

C, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, affidavit in support of bill H. R. 15072, to pension Henry C. Shepherd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence of Lizzie, or Lydia Ann, Scott and Nero Dougherty, in support of bill H. R. No. 14956, claim of Robert Scott, Company D, One hundred and twenty-sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the Troy Chemical Company, in favor of the Boutell bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Board of Trade of La Crosse, Wis., for reform in the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of executive committee of the Manufacturers and Jobbers' Union of La Crosse, Wis., in favor of reform in the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petition of the pastors and 56 other voters of Morristown, Vt., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: Petition of S. M. McCarter and 15 other citizens of thirteen civil districts of Davidson County, Tenn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. W. T. Haggard and 15 other voters, of West Nashville, Tenn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of W. J. Stewart and 19 other voters, of Nashville, Tenn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of R. M. Halland and 12 other voters, of Nashville, Tenn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of H. F. Burns and 8 other voters, of Nashville, Tenn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: Petition of Reverend Nickline and 21 other voters, of Falling Spring, W. Va., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of D. F. Grady and others, representing the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Providence County, R. I., for the passage of a bill for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Papers to accompany bill granting pension to Isaac Hawkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of C. W. Brady and other voters, of Syracuse, Ohio, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Also, petition of citizens of New Straitsville, Ohio, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. D. J. Smith and other voters, of New Straitsville, Ohio, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Lancaster (Ohio) Medical Company, favoring the passage of bill H. R. 9303—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of New Lemington, Ohio, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Petition of the Delta Diphtheria Company, of Evansville, Ind., urging the passage of bill H. R. 9303—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petition of Rev. R. F. Dunn and 42 other voters of Bosqueville, Tex., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition recommending favorable action on the bill creating the Colorado Cliff Dwellings National Park—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Kings County (N. Y.) Pharmaceutical Society, favoring the passage of bill H. R. 12646—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of the Frances Willard Union, Mrs. Joseph Cramer, president, of Camden, N. J., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON: Papers to accompany the bill for the relief of Micajah R. Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition for a service-pension bill, by the veterans of the civil war of Valley Center, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PORTER: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 14780, for the relief of Robert C. Machesney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Lewis M. Haupt, of Philadelphia, in favor of

the Dalzell bill to charter the Lake Erie and Ohio River ship canal—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. PUJO: Affidavits to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Rebecca V. Mackenzie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution adopted at the Southern Good-Roads Convention in session assembled at New Orleans April 6, 1904, in favor of national good-roads legislation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAINES: Protest of Haines, Ruppert & Co. and other retail merchants of Rockport, Ill., against an experimental parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of A. R. Otis, of Kendallville, Ind., in favor of bill H. R. 9303, for reduction of the internal-revenue tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of M. L. Hussey & Sons, of Cromwell, Ind., in favor of bill H. R. 9303 for a reduction of the internal-revenue tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Petition of Cooper & Hardenbaugh, in favor of bill H. R. 9303—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. R. M. Roberts and 23 other voters of Ulster, N. Y., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Ellenville, N. Y., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: Petition of R. A. Sutor and 37 other voters, of Marion Center, Pa., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Petition of Peck Brothers and others, of Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring the passage of Mann bill to amend the patent laws—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: Petition of W. S. Schoonmaker and other citizens of Berne, N. Y., in favor of a fractional postal currency and consolidating third and fourth class mail into a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of H. W. Elmendorf and other voters, of Acquettuck, N. Y., in favor of consolidating third and fourth class mails into a parcels post and postal currency—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of Ancient Order of Hibernians of St. Paul, Minn., for the erection of a statue to John Barry, father of the American Navy—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Manila Bay Section, No. 27, St. Paul, Minn., in favor of the passage of bills S. 2990 and H. R. 2991—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: Communication from Corning Division, No. 244, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Corning, N. Y., in favor of the bill to give a military status to those who served as locomotive engineers during the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Additional evidence in the claim of W. H. Blades, affidavit of W. A. Howell—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 19, 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. CULLOM, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the Journal will stand approved. The Journal is approved.

DEFICIENCIES IN APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an additional list of estimates of deficiencies in appropriations covering amounts found due thereunder by the accounting officers of the Treasury, for which no appropriations are available for the payment thereof, aggregating \$2,363.59; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

LIST OF CLAIMS ALLOWED.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 16th instant, a list of claims allowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to

the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, amounting to \$6,040.50; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SPANISH WAR CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Attorney-General recommending an appropriation of \$25,000 to pay judgments to be rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of officers and enlisted men of the Volunteer Army during the war with Spain; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

NEW YORK INDIAN CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Auditor for State and other Departments relating to the settlement and distribution of the amount of the judgment rendered by the Court of Claims on November 22, 1898, in favor of the New York Indians, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

LIST OF JUDGMENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 16th instant, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims not heretofore reported to Congress, amounting to \$14,389.71; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN DEPREDACTION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 16th instant, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of the Indian depredation cases not heretofore reported at the present session; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 8690) to amend the law relating to taxation in the District of Columbia;

A bill (H. R. 11213) to extend the privilege of immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise to various subports in the customs collection district of Puget Sound, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 14826) to amend the homestead laws as to certain unappropriated and unreserved lands in Nebraska; and

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.

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:

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 (S. 4576) transferring the custody of certain obsolete ordnance to the city of Boston;

A bill (H. R. 12446) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 12684) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 13992) permitting the Missouri, Kansas and Oklahoma Railroad Company to sell its railroads and properties to the Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway Company; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 54) to permit Maj. Thomas W. Symons, Corps of Engineers, to assist the State of New York by acting as a member of an advisory board of consulting engineers in connection with the improvement and enlargement of the navigable canals of the State of New York.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legisla-

tion to place Brig. Gen. T. M. Anderson on the retired list of the Army with the rank of major-general; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN. I present a memorial signed by Rev. Thomas S. Barbour, of Boston, as chairman of a conference of missionary societies recently held in Washington, D. C., relative to the Independent Congo Free State. The members of the conference were Henry C. Mabie, D. D., home secretary American Baptist Missionary Union; Thomas S. Barbour, D. D., foreign secretary American Baptist Missionary Union; W. H. Leslie, M. D., missionary, American Baptist Missionary Union, at Banza Manteke, Africa; S. H. Chester, D. D., secretary Southern Presbyterian Board; Rev. W. M. Morrison, missionary, Southern Presbyterian Board, at Luebo, Africa; D. W. Snyder, M. D., missionary, Southern Presbyterian Board, formerly at Luebo, Africa; Rev. Archibald McLean, president Foreign Christian Missionary Society, and E. A. Layton, M. D., missionary, Foreign Christian Missionary Society, at Balengia.

The memorial, with the accompanying document, is a paper that has been prepared with very great care by men of great ability. I desire to present it now, and ask that it may lie on the table until the order for resolutions is called, when I shall offer a resolution predicated upon the memorial.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The memorial will lie on the table, together with the accompanying papers.

Mr. MORGAN. Subject to call.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a memorial of the Fry Coal and Mining Company, of Terre Haute, Ind., and a petition of the Ayrshire Coal Company, of Oakland, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prevent the indiscriminate shipping of so-called "high explosives;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Tri-City Trades and Labor Council, of Granite City, Ill., 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. STEWART presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Weldon, Ind. T., praying for the passage of the so-called "Quay statehood bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors, and also 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 Fourth District Medical Society of South Dakota, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Tacoma, Wash., and a petition of sundry citizens of Tacoma, Wash., 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 the District of Columbia.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of D. M. Currier, of Newport, N. H., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's National and International Rescue League, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing that ice cream manufacturers and venders be included in the Sunday-closing law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented memorials of the Western Pennsylvania Conference of Seventh Day Adventists, of Connersport, Pa.; of Arthur E. Sanderson, of North Windham, Conn.; and of the Secular League of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the closing on Sunday of business places in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTIN. I present a petition of the Central Labor Union of the District of Columbia, praying for the passage of the bill authorizing the extension, construction, and operation of the Great Falls and Old Dominion Railroad into the District of Columbia. The petition is brief, and I ask that it may be read and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the petition was read, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 11, 1904.

To the Senate of the United States:

The Central Labor Union of the District of Columbia, representing 20,000 wage-workers, residents of the city of Washington, petition your honorable body to enact Senate bill 2833, "to authorize the extension, construction, and operation of the Great Falls and Old Dominion Railroad into the District of Columbia."

We respectfully submit that the construction of this road along the route proposed will afford street-railway facilities which are necessary for the development of our city, and for the comfort and convenience of our residents.

We believe that this improvement, which is generally desired by our people, can only be obtained by the enactment of Senate bill 2833 and the extension of the Great Falls and Old Dominion Railway along the route designated in said bill.

We further believe that the two existing railway companies are opposed to the proposed improvement, and that the proposition of the Capital Traction Company to construct a line as provided in amendment to bill 2833, recently introduced in the Senate, is not made in good faith, but is a scheme devised to defeat any measure which would give to the people additional railway facilities in the northeast and release our residents from the merciless grip of a street-railway monopoly.

We earnestly protest against any further gifts of franchises to existing monopolies without securing taxation, cheaper fares, or some other compensation to the people.

We pray that this opportunity to secure healthy railway competition be not withheld, and we therefore respectfully ask on behalf of the 20,000 constituents of the Central Labor Union, who with their families constitute 60,000 street-railway patrons, that the honorable Senate of the United States will enact Senate bill 2833 during the present session of Congress.

Mr. MARTIN. I also present a petition of the Council of Allied Building Trades of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the Great Falls and Old Dominion Railroad Company the right to extend its road in the District of Columbia. I shall not ask to have this petition read, but move that it lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 932) granting an increase of pension to William S. Devlan; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Cumberland County Medical Society, of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation reorganizing the Army Medical Corps and providing for the construction of an adequate general hospital for the Army in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Catholic Total Abstinence Society of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that an appropriation of \$50,000 be made for the erection of a statue in the city of Washington, D. C., of Commodore John Barry; which was ordered to lie on the table.

ROADS AND ROAD BUILDING.

Mr. LATIMER. I present a table, being a statement of the apportionment of \$24,000,000 for good roads under the bill introduced by me on that subject. I move that the statement lie on the table and that it be printed as a document.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, from the Committee on Railroads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5563) extending the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1875, entitled "An act granting to railroads the right of way through the public lands of the United States," asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands; which was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1339) granting an increase of pension to Joseph P. Scott, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 15th instant, proposing to appropriate \$4,000,000 for paying any deficiency which may arise during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, by reason of recent pension legislation, intended to be proposed to the pension appropriation bill, reported it without amendment, submitted a report thereon, and moved that it lie on the table and be printed; which was agreed to.

He also (for Mr. BALL), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5416) granting an increase of pension to James A. Hopson, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. BALL), from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 3805) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Disbrow;

A bill (H. R. 5033) granting an increase of pension to Rowland J. Roberts;

A bill (H. R. 12966) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Lakey;

A bill (H. R. 11843) granting an increase of pension to William Hall;

A bill (H. R. 13543) granting an increase of pension to Henry Clay Hall;

A bill (H. R. 13743) granting an increase of pension to David C. Welch;

A bill (H. R. 13071) granting an increase of pension to John S. Whitmore;

A bill (H. R. 14145) granting an increase of pension to Abel D. Brooks;

A bill (H. R. 13687) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Davies;

A bill (H. R. 12400) granting a pension to Ellen Cain;

A bill (H. R. 6343) granting a pension to Harry Hirschenson;

A bill (H. R. 9393) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Ryan;

A bill (H. R. 9788) granting an increase of pension to George W. Blanchard;

A bill (H. R. 10286) granting a pension to Ellen M. Malloy;

A bill (H. R. 10288) granting a pension to Anna E. Harman;

A bill (H. R. 11293) granting an increase of pension to Frank Fuchs;

A bill (H. R. 14658) granting an increase of pension to Juliana H. Barry;

A bill (H. R. 12164) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Davis;

A bill (H. R. 14017) granting an increase of pension to Louis Voll;

A bill (H. R. 12727) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Coonley;

A bill (H. R. 13115) granting a pension to Sarah Jane Van Alstine; and

A bill (H. R. 12194) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Warren.

Mr. McCUMBER (for Mr. BALL), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8993) granting an increase of pension to Melvina Bottles, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also (for Mr. PATTERSON), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1994) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Chivington, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. PATTERSON), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1576) granting an increase of pension to Emily M. J. Cooley, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. PATTERSON), from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 14270) granting an increase of pension to Loucinda M. Thompson;

A bill (H. R. 13363) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin L. Commons;

A bill (H. R. 13371) granting an increase of pension to James T. Thompson;

A bill (H. R. 13869) granting a pension to Sarah M. Greer;

A bill (H. R. 18494) granting a pension to Cader B. Brent;

A bill (H. R. 13518) granting an increase of pension to Chester R. Heath;

A bill (H. R. 13527) granting an increase of pension to William Odeneheimer;

A bill (H. R. 10270) granting a pension to Mary F. Kenaday;

A bill (H. R. 10544) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Rhoads;

A bill (H. R. 13364) granting an increase of pension to John Cook;

A bill (H. R. 8822) granting a pension to Bird L. Francis;

A bill (H. R. 8921) granting an increase of pension to John McCollister;

A bill (H. R. 9963) granting a pension to Grace Miller;

A bill (H. R. 10062) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Murray;

A bill (H. R. 10182) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Innis; and

A bill (H. R. 11063) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. McMurtry.

Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4156) for the establishment of public convenience stations and bath houses, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. PETTUS on the 1st instant, authorizing the payment to Rittenhouse Moore out of the unexpended balance of the appropriation made in the act of March 3, 1899, for improving the Potomac River the sum of \$3,653.05 for overwidth dredging in the Potomac River below Washington, intended to be proposed to the general deficiency 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. SPOONER, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4651) for the relief of James T. Barry and Richard Cushion, executors of the last will and testament of Martin Dowling, deceased, reported it with amendments.

JULIUS A. KAISER.

Mr. PENROSE. I am directed by the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10891) for the relief of Julius A. Kaiser, to report it favorably without amendment, and I submit a report thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to pay to Julius A. Kaiser \$3,758.45, being the amount disallowed by the accounting officers for difference between active-duty pay of a second assistant engineer and retired pay of a first assistant engineer from October 13, 1868, to July 8, 1873, while on the active list of officers of the Navy.

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

JOHN BREMOND.

Mr. BAILEY. I am directed by the Committee on Finance to report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 12655) for the relief of John Bremond. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to pay to the order of John Bremond, of Austin, Tex., \$15, in redemption of certain interest coupons detached from United States 3 per cent coupon bonds, the original coupons having been lost or destroyed.

