Thompson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2432); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5096) granting an increase of pension to Edmond G. Pugsley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2433); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 682) granting an increase of pension to Jacob S. Grimes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2434); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1494) granting an increase of pension to Edward Colvin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2435); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3119) granting an increase of pension to Raynor H. Newton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2436); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5194) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Overley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2437); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the

bill of the Senate (S. 4086) granting an increase of pension to Ralph Van Brunt, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2438); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 423) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Weaver, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2439); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1687) granting an increase of pension to Harvey R. Backus, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2440); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1909) granting an increase of pension to William Holliday, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2441); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2011) granting a pension to Maggie E. Bamford, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2442); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3665) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. O'Connor reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2443); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the the Senate (S. 4353) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. McCook, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2444); 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. 2182) to grant jurisdiction and authority to the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of Jacob B. Phillips against the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2453); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRANDEGEE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12273) granting authority to the President, in his discretion, to restore certain midshipmen to the naval service, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2454); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

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. HEMENWAY, from the Committee on Appropriations: A bill (H. R. 15054) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for prior years, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 15055) to increase the efficiency of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KALANIANA'OLE: A bill (H. R. 15056) amending an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, approved April 30, 1900—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 15057) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Bridgeton, in the State of New Jersey—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 15058) to permit the use of unoccupied Government grounds in the District of Columbia by the City Gardens Association—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 15059) to increase the pensions of those who have been disabled so as to render their incapacity to perform manual labor equivalent to the loss of a hand or foot—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A resolution (H. Res. 322) to pay out of the contingent fund of the House to CAMPBELL SLEMP the sum of \$1,500 for legal expenses incurred in connection with his election to the Fifty-eighth Congress—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LEVER: A resolution (H. Res. 323) to pay B. B. Hare for services rendered the late Representative G. W. Croft, of South Carolina—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A resolution (H. Res. 324) relative to consideration of joint resolution No. 54—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A resolution (H. Res. 325) providing for the consideration of bill H. R. 3540—to the Committee on Rules.

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. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 15060) providing for the retrocession of certain lands in the city of Washington, D. C., to Howard University, upon which to erect a hospital, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BADGER: A bill (H. R. 15061) for the relief of Thomas Murnane—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads. Also, a bill (H. R. 15062) for the relief of William K. Trautman—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15063) for the relief of David J. Scurry—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15064) for the relief of John Brodie—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15065) for the relief of Lawrence Bast—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15066) for the relief of the estate of Nicholas Schwartz—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 15067) for the relief of the heirs at law of Emily R. Hathorn, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 15068) granting a pension to James Russell Hicks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: A bill (H. R. 15069) granting an increase of pension to Frank Honde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15070) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert P. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 15071) granting an increase of pension to Matilda L. Curkendall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 15072) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Shepherd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15073) for the relief of John W. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNWELL: A bill (H. R. 15074) for the relief of Hector A. Robichon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EMERICH (by request): A bill (H. R. 15075) for the relief of Isaac Rivers—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15076) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence Le Bron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 15077) for the relief of Joseph Loudermilk, of Monroe County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 15078) granting an increase of pension to Israel Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 15079) granting an increase of pension to Constantine J. McLaughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 15080) granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Boggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina (by request): A bill (H. R. 15081) for the relief of William D. Young—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 15082) granting a pension to J. C. Albritton—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 15083) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Clayton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 15084) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 15085) to correct the military record of John Shelton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 15086) granting an increase of pension to John J. Errick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BADGER: Petition of J. M. Freese, architect, in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution of Buckeye Council, No. 75, United Commercial Travelers, urging amendment to the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTON: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 14794, to pay the heirs of John Sevier, sr., for certain lands taken by United

States (referred by mistake to the Committee on War Claims yesterday)—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRICK: Petition of citizens of Kosciusko and Elkhart counties, Ind., in favor of the Brownlow good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of B. E. Pritchard, president National Association of Retail Druggists, in favor of bills S. 3984 and H. R. 12646, for the reorganization of the Hospital Corps of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also (by request), resolution of the Citizen's Alliance of South Bend, Ind., against the passage of an anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of Hancock County, Me., relative to the extermination of dogfish, etc.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Joel V. Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELL: Petition of John J. Davies, of Scranton, Pa., in favor of the enactment of bill H. R. 13679, amending the statutes relative to patents—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. COUSINS: Resolution of Perry Division, No. 114, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, of Perry, Iowa, in favor of an eight-hour law and an anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOVENER: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 14911, granting an increase of pension to James Fulkineer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 14337, granting an increase of pension to James S. Pelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petitions of the Twelfth Assembly District Republican Association, Republicans of the fourth election district, and Republicans of the sixth election district, all of Brooklyn, N. Y., in favor of bill to increase salary of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: Petition of 28 citizens of Linwood, N. J., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Charlotte Smith, against the employment of convict labor, child labor, and inmates of reformatories for the making of mail bags and sacks, etc.—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GRANGER: Resolution of Division No. 35, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, of Providence, R. I., in favor of the passage of an anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Division No. 35, Order of Railway Telegraphers, of Providence, R. I., in favor of the passage of an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Paper to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Thomas Ballard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petitions of congregations and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church and Rev. S. J. Bishop and others, of Clarksburg, Ohio; the Methodist Episcopal Church and W. A. Ellis and 29 others, of Racine, Ohio; H. R. Pfalzgraf and 20 others, of Junction City, Ohio, and the Methodist Episcopal churches of Crossenville, Harvey, Junction City, and Rutland, Ohio, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of Rev. D. L. Hilliard and 52 others, of Cabot, Vt., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of J. P. Otis and 11 others, of Neuack, Del., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD: Petition of Washington Manufacturing Company, in favor of bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Fifteen petitions of citizens of Albion, Walla Walla, Seattle, and other towns of Washington, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Petition of the Bar Association of the Hawaiian Islands, relative to increasing the number of judges on the supreme court bench of the Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, against the passage of bill S. 289—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LANNING: Petition of J. E. Wagner and 20 others, of Princeton, N. J., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of James H. Spencer and 41