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

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 8687) authorizing the sale of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal bonds belonging to the District of Columbia was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (H. R. 11213) to extend the privilege of immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise to various subports in the customs collection district of Puget Sound, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (H. R. 14826) to amend the homestead laws as to certain unappropriated and unreserved lands in Nebraska was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

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

ELECTRICAL WIRING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3) to regulate electrical wiring in the District of Columbia, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert a substitute.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if it is not necessary to have the amendment read in full, I will move that the Senate agree to the amendment made by the House of Representatives. I have examined it very carefully.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think it is going a little too far to adopt an amendment which has never been read in the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I quite agree with the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. President, and will ask that the amendment be read.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I think there ought to be some order in the Senate, so that we can understand the measure that we are acting on. We can not hear a word of it, and we are asked to adopt it now. Never having heard it, I think there ought to be sufficient order in the Senate so that we can hear and understand it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment of the House of Representatives, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have power to make from time to time such rules and regulations respecting the production, use, and control of electricity for light, heat, and power purposes in the District of Columbia, not inconsistent with existing laws, as in their judgment will afford safety and convenience to the public; and the Commissioners of said District are further authorized and empowered to prescribe such fees for the examination of the electrical wiring, machinery, and appliances in buildings as they may deem proper, to be paid to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia, and any such rules and regulations shall after promulgation have the effect and force of law: *Provided*, That nothing in this act contained shall apply to the power plants or buildings of incorporated companies engaged in the production and distribution of electric current for public service or use.

SEC. 2. That the electrical engineer who shall be chief inspector of electrical work and his assistants are hereby empowered and required, under the direction of the Commissioners, to inspect any building in course of erection

and during reasonable hours to enter into and examine any building where electrical current is produced or utilized for lighting, heating, or for power, for the purpose of ascertaining violations of any of the provisions of this act; and upon finding any devices aforesaid defective or dangerous shall cause to be delivered a written notice of any violation of any provisions of this act, or of any regulation of said Commissioners duly adopted, to the contracting contractor, owner, or agent of any building directing him or them to remove or amend the same within a period to be fixed in said notice; and in case of neglect or refusal on the part of the party so notified to remove or amend the same within the time and in the manner prescribed by the chief inspector of electrical work, and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the party so offending shall pay a fine of not more than \$25 for each and every day's failure or neglect to remove or amend the same after being so notified, and in default of payment of such fine such person shall be confined in the workhouse of the District of Columbia for a period not exceeding one month; and all prosecutions under this act shall be in the police court of said District, in the name of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. That in the place of the present electrical engineer now carried on the per diem roll there be, and is hereby, established, under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the office of electrical engineer, and the Commissioners of said District are hereby authorized and directed to appoint an electrical engineer, at a salary of \$2,500 per annum, and said electrical engineer shall be an expert electrician, possessing a thorough knowledge of the most modern methods for the production, use, and control of electricity and electrical appliances, construction, wiring, and insulation, as well as such executive ability and adaptability to office work as is requisite for the efficient management of the said office. And the Commissioners are authorized and directed to appoint two electrical inspectors to assist in the work required by the authority of this act, at a salary of \$1,200 per annum each, who shall perform such clerical duties as may be required by the Commissioners.

SEC. 4. That it shall be unlawful for any person, company, or corporation generating current for electric light, heat, or power in the District of Columbia, to connect its system and furnish current for electrical purposes to any building or premises, the wiring of which shall not have been inspected and approved by the chief inspector of electrical work.

Any person, company, or corporation violating the provisions of this section shall, upon written notice from the chief inspector of electrical work to do so, immediately remove said connection and cut off the current, and shall not again supply said current until authorized by the said inspector. For failure to comply with said notice the offending person, company, or corporation shall be fined not less than \$5 nor more than \$100 for each and every day's failure or neglect to remove said connection and to cut off the current.

The chief inspector of electrical work is hereby authorized and empowered, with the approval of the Commissioners, to cause said connection to be removed and the current cut off upon such failure of the offending person, company, or corporation, and to refuse to permit said connection to be replaced and the current to be used until the wiring shall be put in proper and safe condition.

SEC. 5. That this act shall take effect ninety days from and after the approval thereof.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the provisions of this amendment, or bill, are very elaborate and there was so much confusion in the Chamber that I was unable to hear just what is contained in the proposition.

I wish the Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, would state to the Senate, as he can, no doubt, very readily, just what the fundamental provisions of this bill are, whether they have been considered fully by the committee and by the Senate, and whether this large control that is given to the Commissioners on the subject of electric wires and their application in this District extends by any chance to wires that belong to or are connected with railways.

I could not tell from the reading of the first part, there was so much noise, to what this jurisdiction is confined; and I shall be entirely content if the Senator will give us the explanation, because I know he looks into these matters with great thoroughness.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a little time ago the Senate passed a bill on this subject, and the amendment just read is a substitute made by the House of Representatives for that bill.

The bill had very careful consideration by the Committee on the District of Columbia. We gave a hearing to all parties in interest, the Commissioners of the District, the representatives of the several railroads, the street railroads particularly, and the contractors; and after considerable discussion and interchange of views the bill that was reported to the Senate and passed was agreed upon.

The bill does not interfere with the operation of the plants of the railroads. Those are left in the care of the men who are engaged in that business, and who have experts perhaps superior to those employed by the District of Columbia to look after their affairs.

It does take charge of the small electric plants that are scattered over the city—that is, it gives jurisdiction over them to the Commissioners—some of which are very poorly constructed and which ought to be supervised in some way. It gives jurisdiction to the Commissioners to see that electric wiring in private residences of the District is properly put in and to correct imperfect wiring when it has been reported to them and when it has been determined that it is imperfect.

Mr. President, that is the substance of the bill and all that is in it, as I understand it, and I have taken a great deal of interest in it. I think it is an extremely important subject. There is no question but that a very large proportion of the fires that occur at the present time are due to imperfect electric wiring, and heretofore there has been practically no supervision of that matter lodged in the hands of anyone in this District.

I think that is all I can say about it. I feel sure that the bill ought to pass.

Mr. HALE. My concern in the matter does not come from any solicitude about the plants of the company owning the electric wires, but as to whether there has been or possibly can be under this bill any change in or encroachment upon the policy that has been followed in the city of Washington that all electric wires operating street railways shall be underground.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; it does not deal with that question at all. I will assure the Senator that there is not the least danger of the Committee on the District of Columbia ever permitting a backward step to be taken in that matter. On the contrary, we have recently introduced and reported a bill permitting (it may seem strange that it was necessary) the Western Union Telegraph Company to put its wires underground. The Committee on the District of Columbia has called upon all these corporations to get rid, as speedily as possible, of the last pole and the last overhead wire in this District.

Mr. HALE. I am very glad that is being done by the committee. I want to see the day when every overhead wire of any kind in the city of Washington, given to any purpose whatever, disappears, so that we may not have them anywhere over our heads.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I can safely assure the Senator that that day is near at hand.

Mr. BURROWS. I should like to ask the Senator, as I see that this is a substitute for the Senate bill, wherein the substitute differs from the Senate bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that a good deal of verbiage in the Senate bill has been eliminated. I think the House did a good piece of work in writing the substitute. It likewise reduced, and I am sure the Senator from Michigan will be glad to know that fact, the machinery and the clerical force that was required under the Senate bill. That is about the only change made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire moves that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 5583) to amend an act entitled "An act granting a charter to the General Federation of Women's Clubs," approved March 3, 1901; which was read the first time by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 5584) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved March 3, 1903; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

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

A bill (S. 5585) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Lee (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 5586) granting an increase of pension to George Fuselman (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 5587) granting an increase of pension to Alfred McPherran.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 5588) to grant jurisdiction and authority to the Court of Claims in the case of Milton S. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 5589) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Burrell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 5590) providing for the promotion of Boatswain Patrick Deery, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5591) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Bigstone Gap, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 5592) granting an honorable discharge to Joshua T. Reynolds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5593) granting an honorable discharge to John Holderby; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 5594) for the relief of Robert G. Carter, United States Army (retired); which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 5595) for the relief of the estate of Roger A. Francis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 5596) granting an in-

crease of pension to Frederick W. Fout; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition of Frederick W. Fout, first lieutenant, Fifteenth Battery Indiana Volunteer Artillery, together with the affidavits of William Somerville, E. P. Stanton, Dr. H. L. Standinger, William Klanke, and James F. Brady. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MONEY submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to use the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$4,000 made by the sundry civil appropriation bill approved August 18, 1894, for the purpose of investigating and reporting upon the importation, use, transportation, and manufacture of high and low explosives, with a view to securing by legislation greater security for life and property, 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.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,874.53 to reimburse the State of Texas for expenses incurred in maintaining a civil government, etc., in what was then known as Greer County, Tex., now known as Greer County, Okla., 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.

Mr. MCCUMBER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$750 to pay Ormsby McHarg for indexing and for extra services as clerk to the Committee on Pensions, 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.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$750 to pay Dennis M. Kerr for services as assistant clerk to the Committee on Pensions, by detail, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HEYBURN submitted an amendment providing for the payment of certain deputy surveyors for surveys executed by them in the State of Idaho, in excess of the liability named in their respective contracts, 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.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$3,000 for the necessary survey, borings, etc., for the construction of a conduit to carry the water of Rock Creek from Lyons's mill to a point about 100 feet south of the south building line of O street, in the District of Columbia, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

SENECA INDIAN LANDS IN NEW YORK.

Mr. STEWART submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof appointed by its chairman, is hereby authorized to investigate the claim of the Ogden Land Company to the lands of the Seneca Nation of Indians in the State of New York, and the proposed allotment of said lands in severality to said Indians. Also to investigate and report upon such other matters affecting the Indians or the Indian Service as the committee shall consider expedient. Said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers, examine witnesses under oath, employ a stenographer and interpreter, and sit during the session or the recess of the Senate at such times and places as the committee may determine; and the actual and necessary expenses of said investigations to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

OLYMPIA HARBOR (WASHINGTON) IMPROVEMENT.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, at the earliest date practicable, to cause a survey to be made of the Olympia Harbor, State of Washington, and to submit an estimate for the improvement of said harbor to meet the demands of commerce.

INDEPENDENT STATE OF THE KONGO.

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

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas a memorial to Congress, signed by Rev. Thomas S. Barbour, of Boston, as chairman of a conference of missionary societies recently held in Washington, D. C., is presented in the Senate, in which conference the following-named societies were represented by their delegates, viz: Henry C. Mabie, D. D., home secretary American Baptist Missionary Union; Thomas S. Barbour, D. D., foreign secretary American Baptist Missionary Union; W. H. Leslie, M. D., missionary, American Baptist Missionary Union, at Banza Manteke, Africa; S. H. Chester, D. D., secretary Southern Presby-

terian Board; Rev. W. M. Morrison, missionary, Southern Presbyterian Board, at Luebo, Africa; D. W. Snyder, M. D., missionary, Southern Presbyterian Board, formerly at Luebo, Africa; Rev. Archibald McLean, president Foreign Christian Missionary Society; E. A. Layton, M. D., missionary, Foreign Christian Missionary Society, at Balengia; and

1. Whereas said memorialists are recognized as citizens who are worthy of public respect and confidence and as the representatives of associations organized for the purpose of Christian civilization, and as making, in good faith and upon credible testimony, true and authentic statements as to the present condition of the natives of the Independent State of the Kongo and of our citizens there and as to the causes of their sufferings and discontent; and

2. Whereas the matters stated in the memorial relating to the government of said state are such as to properly engage the attention of the Government of the United States, on the grounds and for the reasons therein set forth; and

3. Whereas it being proper that Congress, being thus memorialized and informed, should inform the President of their opinion as to the verity of the matters stated in the memorial, after due examination, so that the Government will be prepared, if it is necessary to bring the same earnestly to the attention of the signatory powers of the general act of Brussels of July 2, 1890, and the general act of the conference of Berlin in 1885; and also to the attention of the sovereign of the Independent State of the Kongo, in connection with our treaty with that ruler, proclaimed April 2, 1892. Therefore, it is

Resolved by the Senate, That said memorial, with all the accompanying documents, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

2. *Resolved*, That said committee is authorized to report by concurrent resolution, for the action of the Senate and House of Representatives, such measure and in such form as is considered appropriate to express the opinion of Congress upon the situation stated in said memorial, and as to the action, if any, that should be taken for the relief of our citizens in the Independent State of the Kongo, and of the natives of that State.

3. *Resolved*, That the memorial and the documents submitted therewith be printed, and that the same, except document numbered 10, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

By unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I think I ought to make a word of explanation about this matter before I ask the Senate to act upon it. The Senate knows that the Government of Great Britain and the sovereign of the Independent State of the Kongo are in controversy, based upon the report of the British consul to the Independent State of the Kongo as to the condition of the natives in that State and as to the rights of Great Britain and other signatory powers to have an examination of these reports under the provisions of the Berlin act and also the subsequent Brussels act covering this subject.

The memorial which I have had the honor to present to the Senate has been considered by a body of very able Americans who are connected with missionary enterprises in the Free State of Kongo. It is an admirably prepared paper, very conservative, and at the same time very distinct and very firm, accompanying which is a statement, which for the first time appears, of these missionaries, in regard to their observation of the state of facts in that country.

In presenting this memorial and asking the action of the Senate on it, I would not on my part assume to state what the condition of affairs is in that country, although I have the most implicit confidence in every word that has been stated in these documents. I therefore propose to refer the whole subject to the Committee on Foreign Relations in the form that it is presented here for their consideration and examination, so that they may present the facts to the Congress of the United States as they believe them to exist, at least that portion of the facts that is included in the documents that accompany this memorial, and to advise the President, so that in acting in this matter he shall be assured of the verity of these statements so far as we can assure him.

An examination of the papers, Mr. President, is due to the very able and distinguished body of men who have brought the matter forward. It has occurred to me that that is the proper way to do it, and to make no recommendation at all of what the Committee on Foreign Relations shall do, but ask them to make an inquiry, to examine the papers, and pronounce their opinion upon their verity and authenticity.

The sovereign of the Independent State of the Kongo is in controversy with the Government of Great Britain upon the verity of the report of their consul, who is also the representative of the United States, by request, in the Free State of the Kongo. On my part, I have not the slightest doubt that his representations are entirely just and correct. Still that is a matter with which we have no concern, at least for the present, and we may never have any concern about it.

I wish to say also to the Senate that the American negro is not mentioned or alluded to in these papers at all; his status, political or otherwise, is not referred to in the slightest way. The question concerns entirely the condition of the natives of the Independent State of the Kongo, and deserves to be very carefully examined into.

The matter will probably not be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I do not think it ought to be, until the vacation of the Congress, so that the committee will have ample time to study up the situation. There is a good deal of history connected with it with which the members of that committee are perhaps not very familiar. I trust that the resolution which I base upon this memorial will be adopted and the subject go to the

Committee on Foreign Relations. I submitted the matter to some members of that committee, and they seem to be entirely satisfied that that is the right course to pursue.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. HALE. I rose to ask the Senator who has introduced the resolution if he knows the extent of the documents and papers that he has asked to have printed in the RECORD? Let me say here—

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator will allow me, I ought to have made a statement in regard to that.

Mr. HALE. Before the Senator goes on, let me state that I ask this question because my attention has been called to the RECORD of this morning. A Senator—as he had a right to do—asked the Senate that certain documents might be printed in the RECORD relating to a subject-matter then before the Senate. I see, on examination, that some fifteen or sixteen or more pages of fine print embracing that matter are in the RECORD this morning.

Now, I do not find fault with the Senator who asked yesterday that this should be done, nor with the Senator from Alabama, who asks the same kind of thing to-day; but the object of the RECORD, Mr. President, is not that it should be filled up with matters of that kind. It ought to be a record of the actual proceedings of Congress—the speeches that are made or the remarks upon every subject whatever; but if we are to put into it every document which illustrates the subject-matter which has been before a committee or which has been before a Department, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which is already so voluminous and contains so many big volumes that it is difficult to handle it or to follow it, will become so bulky and unwieldy that nobody will pay any attention to it. Therefore I have asked the Senator from Alabama to state to the Senate the extent of the documents and papers which he asks may be entered upon the pages of the RECORD.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, there are ten documents accompanying the memorial. The tenth document is the correspondence and report of His Majesty's consul at Boma respecting the administration of the Kongo Free State. I ask that that may be printed as a part of the memorial as a document, but not to go into the RECORD, for the reason that it is accessible through other sources to the American people, who feel a very profound interest in this question. The remaining nine documents are brief typewritten papers, which perhaps would not occupy more than three or four pages of the RECORD.

Mr. HALE. To that, of course, I should not object. I wish other Senators would take an interest in this matter, and help see to it that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not so stuffed with matter, which may in itself be good, but which ought not to go into the RECORD, for the reason that it is published as the record of our proceedings. I do not object to the request of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MORGAN. I will be very careful not to load the RECORD with any matter that is not absolutely part of the memorial and which is otherwise accessible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senate agree to the resolution of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]?

The resolution was agreed to.

The papers referred to in the resolution are as follows:

MEMORIAL CONCERNING CONDITIONS IN THE INDEPENDENT STATE OF THE KONGO.

To the Congress of the United States of America:

As authorized representatives of American organizations conducting missionary and philanthropic work in the Independent State of the Kongo in Africa, we would respectfully invite the attention of your honorable bodies to certain conditions at present existing in that State which affect vitally the well-being of the people, and concern also the rights and interests of persons from other countries desiring to reside in the State and conduct business or philanthropic enterprises. In the gravity of the case as related both to the present and future well-being of so vast a multitude of people and to our own interests and our honorable obligation as a nation, in the fact that statements are widely circulated not only making denial of the existence of these conditions, but tending to confuse the issue presented, and in the seriousness of the action we ask from you is our excuse for dwelling at length upon the considerations which we submit for your judgment.

THE INDEPENDENT STATE OF THE KONGO A CREATION OF WESTERN POWERS.

You will recall that the Government known as the "Independent State of the Kongo" was unique in its origin. It came into being by act of an assembly representing all the nations of the western world. In the original movement looking toward the creation of this Government, Leopold, the King of Belgium, bore a leading part, and invited the assemblage of the conference at Berlin, in 1885. A company of geographers, travelers, and philanthropists, representing a number of European countries, had been called together by him in September, 1878. By this conference an organization, known as the "International African Association," was constituted. A few years later a society was organized for a purpose described by one of its members as that of "studying what might be made of the Kongo River and its basin." This society, including at first representatives of several European countries of prominence in the commercial and monetary world, soon came almost exclusively under Belgian control. Having the same officers with the original International Association, it soon practically superseded that organization, and, though in no true sense international, it renamed itself "The International Association of the Kongo."

THE UNITED STATES FOREMOST IN FAVORABLE ACTION.

After some years spent in visits of exploration to the Congo State, the association reported that it had entered into treaty relations with more than 40 chiefs of the Congo territory and sought recognition as a quasi political power. Other plans found favor with certain European powers. A treaty was tentatively concluded between England and Portugal, involving large recognition of the rights of the latter country in western Africa. Representatives of the international association appealed strongly to our own Government in the interest of opposition to this treaty and to any other form of agreement unsatisfactory to the association. As a result of this appeal, after favorable recommendation by President Arthur, the United States Government, on April 22, 1884, granted recognition to the association in the following terms:

"In harmony with the traditional policy of the United States, which enjoins a proper regard for the commercial interests of their citizens, while at the same time avoiding interference with controversies between other powers, as well as alliances with other nations, the Government of the United States announces its sympathy with and approval of the humane and benevolent purposes of the International Association of the Congo, administering, as it does, the interests of the free states there established, and will order the officers of the United States, both on land and sea, to recognize the flag of the international association as the flag of a friendly government."

This action, taken at this critical juncture, proved determinative of the issue presented in the claims preferred by the international association. The Government of Germany soon assumed a favorable attitude. The Anglo-Portuguese treaty was withdrawn. Conventions were made with the association by Great Britain and other powers. Meanwhile a conference, in which fourteen states were represented, including the American Government, was convened at Berlin, as a result of which, in January, 1885, definite sanction was given to the establishment of a free state in the basin of the Congo, and principles regulative of its powers were adopted. Six months later, on the 1st of August, 1885, the association adopted formally the new title of The Independent State of the Congo. Thus a new state, of which Leopold II was recognized as sovereign and sole administrator, was constituted. Such is the remarkable story of the way by which an individual attained to power, unlimited by internal, legislative, or judicial restraint, over a territory four times as great as that of France or the German Empire.

TERRITORY, CLIMATE, AND PEOPLE.

The Independent State of the Congo includes a territory upward of a million square miles in extent. Having a frontage of about 400 miles upon the Atlantic coast, it broadens vastly in the interior, comprising nearly all the basin of the Congo River. This great river, second only to the Amazon in the volume of its waters, with innumerable tributary streams, both enriches the land and affords access to all sections of the great area.

The climate in the coast district is unfavorable for protracted residence, but the elevated plateaus of the interior districts offer an attractive temperature and conditions in general favorable to health. Grazing for cattle is found on the grassy plains, and the timber lands, when cleared, prove at once reasonably fertile, producing the vegetables common in our markets, while the forests abound in tropical fruits. The most valuable product of the forest is supplied by the India-rubber vine, the Independent State of the Congo leading all other sections of the earth in its supply of this commercial product. It is evident that the resources of the country rightly conserved and developed would secure for it wealth indefinitely great and a corresponding position in the world's commerce.

The native peoples, of many tribes and languages, are variously estimated as numbering between twenty and thirty millions. The earliest white visitors to the country give pleasant testimony to the traits of native character. As a rule, they were welcomed and found the people ready to receive instruction. In certain sections considerable progress had been made in the development of the arts. Dr. Hinde, for example, who accompanied the expedition of Baron Dhanis for the overthrow of the Arab slave power, speaks of his surprise in finding "masons, brickmakers, agriculturists, and ironworkers." (The Fall of the Congo Arabs, p. 194, cited in Civilization in Congoland, by H. R. Fox Bourne, p. 159.) Independence, alertness of mind, curiosity, and readiness to adopt new customs are noted by travelers as characteristics of the people. In no country has missionary work found a people more hospitable or more responsive.

There was therefore apparently all ground for the hope that the work upon which this newly created government was entering by sanction of the nations, while encountering many difficulties, would result in a constantly broadening development by which increasing blessings should come to the people, and the land should offer an attractive home to neighboring peoples and to any persons in our own country of African descent who might desire to find a home in their ancestral land.

THE PROFESSION OF DISINTERESTED PHILANTHROPY.

This hope was encouraged by the profession made by those seeking recognition for the State. The enterprise of King Leopold found favor because it was supposed to represent two noble ideals—a generous philanthropy and impartial freedom of commerce for all the world. The announcement made by promoters of the enterprise was definite and reiterated. The proposed State was not to exist for exploitation of the resources of the country with a view to gain to accrue to those establishing it: it was to exist for the benefit of the native people. Indeed, at one stage, the secretary of the association had written declaring that the movement had in contemplation "the establishment of a republican confederation of free negroes, the King simply serving the right to name the president of the confederation." This thought was discredited by other promoters of the enterprise as offering too high an ideal for early realization; but the affirmation of the philanthropic character of the enterprise was incessant. Mr. Stanley, when speaking in advocacy of the movement before the London Chamber of Commerce, said:

"The founders of the International Association have been called dreamers. Some can not appreciate rightly, because there are no dividends attaching to it, this restless, ardent sentiment, which seeks to extend civilizing influences among the dark races, and to brighten up with the glow of civilization the dark places of sad-browed Africa."

Our own Government in taking the leadership in granting recognition to the State emphasized the high ideals which it was thought to represent. In his message to Congress in December, 1885, President Arthur dwelt upon the exalted character of these ideals. He said: "The objects of this society are philanthropic. It does not aim at permanent political control, but seeks the neutrality of the valley." Our Government's recognition of the State was in express terms an announcement of "its sympathy with and approval of the humane and benevolent purposes" of the association.

Equally explicit was the understanding determining the action of the conference at Berlin, in which our Government participated, but whose action it did not formally ratify because of the ideal controlling relations with foreign states. The preamble of the "General act of the Berlin conference" declares that the conference is "concerned as to the means of furthering the moral and material well-being of the native populations."

Prince Bismarck, in an introductory address to the conference, declared that in convening it the Imperial Government of Germany was guided "by

the conviction that all the governments invited agreed in wishing to bring the natives of Africa within the pale of civilization" * * * "by giving its inhabitants the means of instructing themselves, by encouraging missions and enterprises calculated to spread useful knowledge, and by preparing the way for the overthrow of slavery." At the close of the sessions of the conference Prince Bismarck paid honor to "His Majesty King of the Belgians" as "the founder of a work" * * * "which should confer precious service on the cause of humanity," and added, "I pray for the prosperous development of the State and for the fulfillment of the noble aspirations of its illustrious founder."

These expectations were based on the purpose avowed by the King of Belgium himself. "Our only programme, I am anxious to repeat," he said in a published letter, "is the work of moral and material regeneration." President Cleveland was true to the impression widely made when in announcing the organization of the Independent State of the Congo he wrote in his first annual message in December, 1885: "It is fortunate that a benighted region, owing all it has of quickening civilization to the beneficence and philanthropic spirit of this monarch, should have the advantage and security of his benevolent supervision."

FREEDOM OF TRADE GUARANTEED.

And not only is it true that the aim professedly controlling the founding of the Independent State of the Congo was philanthropic, the understanding was definite that nothing of the nature of an individual monopoly was contemplated. The State was to be open to unrestricted commerce. This understanding appears in letters written by the promoters of the enterprise before its recognition by our Government, in the language of our state papers, in the pledges recorded in the act of the conference at Berlin, and in the explicit declaration made by the King when the name, the "Independent State of Congo," was adopted. It was declared, indeed, that neither directly nor indirectly would the Government of the State trade or traffic.

President Arthur, in his message of December, 1884, says: "The importance of the rich prospective trade of the Congo Valley has led to the general conviction that it should be opened to all nations on equal terms." Opposition to the tentative treaty by which England proposed recognition of the rights of Portugal in the Congo Valley was based explicitly upon the fear that under Portuguese administration the commercial rights of other nations would not be safeguarded.

The general act adopted by the Berlin conference is explicit in its provision for assuring respect for the full and equal commercial rights of all nations. Its first article provides, under the heading "Declaration relative to freedom of trade in the basin of the Congo, its mouths, and circumjacent regions," that "the trade of all nations shall enjoy complete freedom."

In closing the conference, Prince Bismarck said: "The resolutions we are on the point of sanctioning secure to the commerce of all nations free access to the center of the African continent. The guarantees which will be provided for freedom of trade in the Congo basin are of a nature to offer to the industries of all nations the conditions most favorable to the development of their security."

Such was the understanding and the purpose of those through whose action the Independent State was constituted. It was not because national governments desired to give to one man commercial privileges of vast value that they consigned the government of this newly opened territory to his care. It was because they would retain these commercial privileges as a due possession for all peoples that this new State was given its being.

THE CATALOGUE OF WRONGS.

The fact to which our information concerning conditions in the Independent State of the Congo makes it our painful duty to ask your attention is that the anticipated realization of these humane, liberal, and just ideals has not been reached by the Government of the Congo State, but has been and is now directly thwarted by the methods of administration which the Government has adopted. Fidelity to the facts known to us compels the statement that the country to-day, throughout great sections, is suffering from a grievous oppression characterized by well-nigh incredible abuses of the people.

The story of personal sufferings is a heartrending one. Among the wrongs alleged in the documents accompanying our memorial are forced labor; the forced contribution of food stuffs and other supplies for the State stations and the stations of monopolist companies licensed by the State, and for the 30,000 men of the regular and irregular militia; forced military service under conditions unjust alike to the soldiers and the people; direct imposts dependent upon the arbitrary will of subordinate officials or commanders of detachments of the militia, and the exaction throughout the rubber-producing districts of a heavy toll of this product—all this without respect to the consent or desire and with slight regard to the ability of the people. The requirements become more and more burdensome as the population diminishes and the supplies obtainable in the territories adjoining native villages are exhausted. In many instances the people are required to make contributions to the State of articles which they do not possess and which they must purchase at a cost greatly in excess of the price allowed them for supplying it. Remuneration for the contributions made is slight. The right to remuneration, indeed, has been denied. An exponent of the policy of the King's Government declared in the Belgian Parliament that whatever remuneration is given is a gratuity.

It is—so the testimony presented by us indicates—in connection with the enforcement of these demands made by the State upon the people that the cruelties by which the land is scourged have developed. The native is driven to his task by a remorseless physical compulsion. For evasion of the task, or for failure to perform it to the full on account of whatever inability, punishments of a most shocking character are appointed. They include the seizure of women, who, chained neck to neck, are forced away from their homes and held as so-called "hostages"; the burning of villages; the indiscriminate slaughter of the people pursued and hunted in the forests to which they flee; the mutilation of the living and the dead.

Horror is added to horror in the dreadful catalogue of reported wrongs. It would be difficult to name a form of atrocity belonging to any history of shameless conquest or of primitive savagery which fails to find a place in this record. The impressing of recruits for the army and for the forces of laborers is accomplished by use of the methods made familiar by the slave raids, which it was thought to be the high mission of the Government of this State to abolish. Slavery practically is restored throughout the State by the action of long terms of service for those professedly freed from bondage, and in certain sections the slave market is wide open under Government protection. Griesome stories are told of the customs of leaders of scattered bands of the militia of bringing in the hands of the dead as proof that the retribution required from them has been inflicted, and of orgies of cannibals systematically permitted to prey upon the bodies of their victims as reward for their work of slaughter.

The testimony to these enormities is of such a character that, morally incredible as the stories seem, we are unable to doubt that they reproduce all too faithfully conditions prevailing through wide sections of the independent Congo State. This testimony, now for many years, has come to the outer world from residents of the State in a steady, unintermittent stream. The list of witnesses includes missionaries, travelers, explorers, consular residents,

and agents of the State who have wearied of the work in which confessedly they had participated.

THE RELUCTANT TESTIMONY OF MISSIONARIES.

It should be borne in mind that the missionary is a reluctant witness against the government under which he lives. It is his desire, and it is for his personal interest, to cultivate the favor of the government, and the missionary devoted to his work will bear much rather than risk a total loss of power to be of service to the people. The testimony of missionaries connected with our American societies, as offered by us, includes that of Rev. G. B. Murphy (Document I), whose statement was published in the *London Times*, November 18, 1895; that of Rev. J. V. Sjoblom (Document II), presented to the British Government in the year 1898, of whose testimony, as given at a meeting of the *Aborigines Protection Society*, Sir Charles Dilke, who was present at the meeting, has recently said:

"I undertake to say that there was not a single person present who was not constrained to believe every syllable he uttered. His statement has never been shaken in any way."