others, of North Adams, Mass., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Petitions of Rev. Theron H. Rice and 20 others, and C. C. McClaughry and 23 others, of Atlanta, Ga., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina (by request): Paper to accompany bill for the relief of William D. Young—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of William Henry Butler and others, of Geneva, N. Y., in favor of bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 14925, granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PORTER: Resolution of United Labor League of Western Pennsylvania, in favor of bill to increase salaries of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RYAN: Petitions of William L. Fuchs and R. A. Bethune, of Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of Senate bill 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIMS: Petitions of W. L. Noell and 16 others, and B. F. Morgan and 26 others, of Huntington, Tenn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petitions of O. H. Robbins and 14 others, of Milburn, Tex., and J. C. Beasley and 12 others, of Brady, Tex., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNOOK: Petition of Abel Comstock, in favor of bill H. R. 5760, providing pensions for ex-prisoners of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petitions of T. A. Eppes and 34 others, of Clarksville, Va., and Rev. S. H. Dana and 14 others, of Exeter, N. H., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the Council of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, relative to the proposed sale of the custom-house building in Philadelphia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Mapleton, Sioux City, and other towns in Iowa, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WACHTER: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLACE: Petition of business men of Arkansas, against the passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of C. C. Herring and 82 others, and A. O. Wallis and 60 others, of Warren, Ark., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEEMS: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 9286, granting an increase of pension to S. Amanda Mansfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Mrs. N. G. Heard—to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 14, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

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

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

ADULTERATION OF FOODS, DRUGS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 6th instant, a report by the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry relative to investigations of adulterated foods, drugs, and liquors made under the provisions of paragraph 2 of the act of March 1, 1899, etc.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask that the communication be printed and referred to the Committee on Manufactures. I understand the other documents referred to have been already printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They have been already printed.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask to have printed only those that have not been already printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The matter not printed in the report will be printed and referred to the Committee on Manufactures, and the printed report will be referred to the same committee.

FINDINGS BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

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

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of John H. Cahoon and Charles G. Cahoon, heirs at law of Benjamin J. Cahoon, v. The United States; 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 (S. 3361) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the maintenance and supply of fuel and illuminating gas and its by-products in Honolulu.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (H. R. 1924) authorizing the recorder of the General Land Office to issue certified copies of patents, records, books, and papers;

A bill (H. R. 6937) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth S. Cushing;

A bill (H. R. 10007) to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to transmit original papers to be used as evidence;

A bill (H. R. 13738) to authorize Frank P. Harman to bridge the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River near Delorme, in Mingo County, W. Va., where the same forms the boundary line between the States of West Virginia and Kentucky;

A bill (H. R. 14110) to authorize the donation of a certain unused and obsolete gun now at Chickamauga Park, Ga., to Phil Kearny Post of the Grand Army of the Republic, at Nelsonville, Ohio; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) for the acceptance of a statue of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, to be presented to the United States by the Polish-American citizens.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of the Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, of Tacoma, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill" and also the anti-injunction bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ANKENY presented a petition of General Grover Post, No. 51, Department of Alaska and Washington, Grand Army of the Republic, of Auburn, Wash., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kent County, Del., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOPKINS presented a petition of the Crescent Coal and Mining Company, of Chicago, Ill., and the petition of S. C. Schenck, agent for the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the lowering of the tunnels under the Chicago River; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Addressograph Company, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation proposing to change the price of printed copies of specifications and drawings of patents; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Traverse City, Mich., praying for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the White Mountains of New Hampshire; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Volinia, Mich., praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill" and also the postal-check bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Central City Lodge, No. 64, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron-ship Builders, of Jackson, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to develop the American merchant marine; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Council of Kalamazoo, Mich., praying for the passage of the so-called "eight-