Another witness adds:

"Apparently almost a dying man, he spoke with broken voice, but intense earnestness in simple language that left none of his hearers in doubt as to the absolute truthfulness with which he recounted his experience of five years' residence in the Equateur district."

Rev. Joseph Clark (Document III), Rev. A. Billington (Document IV), and Rev. C. L. Whitman (Document V), who are now at stations on the upper Kongo River, and Edwin A. Layton, M. D. (Document VI), and Rev. W. M. Morrison (Document VII), who are now in this country, are able, if this is desired, to supplement their testimony by personal words.

We would call particular attention to the testimony of Mr. Sjoblom, and to that of Mr. Morrison. The first, relating to a time seven years ago, is graphic and detailed, and the latter makes the reader almost a spectator of the scenes of horror as they are revealed in certain sections of the Kongo State at this very hour. Note his description of his colleague's visit to the stockade, where a marauding band of cannibal savages in the service of the State had murdered helpless prisoners, and where eighty-one severed hands were slowly drying over a fire.

To this missionary testimony we would add also that of two missionaries of the English Baptist mission, Rev. John H. Weeks (Document VIII) and Rev. A. E. Scrivener (Document IX). Both are living in the far interior of the State. The former tells the story of impressions made upon him on a recent return to Africa after a time of furlough, and the latter gives a detailed record of a journey made by him in the summer of 1903 through the domaines privés of the King.

WITNESSES OF MANY CALLINGS.

This testimony of missionaries finds impressive reinforcement in the testimony of more transient dwellers in the land. That of Mr. Ewart S. Grogan, who, in the volume *From the Cape to Cairo*, tells the story of a journey made by him in the year 1899 (see p. 227); that of Mr. Pickersgill, consul of the British Government, given in an official report in 1898 (see citations from this report in *Civilization in Kongo Land*, by Mr. H. R. Fox-Bourne, pp. 177-180); that of Colonel Williams (see *Affairs of West Africa*, by E. D. Morel, p. 320), an officer in King Leopold's army, who, in the year 1891, denounced to the King the outrages occurring under his administration; that of Major Parminster, a pioneer of the earlier days, who, in 1892, sought the assistance of the *Aborigines Protection Society* in exposing the conduct of the Kongo Government, but who afterwards was pacified by the King (see pp. 132-134, *Civilization in Congoland*); that of M. Moray (see p. 252 of *Civilization in Congoland*), a former agent of one of the great monopolist companies now licensed by the King; that of Senator M. Edouard Pickard, a member of the Belgian Senate, who wrote of impressions made during a visit to the Kongo in 1893 (see *En Congolie*, pp. 95-97, as cited in *Civilization in Congoland*, pp. 244, 245, 248, 249).

In these testimonies the same features grow cruelly familiar—the lash, the raids of soldiers, the terror of the villagers, the weighing of baskets of rubber brought in by trembling natives, the scourging with the chicotte, of hippopotamus hide, the burning of villages, indiscriminate massacre, the severed hands, the excesses of cannibalism.

A COMPANION OF MR. STANLEY.

Perhaps no one of these testimonies made in published volumes is more significant than that of Mr. E. J. Glave, for a time a subordinate of Mr. Stanley in the Kongo International Association, the author of the volume *Six Years in the Congo*, published in 1892, for which Mr. Stanley wrote an introduction in which he gave strong commendation of the character of the author. Mr. Glave revisited the Kongo after an absence of six years, and his record of the scenes witnessed by him as he made his way over the route followed previously with Mr. Stanley is given in articles contributed to the *Century Magazine*. (See articles "New conditions in Central Africa," vols. 53, 54.) At first he is perplexed and incredulous.

December 6 he writes: "I do not think the Belgians are going the right way to work." December 7: "It is said, but I must have it corroborated, that the white officer *** has commissioned several chiefs to make raids and bring him the slaves. They are supposed to be taken out of slavery and freed, but I fail to see how this can be argued out. *** Peaceful families have been broken up. If these conditions are to exist, I fail to see how the anti-slavery movement is to benefit the native." (See *Century Magazine*, vol. 53, p. 307.)

As he advances, the entries in his journal reveal the growth of his deep indignation and abhorrence. December 11 he writes: "The whole country is being beset by the dreadful and thoroughly unjustifiable conduct of the soldiers." (Vol. 53, p. 913.)

December 17 he writes again: "I do not think the natives are making much out of this partition of Africa. This antislavery movement has its dark side also. In stations in charge of white men—Government soldiers—one sees strings of poor, emaciated, old women, some of them mere skeletons, tramping about in gangs with a rope about the neck—naked, except for a miserable patch of cloth. They are prisoners of war. They form a miserable spectacle. (Vol. 53, p. 912.)

January 3: "This station is surrounded by villages paying tribute. It has 5,000 auxiliaries who are sent all over the country to beat the natives into submission." (Vol. 53, p. 915.)

February 28. "We left Equateur after taking on a cargo of 100 small slaves, principally boys 7 or 8 years old, with a few girls among the batch, all stolen from the natives. They talk of philanthropy and civilization. Where it is I do not know." (Vol. 54, p. 708.)

March 12. "Everywhere I hear the same news of the doings of the Kongo Free State—rubber and murder—slavery in its worst form." (Vol. 54, p. 709.)

April 5. "I saw the dead body of a carrier lying on the trail. He was nothing but skin and bone. These posts ought to give some care to porters. The heartless disregard for life is abominable. No wonder the State is hated." (Vol. 54, p. 713.)

Arriving at Matadi, where his death occurred a few days later, Mr. Glave wrote, April 5: "If the Arabs had been the masters, this would be styled 'iniquitous trafficking in human flesh and blood,' but, being under the ad-

ministration of the Kongo Free State, it is merely a part of their philanthropic system of liberating the natives." (Vol. 54, p. 796.)

REPORT OF BRITISH CONSUL—ACTION BY BRITISH PARLIAMENT.

A notable confirmation and reenforcement of all this testimony is found in an official report made in February of the present year by Mr. Roger Casement, His Britannic Majesty's consul in the Independent State of the Kongo, by whom official service has been rendered to our own Government in the absence of consular representation in this State. We submit herewith his painstaking and comprehensive testimony, given after a journey through interior districts, the straightforward, regretful fidelity of which we think can not fail to be apparent to every fair-minded reader. (Document X.) A single citation from the elaborate document will illustrate its character. Mr. Casement paid a visit to a large company of refugees who had sought an asylum beyond the borders of the Kongo State. He says:

"I saw and questioned several groups of these people, whom I found to be industrious blacksmiths and brassworkers. The statements made to me by them were of such a nature that I could not believe them to be true. *** On reaching Bolobo in September I obtained information amply confirming the statements." (For extended account of interview with these natives and the stories of massacre and mutilation given by them, see report of Mr. Casement, p. 60-64.)

In this connection we would call your attention to the fact that, even before the testimony of Mr. Casement had been received, the British Parliament, after an exhaustive investigation of the testimony submitted to it, by unanimous vote took action looking to intervention by the signatory parties of the Berlin agreement. It has addressed these powers upon the subject and has placed in their hands the report of Mr. Casement. The British premier publicly declared that the proofs of the existence of grave abuses were overwhelming.

ARRAIGNMENT IN GERMANY AND IN THE BELGIAN PARLIAMENT.

It is noteworthy also that the German Colonial Society, a body with a membership of 32,000, has issued a public appeal in a similar vein, expressing its conviction of the conclusiveness of testimony as to conditions in this State. Even in the Belgian House of Representatives a resolution was strongly supported demanding inquiry into administration of the government of the Kongo State on the ground that the charges against it were established beyond disproof or contradiction.

The documents and citations presented we offer in part as direct testimony and in part as collateral reports in support of the position we would urge, namely, that there is ample ground for inquiry into conditions in the Kongo State by those to whom right of inquiry belongs. The testimony varies in the gravity of conditions indicated, reports becoming more dark as districts more remote from the coast are touched. Of the situation in regions far removed from missionary stations and the path of travelers, where the native soldiers are quite without restraint in following out their impulses, a suggestion is given in the record of the journey of Mr. Scrivener through a section of the Domaine Prive and in a chapter of the report of Mr. Casement.

PROOF MADE SUPERFLUOUS BY OPEN ADOPTION OF AN INDEFENSIBLE SYSTEM.

But we have now to remind you that, decisive as is the evidence of wrong suffered by the natives under the rule of the Independent State of the Kongo, the presentation of specific proofs of wrong is made almost superfluous. For the government of the Independent State of the Kongo undeniably has followed a course which involves, apparently, a central breach of faith with the powers creating it and with the native people whom it was appointed to serve, and this course is such that by it the wrongs to which the testimony cited bears witness are invited and made inevitable. The root of administrative evils in the government of the Independent State of the Kongo is in its monopolization of the territory and the resources of the State.

The astonishing claim leading to this action is now traceable in a document issued July 1, 1885, which at the time was supposed to be dictated by concern for the rights of the natives. It declared that "no one may dispossess any native of lands occupied by him," adding that "all vacant land is considered as belonging to the State." Later, through successive public edicts, it became clear that the term "vacant" was to be interpreted as meaning all territory in the State with the exception of the sites of the native villages, and the gardens of such villages. This was consummated, without offer of compensation to the natives, this appropriation by the government of all the vast Kongo territory save the little areas occupied by villages and gardens.

Certain monopolist companies have been created in which the King has controlling financial interest, either through ownership of a majority of the stock, or through demands upon the revenues; but more than 800,000 acres are set apart as belonging to the "domaine prive" of the King. Forest and plain, hill and valley, the river and its affluents, are his private possession.

And the claim applies not simply to the territory, but all products of this immense region, native or developed by cultivation, are claimed as the King's personal property, even the produce of the gardens. The natives may not trade in these products; they may only bring them to the King's agents for such compensation as the agents choose to allow.

AN ARMY OF SAVAGES.

The relation of these extraordinary claims to the evils from which the land is suffering is easily traced. The products of the country must be collected by the natives, and, all true motive for industry having been destroyed, no resort remains but that of compulsion. A body of armed men is required for enforcement of the King's will. This body must be secured through raids upon the native tribes, and the more savage tribes are chosen by preference. The captives are taken far from their homes, and after a time of restraint are commissioned for the appointed service. This "force publique" in 1896 was a force of 8,500 men; six years later it had more than doubled in numbers. In addition to this native force, the monopolist companies are allowed to raise auxiliary forces, and savage tribes are made the allies of the State for prosecution of the same ends. This force as a whole is now believed to comprise a body of 30,000 men.

The character of the work of these men is indicated in the words of M. Edouard Pickard, a member of the Belgian Senate: "Their ferocity equals that of a pack of hounds hunting their quarry." (En Congolie, p. 301.) See citation in *Civilization in Congoland*, p. 249. Unrestrained by natural sentiments of compassion, held severally responsible for securing at any cost the appointed tributes from the people, officered by men incited to their task by promise of "bounties proportionate to the results obtained," these barbaric hordes are let loose upon the people. Their representative in the villages is "the sentry," whose work is to secure the appointed levy of rubber or other products, and who is practically without restraint upon his savage propensities. He is described by one visitor to the country as a "dare-devil aborigine armed with a rifle, his power limited only by such repression as the government chooses to use." It was of these men Mr. Glave wrote, "The black soldiers are bent on fighting and raiding; they want no peaceful settlement. They have good rifles and ammunition, realize their superiority over the natives with their bows and arrows, and they want to shoot and kill and rob, *** whether the victim be man, woman, or child, and no matter how defenseless." It is apparent that of such a system wrongs and atrocities are the certain product. (Century Magazine, vol. 53, p. 908.)

It should be borne in mind that the subordinate agents of Government, if continuing in its service, are made practically helpless. Receiving instruction to furnish a given number of soldiers and a certain amount of rubber, with the understanding that they must employ whatever means are necessary, they know of no methods adequate for the end except those involving appeal to fear. Mr. Glave says that most white officers are averse to the India-rubber régime of the State, but the laws command it. It would be unjust not to recognize that the conditions prevailing have aroused distress in men connected with the Government, yet it is to be feared that it is only a few of these who have the interests of the people at heart, and these are powerless to stem the tide of oppression. The punishment of subordinates, whether soldiers or white officers, even if honestly attempted, would not reach the evil. The fault is not theirs primarily. It belongs to the system and to the authority responsible for the establishment and enforcement of that system. Proofs of individual guilt become of secondary consequence as compared with the question as to the essential character and the certain results of the system which the Government of the State has ordained.

From the considerations thus presented it is apparent that the course pursued by the sovereign of the Independent State of the Congo has laid his Government open to question in respect to violation of the trusts committed to it. Apparently that Government has not been true to the faith solemnly plighted in behalf of the native peoples. Before the world and before God the sovereign pledged himself in the Berlin conference to safeguard the interests of the natives and to insure to them the benefits of peace and of civilization. The few specimens obtainable of the treaties made by Mr. Stanley with native chiefs in the name of the International Association, before the Berlin conference had been convened, show that that association pledged itself to protect the people from oppression, but in place of protection and fostering care for their welfare under the Government in which the rights and powers of that association were merged, they have suffered from every form of ill usage which a savage inhumanity could devise, and the ruler who promised them protection has imposed upon them the one wholesale wrong, the parent of all lesser acts of injustice, the cruelty of dispossessing them of their ancient rights in their native land. In these lands they held dominion under tribal government, hunting in the forests and gathering the products of forest and field. Now the people practically are slaves upon their native soil. They may not for their own benefit collect its produce; they may not barter it for merchandise; they may only bring it to the agents of the Congo for such return as it is the pleasure of the agents to make. This is slavery in fact. It is the imposition of bondage under the name of government.

THE TWOFOLD BETRAYAL OF TRUST—THE DEFRAUDING OF THE NATIONS.

And the crime against the natives is a crime against the nations. The people may not trade, and have nothing with which to trade. So the trader from another land may not buy. The Berlin agreement, in its opening article, affirmed that the trade of all nations should enjoy complete freedom. So solicitous was the conference at Berlin for the safeguarding of this right that in the protocol of the general act of Berlin it was provided that no modifications of the agreement should be introduced tending to hamper the liberty of trade. No other thought could have been in the minds of the members of this conference than that of freedom in the only kind of trade possible in Africa—the collecting and sale by the natives of their products in exchange for such European merchandise as they should desire to secure. Today, with the exception of the narrow district of the lower Congo where free trade hampered by taxation still exists in diminishing volume, the entire territories of the Congo State have been converted into a vast monopoly.

Above Stanley Pool trade does not exist. For fifteen years the great territory of the "Domaine Privé" of the King has been closed to all commercial enterprises. The territory along the Kassai River, for a time left to freedom of trade, has now been forced into a monopoly, with the State as its chief stockholder. The commercial companies representing the King were reconstructed a few years since, being brought under the law of the Congo State, by which they are not required to make public their transactions. The earlier traders have been dispossessed and driven from the country. The purchase of products from a native by a foreign trader is now a crime, exposing the trader to severe legal penalties and severer arbitrary punishments. The story of the execution of Mr. Charles Henry Stokes (see Civilization in Congoland, pp. 200-202, 266-270), a trader in ivory, who was hanged by a representative of the Government in 1895, and that of the arrest and subsequent death of Herr Rabinek, who originally possessed a license for trade, but was refused recognition after reorganization of the Katanga Company, are suggestive of the fortune appointed for those who presume upon the binding force of the pledges given originally by the Government of the Congo State.

Such is the system and policy openly adopted and defended by the Government of the Independent State of the Congo, apparently the direct negation of the two principles made prominent in its original professions and determinative of the action at Berlin.

But a presentment against the Government of the Independent State of the Congo might not inappropriately be based also on another ground, that of the result following from this rule. The development confidently looked for has not resulted from the experiment entered upon with the solemn sanction of western powers.

ACCUSING FIGURES.

One need but consult official reports to discover conclusive evidence of this. Among public expenses, we find an item of 7,700,000 francs for the public force, the soldiery, by whom the exactions of government are enforced, while for public works the expenditure is 1,000,000 francs.

Not less suggestive are figures relating to the commerce of the country. For the year 1901 exportation was \$10,035,200; of this amount, exports of rubber and ivory represented \$9,585,800. Thus the exportation of other products, representative of such industries as develop the capabilities of the people and the resources of the country, were but \$449,400. It should be added that about 97 per cent of the small general trade thus reported is almost exclusively the exportation of palm products from the Lower Congo by the Dutch house. Of the export of rubber about 50 per cent is from the private domain of the King, the remainder from territories worked by the monopolist companies.

Equally instructive is the comparative table of exports and imports. During a period of four years we find a total exportation of \$33,800,000, the imports during the same period being \$17,346,000, the importation thus representing less than one-half the exportation, a situation said to be without parallel in European colonies. When to this it is added that 70 per cent of this importation represents supplies for government, stores for the railway, arms and ammunition for the military force, it will be seen how small is the inflow to the State as a whole from the products of the world's industry and invention, and how insignificant is the tidal rill from the great ocean of the world's material wealth which trickles beyond the relatively favored district by the Atlantic coast. When it is recalled that Mr. Stanley predicted for Great Britain alone an annual trade with the Congo of £20,000,000, the failure of the rule of its Government to realize the possibilities supposed to be opened before it becomes apparent.

THE ABSENCE OF THE SCHOOL AND THE HOSPITAL.

And we seek in vain in the Congo State for those forms of service which it is the high privilege of civilized governments to render to their peoples.

Where is the school system which it should have founded? Where is the hospital system with which it should have ministered to the physical need of the people? Apparently the one movement bearing a resemblance to philanthropic effort is the plan by which orphans, with the State's approval, may be taken under the care of religious or philanthropic associations; but these orphans are the hapless little ones left parentless and homeless by the military raids, and visitors to the country reproduce no more dreadful scenes than those connected with the transportation of these children from their village homes to those to whose care they are committed. Certain material enterprises, as the railway, bear witness to great energy and perseverance, though themselves identified with terrible cost to the lives of the natives; but these enterprises are connected directly with the one aim which unhappily seems to have absorbed the energies of the Government, that of enriching itself by a swift exploitation of the natural products of the State.

A BROKEN-SPRITED PEOPLE.

This presentment against the Government of the State on the score of the results following upon its work is not simply of a negative character. The misrule of government affects directly the life of the people in that it takes away all incentive to labor by depriving them of the rewards of toil. In the interior districts the people have no heart for the planting of gardens or for the building of homes. They dwell in continual alarm, fearing the coming of the soldiery. Homes are ill kept; houses falling into decay are not repaired.

The picture revealed in the concurrent representation of impartial witnesses is a melancholy one. Mr. Stanley, arriving at the mouth of the Congo, on the 14th of August, 1879, as the representative of the International African Association, set before himself a proud programme: "To ascend the river, with the noble mission of sowing along its banks civilized settlements; to peacefully conquer [the country] and subdue it; to remodel it in harmony with modern ideas into national states, within whose limits the European merchants shall go hand in hand with the dark African trader, and justice and law and order shall prevail, and murder and lawlessness and the cruel barbarer of slaves shall forever cease." (See The Congo, vol. 1, p. 59.)

As illustrating the unhappy contrast with this forecast presented in the conditions realized to-day, we may quote the testimony of the consul, Mr. Roger Casement, regarding one representative station in the State: "I must confess with pain and astonishment * * * that I felt I was visiting a penal settlement." (From letter of Mr. Casement to the vice-governor-consul of the Congo State, September 4, 1903.)

THE EXHAUSTED AND DEPOPULATED LAND.

Terrorism holds sway. The methods of the slave régime are reinforced by the inexorable authority of the Government itself. Cannibalism is carried to regions where before it was unknown. The lands are depleted. The profuse bleeding of the rubber vines has brought about their destruction in wide areas. The State is reaching on for new territories over which its devastating work may spread. The deportation of young men, the massacres, and the flight of the people are draining the population of the country. In no one feature are the testimonies submitted by us in more painful agreement than in their description of the depopulation of the country. Every returning missionary, every traveler revisiting the land, bears testimony to this.

Mr. Scrivener, in his record of the journey recently made through a section of the Domaine Privé, says that one may walk for five days without seeing a single village where once village life abounded. "The most striking characteristic of the land," so another witness writes, "is the absence of human life. It is not, after you have passed the arid mountains of Palabala, poor or unfertile; but it is empty." (M. Mille Au Congo Belge, p. 49.)

M. Edouard Pickard, of the Belgian Senate, after his journey in 1896, speaks of "the desolation resulting from the engineering exploits," of "the mutilated forests where until lately villages had nestled," of "great heaps of cinders amid deserted palm groves and trampled down banana fields." He adds: "The terror caused by the memory of inhuman floggings and of massacres haunts their brains, and they go as fugitives to the hospitable bush or across the frontiers." (En Congolé, p. 85, cited p. 244 Civilization in Congoland.)

Mr. Grogan, in his work *From the Cape to Cairo*, says: "A country formerly well populated and apparently responsive to just treatment is now practically a howling wilderness. The scattered inhabitants live almost without cultivation in the marshes, thickets, and reeds, madly fleeing even from their own shadows; * * * the very white men who should be keeping peace where chaos now reigns supreme spend thousands in making of peace a chaos of their own." (From the Cape to Cairo, p. 227.)

But the natives may not all abandon the country. There are other perils in the outlook. It is apparent that the policy of the Government is not winning the friendship of the people. Mr. Robert Codrington, commissioner for Great Britain in the neighboring territory of northern Zambia, who wrote after a tour in the Kongo district, says: "The natives are continually in rebellion, and the country is unsafe except in the immediate vicinity of the military commissaries and within the spheres of the missionaries." (Geographical Journal, May, 1902, p. 601.) Mutinies in the army are frequent. The Kongo State may yet work its own doom. The forces of savagery may turn upon it. The question raised by one writer is a startling one: "When the present rule is ended, what will remain for Europe and America to deal with? * * * A vast region with undying hatred of the whites—a great army of cannibal levies, trained in the usage of modern weapons and taught the worst vices of depraved men in civilized lands."

CHOSEN METHODS INEXCUSABLE.

It is clear that there can be no defense for this desolating and hazardous work. The dreadful story reveals no palliating feature. Had the cooperation of the people been sought in just enterprises, reasonably conducted, they would have been found willing allies. These peoples of Central Africa are not unamenable to gentle influences. Mr. Glave writes of his observations in one section invaded by the raid of rubber: "Everywhere the natives are friendly and polite. They are not lazy good-for-nothing people. Their fine powers are obtained by hard work, sobriety, frugal living." And again, in almost the last words written before his death, he says: "The methods employed by the Government are not necessary. Years ago, when I was on duty at the equator without soldiers, I never had any difficulty in getting what men I needed, nor did any other station in the old, humane days." He adds: "It is only the State officials who make war. Seldom do the traders (of the older class) have any trouble, and the missionaries never." (See Century Magazine, vol. 54, p. 714.)

THE GROUND OF MISSIONARY ACTION.

Our interest as missionary organizations in the record we have been presenting is due not alone to desire for advancement for the special work in which we are engaged, though this work, in its beginnings antecedent to the founding of the Congo State, was formally recognized in the action of the Berlin conference, and in the proclamations of the King, as essential to realization of the philanthropic aims for which professedly the State was established. Our missionaries have sought, to quote the language of the Berlin agreement, "the moral and material well-being of the native population." What the State has failed to do they have endeavored to do. They have reduced languages to writing. They have taught the people. They are establishing schools. They are developing useful arts; and they are seeking to

supplant the gross superstitions and inhumanities of the people by Christian beliefs and practices. This work, which the State had engaged to encourage and support, is sadly impeded by the conditions now developed.

Our complaint is not a personal one. Our missionaries personally have not been ill used. Yet we have definite complaint as respects the security of missionary work, which, as furnishing a definite instance of the failure of the State to regard its treaty obligations, we have submitted to the State Department of our Government. Lands, withheld in general from private purchasers, are denied to our representatives. Within the past four years it has been found quite impossible to purchase land or to secure leases of land for more than a very limited period of time. Thus the guaranty of permanence essential for the development of our work is destroyed. Our Government's treaty with the Kongo State definitely secured to missionary organizations the right to build, and thus implicitly the right to buy land upon which to build. While sales of land are refused, the law forbids that a missionary shall remain for more than fifteen days in any place in which he does not hold a title to land. Thus the stay of missionaries in the country practically is threatened. Our missionaries, moreover, at certain stations, becoming increasingly numerous, are forbidden to buy supplies from the people, even the sale of food products by the natives being prohibited; they must bring these to the State agents. The missionary would gladly buy of the natives at a fair price, but this privilege is denied him. Our missionaries, thus forced to depend on the station posts for all food supplies, are made involuntary abettors of the wrong practiced upon the people.

In other ways also the work our representatives would gladly accomplish for the uplifting of the people is thwarted. The people, terrorized, flee from the approach of the unknown foreigner. The missionary in his touring finds villages vacated and leveled to the ground. The periodical flights of the people in certain districts render continuity of work impossible, and the total extermination of the people, accomplished now in several sections, obviously is fatal to the purpose represented by the missionary's presence in the land. The humane aims of missionary effort, philanthropic and Christian, are hindered and defeated through the opposing blighting influence by which the land is desolated.

But a larger reason influences our representatives and ourselves in this appeal, that of regard for a people suffering from dreadful inhumanities. Those whose residence in the country gives them knowledge of these wrongs can not remain silent without guilt. Repeated representations made to the Kongo Government by our missionaries having proved ineffectual: they and we are compelled by motives of common humanity and by regard for justice to bring our appeal to a higher resort.

THE MISSIONARY A REFUGE FOR A HUNTED PEOPLE.

The missionary can not escape direct relation to this issue. The appeal of the people is constantly pressed upon him. Men, women, and children flee to the missions seeking protection. A white officer, unacquainted with the missionary whom he was addressing, after a cruel raid jokingly remarked that he had killed many people and secured a fine lot of curios. He said that while his soldiers were firing upon the villages the people ran wildly about crying, "Sheppite! Sheppite!" It was their name for Rev. W. H. Sheppard, the associate of Mr. Morrison, whom they were beseeching to come to their aid. The motive actuating our missionaries and ourselves, as we bring to you our request, is embodied in a sentence of a letter addressed by Rev. J. H. Weeks, of the English Baptist Missionary Society, to officials in the Kongo Government: "I deeply regret having to write this letter to you, but I can not sit quietly and see these unfortunate folk crushed out of existence by oppression and cruelty without making a protest in the name of religion and of humanity."

FUTILITY OF APPEAL TO THE STATE GOVERNMENT.

We think it will be clear to you that the case which we thus bring to your attention is one demanding the intervention of those responsible for the founding of the Independent State of the Kongo. May we urge that you will not fail to note that appeal to the Government of that State would not meet fittingly the requirements of the case? In responsibility for the conditions now prevailing in this stricken land obviously the Government is involved, and it is scarcely appropriate to ask an alleged offender to make inquiry as to his own wrongdoing. The testimony to the existence of wrongs is testimony also to indisposition in the Government to remedy these wrongs.

The possibilities belonging to appeal to the Kongo Government have already been exhausted. Delay in bringing the story of these enormities formally to the attention of western governments is attributable to unwillingness to believe that the facts could be known to the administration, and the hope that when known they would secure redress. But all reports, personal and official, private and public, if receiving any attention, have won at most only the renewal of professions of innocence and of disinterested and humane intentions. Investigations have not been so conducted as to satisfy the complainants. It is alleged that witnesses have been terrorized; indeed, the native dare not testify in a court whose highest authority is the government under which he suffers: he has no resort but a patient bearing of wrongs that he may avoid wrongs yet more dreadful. The victims of a shocking outrage, when told by an amazed visitor that they should complain to the State, replied: "We should not be believed: they would put us in chains at once;" and, when told they should carry the bodies of their murdered dead in canoes to the official, they replied: "We never could get past the sentries."

It is clear that, inasmuch as it is part of the testimony of the witnesses in the case that complaints have been made often to Government only to be disregarded; that the so-called investigations have been an evasion; that, indeed, the system to which the Government is definitely and persistently committed is the *tous et origo* of the evils, these testimonies will have received the attention due them only when provision is made for investigation by a power external to the State. All replies proffered by the Government of the Independent State of the Kongo to the accusations made against it essentially are this: "The accusations are false." The question of the truth or falsity of the charges is the question at issue, and inquiry impartially conducted from without offers the one rational method for reaching a just answer to this question.

INTERPOSITION A RIGHT OF THE POWERS.

The right of the nations to interpose for the suppression of these evils seems clear. It has indeed been claimed by the Government of the Kongo State, as, for example, in reply to the note of the British Government, that while the State was created by international action, having been created, it is a sovereign power, responsible only to itself for the administration of its internal affairs. If this claim were sound, it would be true that the action of the powers at Berlin, which gave the King a sovereignty unlimited by internal restraint, created the one wholly autocratic and irresponsible government in all the civilized world. The validity of this claim of one man to a gift of so fabulous value, involving so sweeping sacrifice of the primitive rights of more than a score of millions of people and the allied rights of all mankind, can not be thought admissible. The question of gravest international concern is this: Is it true that a sovereign and absolute power was created at Berlin which is responsible only to itself, and that the pledges solemnly made to other powers, including our own Government, are binding only in so far as in its sovereign discretion it may choose so to consider them?

The Independent State of the Kongo acquired its international status by a formal acceptance of the provisions of the act of Berlin. This act is its charter, unique, and in its spirit as benignant as any known to the history of Christian civilization.

As President Cleveland in his message of December, 1885, recognized, "the Berlin convention laid down certain obligations purporting to be binding on the signatories." In the binding nature of these obligations the right and duty of subsequent supervision is involved. It is a fact of the highest importance that this right and duty were recognized distinctly in the report of a committee of the conference, in which it is said:

"With regard to these native populations the conference must assume the position of an official guardian. The necessity of insuring the preservation of the natives, the duty of helping them to obtain a higher and better political and social status, the obligation to instruct them and initiate them into the advantages of civilization are unanimously recognized." But, in addition to these declarations of the purpose of the conference, it is also true that the Berlin agreement makes definite reservation of the right of revision of that agreement as belonging to the powers represented in the conference. Article 36 of the general act of Berlin provides:

"The signatory powers of the present general act reserve to themselves the right to introduce into it subsequently and by common accord such modifications and improvements as experience may show to be expedient."

It is furthermore true that the appeal made by the Government of the Independent State of the Kongo to the conference at Brussels in the year 1890 for authorization for the imposing of import duties involved definite concessions on the part of that State of right of supervision and revision as belonging to the parties creating it. If the State might without impropriety violate in respect of other features the compact made in the Berlin act, it might without impropriety disregard its prohibition of import duties.

THE RIGHT A RESPONSIBILITY.

Concession of right implicitly involves an admission of obligation. The great treaty powers have continuing rights as supervisors and directors in the enterprise conducted by the King. The King is their trustee to execute the powers conferred by the treaty and is answerable to them for the use of the powers intrusted to him. Is it too much to say that the great powers of the West are under obligation to communicate with the ruler of the Independent State of the Kongo concerning the statements relating to his rule, apparently so thoroughly supported, and to take such measures as will guarantee to these unhappy people the rights established for them in the treaty of Berlin?

RELATION OF OUR OWN GOVERNMENT TO THIS RESPONSIBILITY AND RIGHT.

This right and responsibility, belonging to other nations, we trust will be recognized as belonging to our own American Government. We are not signatories of the act of the Berlin conference. Does this fact deny to us the right of action at the present juncture? We think this position must be regarded as indefensible.

It may, we think, justly be held that the sacred primal right of membership in the family of states in itself would justify inquiry and protest under the laws of nations.

The foremost part borne by us in the recognition and practical creation of the Kongo State can not be regarded as without bearing upon the question of our relation to the present situation.

Our presence in the conference at Berlin and our implicit indorsement of its action, which fell short of a technical ratification only because of considerations of a technical nature, further accentuates our interest in a just discharge of its pledged obligations by the Government of the Kongo State.

The right involved in full participation in the conference at Brussels belongs to our Government. The charges made against the Independent State of the Kongo involve disloyalty to the understanding and the definite declarations of that conference as they involve disloyalty to the conference at Berlin.

Furthermore, obviously the right of a party to a treaty is ours. Our treaty of 1891 secures to us definitely the right of freedom of trade, the right of all citizens to reside and build in the state. And this treaty furthermore formally secures to us all rights of the signatories of the Berlin agreement and the rights conceded to the most favored nation. It is these rights which by common report are violated by the deeds and claims of the Government of the Independent State of the Kongo.

We would ask your attention to certain specific provisions of the Brussels agreement and of our existing treaty with the Kongo State. We are convinced that, if indorsing the position that this right belongs to our Government, you will hold that in our case also the right involves an obligation grave as the seriousness of the wrongs to which it relates.

[From the general act adopted at Brussels.]

PREAMBLE.

Being equally actuated by the firm intention of putting an end to the crimes and devastation engendered by the traffic in African slaves, of efficiently protecting the aboriginal population of Africa, and of securing for that vast continent the benefits of peace and civilization:

ART. II, SECTION 1. These stations shall have the following subsidiary duties:

1. To support and, if necessary, to serve as a refuge for the native population, * * * to initiate them in agricultural labor and in the industrial arts, so as to increase their welfare, to raise them to civilization and bring about the extinction of barbarous customs. * * *

2. To give aid and protection to commercial enterprises, * * * and to prepare the way for the foundation of permanent centers of cultivation and of commercial settlements.

3. To protect, without distinction of creed, the missions which are already or that may hereafter be established.

ART. V. The contracting powers pledge themselves * * * to enact * * * a law rendering applicable on the one hand the provisions of their penal laws concerning grave offenses against the person to those organizing and abetting slave hunting, to those guilty of mutilating male adults and children, and to all persons taking part in the capture of slaves by violence. * * *

From our treaty of 1891 we make these quotations:

"ARTICLE I. There shall be full, entire, and reciprocal liberty of commerce, establishment, and navigation between the citizens and inhabitants of the two high contracting parties.

"The citizens and inhabitants of the United States of America in the Independent State of the Kongo and those of the Independent State of the Kongo in the United States of America shall have reciprocally the right, on conforming to the laws of the country, to enter, travel, and reside in all parts of their respective territories, to carry on business there. * * *

"They can freely exercise their industry or their business, as well wholesale as retail, in the whole extent of the territories. * * *

"In like manner they will enjoy reciprocally the treatment of the most-favored nation in all that relates to rights, privileges, exemptions, and immunities whatsoever concerning their persons or their property and in the matter of commerce, industry, and navigation. * * *

"ART. IV. The citizens and inhabitants of the two countries shall enjoy in

the territory of the other a full and entire liberty of conscience. They shall be protected in the free exercise of their worship. They shall have the right to erect religious edifices and to organize and maintain missions."

We would ask also that, in view of the provision of our treaty which concedes to us all rights accorded to the most-favored nation, the language of the Anglo-Kongo convention of 1884 be taken into consideration:

"They shall have the right of buying, of selling, of letting, and of hiring lands and buildings, mines, and forests situated within the said territories, and of founding houses of commerce." (Art. II, Anglo-Kongo convention.)

We would respectfully call your attention to the fact that besides those forms of procedure by which international inquiry and interposition may be promoted, a definite line of action is opened for our Government by Article XIII of our treaty with the Independent State of the Kongo. This provision reads: "In case a difference should arise between the two high contracting parties as to the validity, interpretation, obligation, or enforcement of any of the provisions contained in the present treaty, and it could not be arranged amicably by diplomatic correspondence between the two Governments, these last agree to submit it to the judgment of an arbitration tribunal, the decision of which they bind themselves to respect and execute loyally." By this provision, if in no better way, the question as to the consistency with treaty obligations of the fundamental system established in the Independent State of the Kongo may reach a definite, judicial decision.

THE GRAVITY OF THE OBLIGATION.

The obligation resting upon us as a government seems to us a grave and solemn one. The position of our Government is such that it can act without suspicion of unworthy motive and with influence indefinitely great. And independently of the demand for protection for a helpless people, a question is at stake which is of commanding moral and political interest. May a state appropriate for its own aggrandizement the land, the products, all the emoluments of a vast national territory? It is the issue of the closed door—closed against the people of the house and against the people of all lands. If the coming together of the powers were not demanded by need for inquiry into reported abuses, it would seem amply justified by the necessity for international judgment upon the astounding claim represented by the Government of the Independent State of the Kongo.

And the issue relates not simply to the Belgian-Kongo rule; it relates to the Belgian-Kongo theory. The evil practice of the Kongo State is infectious. Proofs of this are not wanting in other African territory. Shall this practice be further developed and the world's fields be appropriated for selfish aggrandizement? The menace is a serious one to the commercial interests of our Government and of all governments. The need is urgent that calm consideration and resolute action shall put upon this theory the stamp of international disapprobation and abhorrence. We believe that this is not a time when America can afford to keep silent. We are convinced that our Government would scarcely be willing that such an issue should be determined without its participation in deliberation and action.

It has been held, and with reason, that the Independent State of the Kongo should prove a second China as a market for the absorption of manufactured goods. Already rich areas are almost hopelessly impaired, and the depopulation of the land and the incitement of a brooding hatred in the hearts of the people threaten irrecoverable loss of the wealth rightfully belonging to the world.

It is on these high grounds we would bring to you our appeal—on the ground of concern for high political principles; on the ground of the rights of our citizens who would be branded as common thieves if they were to attempt in the Kongo State exercise of their just rights in respect of trade; on the ground of righteous protest against the violation of pledges solemnly given; above all, on the ground of that humane interest in the well-being of mankind which influenced our Government in its recognition of the Independent State of the Kongo and which increasingly is characteristic of its action in the parliament of the nations.

OUR REQUEST.

We therefore pray your honorable bodies that you will take such action as seems to you most fitting for the promotion of a strict and impartial inquiry into present conditions in the Independent State of the Kongo—through a tribunal external to the State—and that you will follow this action with such other action as may be found necessary and appropriate for the correction of the evils from which that State is suffering. We are convinced that by every worthy consideration related to the case this course is commended. Reports of alleged wrongs certainly are sufficient in volume and definiteness to justify inquiry. The Government of the State itself should desire such investigation for the vindication of its good name if it be unjustly aspersed. The action asked by us, moreover, we are persuaded is favored by that instinctive love of just government and that compassion for helpless sufferers to which as a nation we are committed by the traditions of our past and by the generous sentiment and impulse of our people.

Respectfully submitted in behalf of the Conference of Missionary Societies.

THOMAS S. BARBOUR, *Chairman.*

Secretary.

APRIL 16, 1904.

Members of the conference: Henry C. Mabie, D. D., home secretary, American Baptist Missionary Union; Thomas S. Barbour, D. D., foreign secretary, American Baptist Missionary Union; W. H. Leslie, M. D., missionary, American Baptist Missionary Union, at Banza Manteke, Africa; S. H. Chester, D. D., secretary, Southern Presbyterian Board; Rev. W. M. Morrison, missionary, Southern Presbyterian Board, at Luebo, Africa; D. W. Snyder, M. D., missionary, Southern Presbyterian Board, formerly at Luebo, Africa; Rev. Archibald McLean, president, Foreign Christian Missionary Society; E. A. Layton, M. D., missionary, Foreign Christian Missionary Society, at Balengi.

DOCUMENT I.—Statement of Rev. J. B. Murphy.

[From London Times, November 18, 1895.]

The attitude of the natives of the Kongo Free State is everywhere unfriendly, and if the people do not universally rebel against authority it is because they are reduced to a state of despair. If possible they leave the territory. Two of the most flourishing towns in Mr. H. M. Stanley's time, situated at Stanley Pool, viz., Kinntama and Kinshasa, are now no more, and the people have gone over to the French Congo. Besides the natives of the towns I have named, many people have left the main river and gone into the interior in order to escape the arbitrary demands of the State. Difficulties had arisen, too, between the State and the porters, and as the requisite number of carriers were not forthcoming detachments of soldiers were sent with orders to capture all the women they could find.

I have been in the interior and have seen the ravages made by the State in pursuit of this iniquitous trade. In one place I stood by the side of the river and heard a little boy describe how he had seen the Belgians shoot people for not fetching rubber, and at the same time he pointed to the flagstaff to which the poor victims had been tied, and which still bore the bullet and blood marks. One day a State corporal, who was in charge of the post of Solifa, was going round the town collecting rubber. Meeting a poor woman whose husband was away fishing, he asked, "Where is your husband?" She answered by pointing to the river. He then asked, "Where is his rubber?" She answered, "It is ready for

you." Whereupon he said, "You lie," and, lifting up his gun, shot her dead. Shortly afterwards the husband returned and was told of the murder of his wife. He then went straight to the corporal, taking with him his rubber, and asked why he had shot his wife. The wretched man then raised his gun and killed the corporal. The soldiers ran away to the headquarters of the State and made representations of the case, with the result that the commissary sent a large force to support the authority of the soldiers; the town was looted, burnt, and many people were killed and wounded.

Upon another occasion in the same month some soldiers ran away from a State steamer, and, it was said, went to the town of Bombumba. The officer sent a message telling the chief of the town to give them up. He answered that he could not, as the fugitives had not been in his town. The officer sent the messenger a second time with the order, "Come to me at once or war in the morning." The next morning the old chief went to meet the Belgians and was attacked without provocation. He himself was wounded, his wife was killed before his eyes, and her head cut off in order that they might possess the brass necklace that she wore. Twenty-four of the chief's people were also killed and all for the paltry reason given above.

Again, the people of Lake Mantumba ran away on account of the cruelty of the State, and the latter sent some soldiers in charge of a colored corporal to treat with them and induce them to return. On the way the troops met a canoe containing seven of the fugitives. Under some paltry pretext they made the people land, shot them, cut off their hands, and took them to the commissary. The Mantumba people complained to the missionary at Irebu, and he went down to see if the story was true. He ascertained the case to be just as they had narrated, and found that one of the seven was a little girl, who was not quite dead. The child recovered, and she lives to-day, the stump of the handless arm witnessing against this horrible practice. These are only a few things of many that have taken place in one district.

DOCUMENT II.—Testimony of Rev. E. V. Sjolom.

[This testimony was given by him in 1897.]

The natives in inland towns are, as a matter of custom, asked whether they are willing to gather India rubber. The question put to them is not, "Will you live at peace together? Will you acknowledge the Kongo government?" It is, "Will you work India rubber?" Well, many of the people are killed, and they try suddenly to disband, and refuse to bring the India rubber. Then war is declared. The soldiers are sent in different directions. The people in the towns are attacked, and when they are running away into the forest and try to hide themselves and save their lives, they are found out by the soldiers. Then their gardens of rice are destroyed and their supplies taken. Their plantains are cut down while they are young and not in fruit, and often their huts are burned, and, of course, everything of value is taken.

Within my own knowledge 45 villages were altogether burned down. I say altogether, because there were many others partly burned down. I passed through 28 abandoned villages. The natives had left their places to go farther inland. In order to separate themselves from the white men they go part of the way down the river, or else they cross the river into French territory. Sometimes the natives are obliged to pay a large indemnity. The chiefs often have to pay with brass wire and slaves, and if the slaves do not make up the amount their wives are sold to pay. I was told that by a Belgian officer. Native sentinels—who, of course, are the sentries referred to by Consul Pickersgill—are placed in the villages. The sentinels see that the other natives work. They are forced to build large houses for these sentinels, and have to leave their places and try to find other places farther away. The sentinels themselves have told me this. I have been in the towns and seen it myself. In the morning the sentinels will go to and fro in the towns to see that no man stays behind. Only a few slaves are allowed to stay at home besides the women and children. Often they say that they have been told by a commissary that if they saw a man staying behind in the village they must shoot him.

I will give you an instance of a man I saw shot right before my eyes. In one of my inland journeys, when I had gone a little farther, perhaps, than the commissary expected me to go, I saw something that perhaps he would not have liked me to see. It was at a town called Ibera, one of the cannibal towns to which no white man had ever been before. I reached it at sunset after the natives had returned from the various places in which they had been looking for India rubber. They gathered together in a great crowd, being curious to see a white man. Besides, they had heard I had some good news to tell them which came through the gospel.

When that large crowd gathered, and I was just ready to preach, the sentinels rushed in among them to seize an old man. They dragged him aside a little from the crowd, and the sentinel in charge came to me and said, "I want to shoot this man because he has been in the river fishing to-day; he has not been on the river for India rubber." I told him, "I have not authority to stop you, because I have nothing to do with these palavers, but the people are here to hear what I have to say to them, and I don't want you to do it before my eyes." He said, "All right, I will keep him in bounds then until to-morrow morning when you have gone; then I will kill him." But a few minutes afterwards the sentinel came in a rage to the man and shot him, right before my eyes. Then he charged his rifle again and pointed it at the others, who all rushed away like chaff before the wind. He told a little boy, 8 or 9 years of age, to go and cut off the right hand of the man who had been shot. The man was not quite dead, and when he felt the knife he tried to drag his hand away. The boy, after some labor, cut the hand off and laid it by a fallen tree. A little later this hand was put on fire to smoke before being sent to the commissary.

All except the old chiefs, etc., are forced to go away and work rubber. It is very difficult for the natives to get it. It has been difficult from the very beginning. They have to wade in marshes. I have seen them often when they passed. They have knives in their hands and they cut until the sap drops, drop by drop, and they stand in the water. It is difficult for them to work close to their own towns, but as they have to bring a large amount they have to cut the trees constantly until they dry up. Then they go to another place, and by-and-by they will have to go still farther inland, where the State is not yet fighting the natives, and they have to stay away many days at a time.

The sentinel told me that the natives there are not able to carry any food with them, and it often happens that they stay away for days at a time and that they die in the marshes of fainting and starvation. The sentinels are from the wildest tribes. They were wild already, but when they get to this work they are many times worse. They are really small kings in the towns, and they often kill the people for the sake of India rubber. They often rob and steal and plunder, and take whatever they can get hold of. At the beginning, when I saw that, I told the commissary about it, but he turned in anger on me and, in the presence of the soldiers, said that he would expel me from the town if I meddled with matters of that kind any more.

If the rubber does not reach the full amount required the sentinels attack the natives. They kill some and bring the hands to the commissary. Others are brought to the commissary as prisoners. Hundreds are constantly taken down in large steamers. Lying in the steamers there are the dead bodies of prisoners who are being taken down to the coast. At the beginning they came with their smoked hands. The sentinels, or else the boys in attendance on them, put these hands on a little kiln, and after they had been smoked they by-and-by put them on the top of the rubber baskets. I have on many occasions seen this done.

At one time I went to an inland lake several miles wide; the natives told me

I was the first white man who had ever seen it. Under the shadows of palms and plantain I saw the villages. I saw somebody coming alone and looking at what was going on. As he met me he said, "What am I to do? The rubber does not reach a large amount; some of the people have run away, and those who are left refuse to bring the full amount." And then he told me the amount these people had to bring. The commissioners lower down the river do not know how many people there are in a village. They put on a small village as large an amount as on a big village. In this case it was impossible for the people to collect the required amount.

From this village I went on to another, where I met a man who pointed to a basket and said to me, "Look; I have only two hands." He meant there were not enough to make up for the rubber he had not brought. He had several prisoners tied to the trees. They were waiting to be taken away. When I came back some of the villages were in an uproar. The people were leaving their homes and rushing to the forest. When I reached the river I turned round and saw that the people had large hammocks, in which they were gathering the rubber to be taken to the commissary. I also saw smoked hands, and the prisoners waiting to be taken down to the commissary.

That is only one of the places in which these practices occur. There is a small island in a stream at Lake Mantumba. The people had not been able to bring the full amount of rubber. The officers with some soldiers went along there. Several of the natives were killed. I saw the dead bodies floating on the lake with the right hands off, and the officer told me when I came back why they had been killed. It was for the rubber. In fact, the officers have always freely told me about the many who were killed and always in connection with India rubber. In one village which I passed through I saw two or three men on the wayside quite recently killed—about an hour before. The sentinel, who had to oversee the gathering of the rubber, told me they had killed the men because they had not brought the rubber. When I crossed the stream I saw some dead bodies hanging down from branches in the water. As I turned my face away at the horrible sight one of the native corporals, who was following us down, said, "Oh, that is nothing; a few days ago I returned from a fight, and I brought the white man 160 hands, and they are thrown in the river."

At Lake Mantumba, later on in 1895, the natives, after they had begun to get India rubber close to the lake, found hostile tribes with poisoned arrows. The natives could not get far enough for their India rubber. Two or three days after a fight a dead mother was found with two of her children. The mother was shot and the right hand was taken off. On one side was the elder child, also shot, and the right hand also taken off. On the other side was the younger child, with the right hand cut off, but the child, still living, was resting against the dead mother's breast. This dark picture was seen by four other missionaries. I myself saw the child. The natives had begun to cut off the left hand, but, seeing their mistake, they left it and cut off the right hand instead.

If such punishment is in any case right, why not try to find out those who are really guilty, and who failed to gather the full amount of rubber? But to attack not only one village, but a whole set of villages, because one or two have failed to give their amount—that is one of the things we object to. The soldiers are sent out to attack a whole village instead of finding and punishing the guilty, if any are guilty. At the end of 1895 the commissary—all the people were gathering the rubber—said he had often told the sentinels not to kill the people. But on the 14th December a sentinel passed our mission station and a woman accompanied him, carrying a basket of hands. Mr. and Mrs. Banks, besides myself, went down the road, and they told the sentinel to put the hands on the road that they might count them. We counted 18 right hands smoked, and from the size of the hands we could judge that they belonged to men, women, and children.

We could not understand why these hands had been collected, as the commissary had given orders that no more natives were to be killed for their hands. On my last journey I discovered the secret. One Monday night a sentinel who had just returned from the commissary said to me, "What are the sentinels to do? When all the people are gathered together the commissary openly tells us not to kill any more people, but when the people have gone he tells us privately that if they do not bring plenty of India rubber we must kill some, but not bring the hands to him." Some sentinels, he told me, had been put in chains because they killed some natives who happened to be near a mission station, but it was only because he thought it might become known that the commissary, to justify himself, had put the men in chains.

I said to the sentinel, "You should obey the first command—never to kill any more." "The people," he answered, "unless they are frightened, do not bring in the rubber, and then the commissary flogs us with the hippopotamus hide, or else he puts us in chains, or sends us to Boma." The sentinel added that the commissary induced him to hide cruelty while letting it go on, and to do this in such a way that he might be justified in case it should become known and an investigation should be made. In such a case the commissary could say, "Why, I told him openly not to kill any more," and he might put the blame on the soldier to justify himself, though the blame and the punishment in all its force ought to have been put on himself after he had done such a terrible act in order to disguise or mislead justice. If the sentinels were puzzled about this message, what would the natives be?

One important fact happened on the Saturday before the sentinel told me about it. The chief informed the sentinel that he would report to the commissary that the sentinel had killed his father. But the sentinel said, "What could you do to me? I would simply tell the commissary that you had not brought rubber, and then he would put you in chains instead of me." "Oh," said the chief, "you have killed my father for nothing, but I will not go with you to the commissary," and then he went away from the village, from the place where the rubber was placed. But the sentinel caught the chief. He called some sentinels from other villages and they forced him along and threw him down, some holding down the head, some the arms, and some other parts of the body, and they flogged him until the blood streamed down his back. Then they told the chief to stop in the camp. They pushed him, and a soldier took his gun and leveled it close to the chief's heart. The chief stood shivering with fear, and the sentinel said, "I can kill you if I like."

I have seen extracts from letters in which the writers have freely told about hundreds being killed, about hundreds of hands being brought by the sentinels, about hundreds of slaves being taken, and one of the State officials said to a resident agent, "I have 200 slaves here; do you want some?" Another agent told me that he had himself seen a State officer at one of the outposts pay a certain number of brass rods to the soldiers for a number of hands they had brought. One of the soldiers told me the same. That was about the time I saw the native killed before my own eyes. The soldier said, "Don't take this to heart so much. They kill us if we do not bring rubber. The commissary has promised us if we bring plenty of hands we will shorten our service. I have brought in plenty of hands already, and I expect my time of service will soon be finished."

[Documents III, IV, and V, being true copies of letters from Rev. Joseph Clark, of Ikoko, Africa; Rev. A. Billington, of Bwemba, Africa, and Rev. C. L. Whitman, of Ikoko, Africa, respectively, now in the files of the American Baptist Missionary Union, and written in response to a series of questions addressed to the missionaries by the foreign secretary, Rev. Thomas S. Barbour, D. D.]

DOCUMENT III.—*Testimony of Rev. Joseph Clark.*

"1. Forced military service in the State army."

Yes. On two occasions I have seen men compelled to leave this village for military service under the State. I have never known anyone volunteer for

such service on the Upper Kongo. I do not insist that none do so, but I have not met any person who had done so.

"2. Compulsory service for which little or no compensation is given."

I know that women have been compelled to go regularly from this and other villages to the local State post to labor two days weekly. Though living in contact with the people, I never heard of one of them having received any pay for this weekly service. It was called a "labor tax." I frequently heard the people complaining among themselves that they did not receive even enough food. They generally blamed the soldiers for this, saying that they took and sold the food which they should have given to the women at work in the gardens.

I know that for any offense, however slight, natives have been without the form of a trial, put in "chain" and compelled to labor in carrying bricks and clay for the construction of State houses. I have seen men and women chained together by the neck, being driven by an armed soldier. A stick or the butt end of a rifle was being used to persuade them to go fast. They were supposed to be "criminals." For such work there is no pay no matter how long or how hard it may be. The soldiers and ordinary workmen are, I believe, properly paid.

"3. Exorbitant tribute required of the natives."

I know that in the past demands made by the white officers for rubber were the cause of very great trouble and hardship to the natives. When you remember that of old the white man in charge of a post received extra pay for rubber collected and for coffee planted, etc., you can understand why these local officials pressed the natives beyond reason.

"4. Grievous illtreatment of the natives by State officials for nonpayment of tribute."

Sometimes soldiers have been quartered on villages and made responsible for the collection of the "tax," and in those cases great wrong was done the people. I saw a chief report to an officer that the soldiers quartered in his village had stolen everything that was worth stealing from him, and that they had forced his wives to live with them. This man was kicked off the veranda. A soldier was sent to a village partly to see that the people provided the fish demanded from them and partly for hunting. He treated the natives badly and at last shot one of the head men of the village. The body was placed in a canoe and taken to a State post and complaint made against him. As the people were on the way home with the body he met them and fired at them for having done this and fatally injured another man. I reported this and the man was arrested, but I never heard of either a trial or punishment for his offenses, and some time later he was at liberty. These are not recent events.

During this month we have had the following experiences: An officer has been in this district with about three dozen State soldiers. I have seen these soldiers striking innocent people within a few yards of the officer. Possibly he did not see what was going on, but he ought to have seen what his men were doing. I have seen a young boy, a scholar from the village, taken by one of the soldiers. He was in a canoe, and his friends fled on the approach of the soldier, but he, being a schoolboy, did not flee. He was taken prisoner on the plea, given me by the soldier, that he was from the district then at war with the State. So of course all the goods in the canoe were to be the prize of the soldier and his paddlers. He was at once set at liberty when I threatened to write to our local officer at Bikoro.

A woman of Ikoko was taken prisoner by the white man. She was kept one night and all the next day. There was no charge against her. A note was sent to the officer about her and he replied: "Je relâche avec plaisir la nommée, Longonda qui avait été prise comme otage." From whom the pledge was taken, or for whom she was held as a hostage does not appear, but she was set at liberty. I spoke on behalf of an old chief, who is a hard worker and who has been very ill. He was charged by the officer with having allowed the people, presumably enemies of the State, to flee with his canoes. I said that when the Ikoko people stampeded I had to place watchers at my beach to keep my canoes from being taken as a means of escape. He, too, was freed. Other five Ikoko people were tied up, but only one boy was taken away, and one man, who should have been resident in another place. These have both been released, as also other two, who were prisoners evidently without any definite charge against them.

I hear, but can not be certain of the truth, that in the campaign now closed 16 natives have been killed. Three only of that number were in or of the district that was to be punished for rebellion. Eight are of one village, 2 of another, and 3 are each from a separate place; but these 13 are not people of the district supposed to be at war with the State. Yet, when I said to the State officer that the Ikoko people were off to hide in the bush, he said, "They need have no fear. We are not at war with them." In spite of that statement by him, two or three of the headmen were arrested, and some others, of whom I saw three brought to him. They were released, but I saw the marks of the treatment they had received from the soldiers, and what they then experienced will insure their being "absent" the next time a strange officer comes here with men.

"5. State levies on villages for laborers and soldiers."

I have known of demands being made on villages for both workmen and soldiers. When you remember that in Belgium military service is compulsory this would not be surprising.

"6. Domaine and monopolies."

It is unquestionably true that enormous tracts of country are set apart for "private domain" and for companies in which it is published that the King holds shares or from which he receives part of the profits. As to the King's sharing in the profits of these companies I can not write with certainty, but all know about the division of the country.

9. It is my opinion that unless great changes are made in the management of the State the Protestant missions have poor prospects for extension of their work; also that owing to the lack of trust in the government the native is hard to reach. His mind is not at rest. He has no desire for the improvement of his surroundings. He will not make a good house or make large gardens because that will give the State a greater hold on him. His wife refuses to become a mother because she will not be able to run away in case of an attack. Twice this week the people of Ikoko have been rushing off to the "bush" to hide on the approach of a large canoe with soldiers. With the natives around us in this unsettled state it is no wonder that our work is difficult. We can not put native teachers out any distance from our station into the interior because of the unrest and uncertainty.

Attested as a true copy of an autograph statement of Rev. Joseph Clark, of Ikoko, Africa, now on file in the rooms of the American Baptist Missionary Union.

THOMAS G. BARBOUR, Corresponding Secretary.

Sworn to before me this 14th day of April, 1904.

JOHN F. BARNES, Notary Public.

[SEAL.] DOCUMENT IV.—*Testimony of Rev. A. Billington.*

"1. Forced military service in the State army."

I have not known of any being forced into military service from this district, but I have heard of it in other districts, and believe it to be true. What is known as the Vankerhoven expedition took some forty men from this district; each village was forced to supply a certain number, very few of whom have ever returned. These men were used for fighting and carrying. The object of this expedition seems to have been to exhibit the power of the State, which was done by the use of cartridges and fire. Most of the villages of this and other districts were de-

stroyed. One asked the chief of the expedition: "How will you furnish your men with food?" "With cartridges," was the reply. Even if he intended it for a joke, it unfortunately contained much truth.

"2. Compulsory service for which little or no compensation is given."

"3. Exorbitant tribute required of the natives."

Men are forced from this district to cut wood at the "wood posts." They are first applied for, and if they do not present themselves, a soldier or soldiers are sent, who tie up the women, or the chiefs, until the workmen are forthcoming. The first of our Christians from the village of Bwemba has recently been to prison because he had no man to give, and after some ten days carrying water, etc., his friends hired a man for 750 brass rods, value £1-10-0. Woodcutters are fed and paid a fair wage, but sometimes much is kept back in fines, but they probably make up all deficiencies by plundering passing canoes and talking palaver. If a man falls sick another is demanded to fill his place at once.

All natives in villages around about us are compelled to work on the telegraph path, but this only means one or two days in a month. A small pay is promised and is sometimes paid, but not always. A white man who superintends this part of the line told us last week that he had received nothing since May, in last year, to pay those who clean the path. Many walk 20 miles from their villages and do their part without the slightest pay, as it is all swallowed up by the Kapitas near at hand. Speaking generally, Kapitas are bad men and the poor natives suffer much at their hands. The women are compelled to make "bingwelle," mandioce puddings, which are paid for at about one-third of the marketable value. This food has to be carried in canoes from 2 miles to 10 miles (day's work for two or three persons; for the further villages every six days, for which nothing is paid). Chiefs are called, at the will of the official in charge, 30 miles to his station with no remuneration. Villagers, both men and women, who live near to State stations are called at any time to hoe the ground, etc., without any pay being given except now and again a spoonful of salt.

"4. Grievous illtreatment of the natives by State officials and soldiers for non-payment of tribute."

We have known natives to be cruelly beaten at the wood posts near us for not bringing the proper size of pudding, or not having boiled it enough, and then to be kept to work a day or two as well; all this, of course, by a native Kapita, and we have seen the marks of much worse cruelty higher up river.

"5. Refusal to Protestant missions of land grants for new missions stations."

We applied for land east of Kifwa some months ago, but the governor-general could hold out no hope. We also applied for the new site for Kilwa, but no grant has yet been made. Mr. Grenfell of the Baptist Missionary Society applied for land beyond the Aruwimi River, but it has been refused. The Congo Bolo Mission tried again and again to get land up the Juapa River some three years ago, but never could get it.

"6. The system of short-term leases, with possible refusal to renew."

We have heard of leases being offered to traders for a term of years, and I think such a course would be very undesirable for a mission, especially if there is no change in the general management and spirit of the State.

"7. Domaine privé and monopolies."

Monopolies are no secret in the Congo State, and the various companies publish from time to time their names and dividends.

"8. The prospect for Protestant missions under the Protestant régime."

The present régime is a great wrong to the natives; neither liberty nor poverty nor life are secure, and thus it is a great hindrance to our work, and should the present movement in England and America fail in bringing about a change for the better we shall expect greater hindrances and difficulties.

Attested as a true copy of a statement of Rev. A. Billington, of Bwemba, Africa, now in the files of the American Baptist Missionary Union.

THOMAS G. BARBOUR,
Corresponding Secretary.

Sworn to before me this 14th day of April, 1904.

[SEAL.] JOHN F. BARNES,
Notary Public.

DOCUMENT V.—*Testimony of Rev. C. L. Whitman.*

"1. Forced military service in the State army."

It is commonly reported that the "force publique," the Congo State army is made up largely of prisoners, taken either by the State or by tribes allied with the State. Other men are put in chains when their villages fail to bring in the required tribute, and are forced into the army. On this pretext some men have been taken from Ikoko.

"2. Compulsory service for which little or no compensation is given."

There is no doubt about this. Our nearest State post and plantation, Bikoro, has several hundred workmen, most of whom were brought from far away districts, having been taken from their homes as prisoners on various pretexts. Most of them are probably well fed, but I saw a score or more working in chains, and was informed that their diet was only the native bread, "quanga," and water. These were men from the near-by villages, imprisoned because their people had not brought the required tribute. Their pay consists of rations and a small allowance for cloth, or of cloth. At one time the Ikoko women were required to work at Bikoro two days a week, and for this they received absolutely nothing, if reports are to be believed.

"3. Exorbitant tribute required of the natives."

Yes. The rubber tax is the most severe, as often the natives have to go long distances for the rubber, and on the journey their lives are in constant danger, because of the climate and the attacks of hostile tribes. This was once the case with the villages about the lake (Ntumba), and even now the State demand for food supplies is so great as to drain the entire lake district, often leaving the natives without sufficient food for themselves and discouraging all attempts to plant extensive gardens, to keep goats or more than a few fowls, or to engage in other forms of productive industry. For the last two months six to ten Ikoko men have been in chains at Bikoro because the high water has made it difficult for the Ikoko people to bring in the full amount of fish tax.

"4. Grievous illtreatment of the natives by State officials for nonpayment of tribute."

Yes. Some six years ago, during the rubber-tax wars, many villages were burned. Many of the people fled to the French side of the Congo; others were either killed or died from exposure. Many hands were cut off; for a long time one of the handless victims made his headquarters here at Ikoko. Just recently some of our brethren of the English Baptist Missionary Society saw some native troops, commanded by two white officers, attacking an inoffensive up-river village. The black soldiers were cutting up the bodies of the slain and were carrying away the pieces, and this in full view of the white officers. In this case a near-by village, not the one attacked, had failed to pay the State tribute.

Only last week a State officer with 35 soldiers passed through Ikoko on his way to punish a tribe some 10 miles back for nonpayment of the food tax. On his arrival he found that most of the people had run away, but he killed three, and burned a few houses. On his way back, on the groundless suspicion that they had given the alarm to their neighbors, he attacked another village (one which had always met the State's demands), killed 10 people, and carried off all movable property in sight. The chief of another loyal village was taken and cruelly maltreated, and the soldiers were ordered even to kill him. This because his people, in sheer fright, had gotten out of the way of the soldiers. At Ikoko the villagers ran away on his approach, and but for Mr. Clark they would have been pursued and attacked on the pretext that they were fugitives from the village he had been sent to punish.

"5. State levies on villages for laborers and soldiers."

That is the common report, but I do not know the methods taken to secure them other than above indicated.

"6. Refusal to Protestant missions of land grants for new mission stations."

I have heard of several applications for land grants for new mission stations that have been refused. The refusals were to Protestant societies only. There are indications that the Catholics are getting all they ask for along this line.

"7. The system of short-term leases with possible refusal to renew."

I understand that Mr. Grenfell, of the Baptist Missionary Society, was offered a site for a new station, the lease to be for the rest of his life. This is the only definite case I know of. The probabilities against renewal are now so strong that, in my opinion, it would be extremely unwise for any Protestant mission society to accept any offer for a short-term lease.

"8. Domaine privé and monopolies."

Yes, undoubtedly. Repeated reports come to us of the doings of the companies operating in the various districts. They carry things with a high hand, so that often their agents incur charges of cruelty surpassing that of the State officers. The Lac Ntumba district is included in that part of the "domaine privé" not granted to any company. In former years this district was exploited for rubber, with the result that through war, exposure, and flight, two-thirds to three-fourths of the population has disappeared. The rubber tax is no longer imposed upon the survivors, but instead they are required to bring to the State posts large quantities of food supplies for which they receive little or no pay. If a village is able to gather or make other things, as for instance, gum copal, or baskets, these also are demanded on the same terms. Naturally, the ambition of the people is paralyzed, as they would receive no reward for their labor.

It may rightly be said there is no trade above Stanley Pool. Theoretically it is not prohibited, but practically all products of the soil, and the animals of the forests and the fish of the waters as well, are held to belong to the King or to the companies he has chartered. The natives are forbidden to sell any of these things, therefore they have nothing to buy with; and if they should happen to sell any prohibited article, the men who have the temerity to buy it are considered as thieves and treated accordingly. This procedure has crushed out all legitimate trade about Stanley Pool; the only business done is the exportation of the products of the soil gathered by the State or by its subsidiary companies, and the distribution of a few pieces of cloth or valueless trinkets among the natives as a sort of mock payment for their services in collecting rubber, food, etc. Even at Stanley Pool the State has begun to pay its workmen in cloth instead of money, and it will be only a matter of time when the English, German, and Portuguese merchants there will be obliged to close their doors, for the simple reason that the native population will have nothing to buy goods with.

"9. The prospect for Protestant missions under the present régime."

The prospect is not rosy at present: our chief hope is that the Congo State will become a Belgian colony, and that a regularly organized system of courts and laws, administered by civilians, will take the place of the present despotic military régime, of which King Leopold is the head.

Attested as a true copy of a statement of Rev. C. L. Whitman, of Ikoko, Africa, now on file in the rooms of the American Baptist Missionary Union.

THOMAS S. BARBOUR,
Corresponding Secretary.

Sworn to before me this 14th day of April, 1904.

[SEAL.]

JOHN F. BARNES,
Notary Public.

DOCUMENT VI.—*Testimony of Edwin A. Layton, M. D.*

Early in the year 1897 the Foreign Christian Missionary Society sent two representatives to found a mission in the Congo Independent State. After seeing and selecting sites, applications were made in usual form for the necessary leave to locate, erect buildings, and organize a mission. Every effort met with exasperating delay or definite refusal without apparent good reason, so that the better part of two years passed with no prospect of success. At that time a station of the American Baptist Missionary Union at Bolengi, Upper Congo, was transferred to this society and subsequently no further applications were made for mission sites pending the fruitless negotiations of the Baptist Missionary Society and the Congo Bolo Mission and others, all of which could bring much stronger pressure to bear upon the State authorities. While, therefore, the Foreign Christian Missionary Society was attracted to this part of Africa by the inviting terms of the treaty of Berlin, specifying, as it does, that "the right to build edifices for religious purposes and to organize religious missions of every creed shall be subject to no restriction or impediment whatsoever," this society has been unable to gain a foothold at all in the Congo Independent State in full six years' time.

The writer, Edwin A. Layton, M. D., and wife, resided during the later months of 1901, during 1902, and 1903 at Bolengi, near Coquilhatville, the capital of Equator district, upper Congo country. My work as a medical missionary has taken me to all the villages round about and perhaps 100 miles into the interior; to the northern shores of Lake Mantumba; as far up the Congo River as Monseabe; the entire length of the Lolangwa River, and up the Lopori to Bongandanga. Having been on the ground and myself seen victims of atrocious acts, cruelties, and oppression resulting from forced labor and an unjust taxation, undoubtedly signs of devastation and depopulation, and having either witnessed or met numerous native witnesses to various administrative abuses, I can testify to the correctness of statements made by Consul Casement in his report, by Mr. E. V. Sjöblom, Mr. and Mrs. Banks,^a and by several English missionaries. At the present time, however, I wish to speak more specifically of conditions in and about Bolengi.

The poor people of this section are broken spirited and poverty stricken by an arbitrary and oppressive system of taxation. While admitting the good professions of the Government, no philanthropic person can be in Congo without seeing and speaking of the really ruinous results of the present régime. Many years ago the people were taxed cassava bread ("kwanga"), fish, fresh meat, and fowls. This provision tax was probably fixed according to the population and the "payment" fixed at the then current prices, namely, one brass rod (equivalent to one cent) for each ration of bread, fish, etc. To my knowledge this has never been adjusted to the changed and ever-changing conditions caused by death or removal from any cause—there has been an obvious decrease in population—by the scarcity of native food stuffs or the marked advance in value. Thus, in course of time, the "taxes" have come to be very unequally apportioned and increasingly burdensome.

A close acquaintance with the conditions shows the cogency of the natives' contention that they are no less than slaves to the State. And as slaves, I have observed, they must sometimes "make bricks without straw," as when one must furnish fish weekly the year around, and he can catch fish only at certain seasons. Then one is forced to buy in other parts, paying, in this day, ten to forty times what will be received in return at the State post. To meet these obligations, A_____, of W_____, one of the remaining few of a once large family, had to pawn, i. e., sell into slavery a younger member of his family. He often had to buy fish at the market value of 30 or 40 brass rods a ration, which he must deliver to the State for the nominal sum of 1 rod a ration. He was never given any voice in the matter. The time required for the preparation of the provision tax extends, on the average, over several days of each week. A band of people from the village of B_____, mostly boys and girls, carrying baskets of food weighing 40 or 50 pounds, having passed over indescribably bad roads, rested at our mission the night of the fourth day of their journey to Coquilhatville—and all this in the mere act of delivering the food tax when once prepared. I saw a canoe

^aCivilization in Congoland.

full of fish—300 rations, they told me—leaving a village of a half dozen huts near the mouth of the Mabangi River, for Coquilhatville, which was three days' hard paddling upstream.

— was at one time a populous village on the banks of the Congo. Many had died, and a few fled from fear, so that the number of inhabitants was so reduced that I could find but two responsible men with their families. These still bore the original assessment of 50 rations of kwanga and 20 of fish. So far as I could see they spent all their time working out their taxes and they never ceased to appeal for relief, but with no avail. —, the headman, showed me the wheals from the cruel chilote when a shortage occurred and told of threats of the chain. At one time this village was ordered to clear the roadway a certain distance for the telegraph line, which, under the circumstances, was clearly an impossible task for them. They demurred. When nothing was done — was sent for, but was afraid to go. A soldier was then sent to compel him to appear with a pacifying present of 10,000 brass rods or be thrown immediately into chains. The matter was now in the hands of the civil officer. I tried to intercede for —. The judge stated he could not receive the statement of a white man, as he would feel bound to act accordingly, and so could not give an impartial verdict. The fine stood and — succeeded in paying it by pawning one of his women and by help of friends. I believe, however, the work was never done.

Besides the provision tax the villages are required to furnish firewood for brick-kilns or steamers, roof mats for the State buildings, to work on the telegraph line, men for the public force, and laborers for the State plantations. The village of Bolengi worked several weeks clearing the way for the telegraph line, building and repairing bridges, and when the chief, I —, reported the work as completed he received 300 brass rods as a personal present. Bolengi and other villages had to furnish firewood, which, owing to the ravages of the "white ant," was difficult to obtain. The wood was due at the State post every Sunday and required every available canoe for its transport. A considerable number of the children necessarily engaged in this work, and, moreover, were often held by the State as "hostages," because of delinquencies or deficits.

These matters seriously interfered with attendance at school and at Sunday services. It was almost impossible to have school at Wangatta when at least half the children were wading and searching the swamps daily for "ndebe" leaves with which to make roof mats for the State. Their provision tax was payable Sunday. Religious meetings were almost out of the question in the presence of several armed sentries before whom the hundreds of rations of food and brass rods, in payment of heavy fines, were being stacked up.

Itinerating in the interior, I found the people invariably in a state of intimidation. Entering a village unarmed and cautiously, all who could would flee to the forest. As soon, however, as they were assured that the visitor was not a State officer, they were ready to return and laugh at their sudden fear and flight. Bad roads were made worse for purposes of defense. Meeting with intertribal warfare, I found that the only people killed next death by means of modern firearms.

Villages along the rivers, the paths of commerce, are rapidly being depopulated. Of course, the death rate is high; but all who can, get away as far as possible into the interior. Under my own observation two villages became wholly extinct. When a few years ago Inganda presented solid rows of houses extending for miles, there are now but a few scattered and miserable huts. They are so used to being robbed that they reason it is better to have nothing, so as to have nothing to lose. Hence the native arts, as the hewing of canoes, are being lost. A most galling thing about the provision tax is that it is needed for and extorted by a savage soldiery who are privileged to pillage and plunder, to murder and to mutilate. The character of these "soldiers" is made clear not alone by observation, but by the honest confessions of several which I have heard. The people of M — have not forgotten the wanton attack made upon them, and there are witnesses who saw the human hands being carried by the Mission.

EDWIN A. LAYTON, M. D.

DOCUMENT VII.—A statement by the Rev. W. M. Morrison, submitted to His Majesty's Government.

ABUSES IN THE KONGO FREE STATE.

The following correspondence is in continuation of a long series of appeals made in the course of the past seven years by the Aborigines Protection Society to His Majesty's Government for its intervention on behalf of the ill-used natives of the Congo State. It is here printed as an introduction to the statement by the Rev. W. M. Morrison, which was invited by the secretary of state for foreign affairs, and to the report of a public meeting that was convened by the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society after Lord Lansdowne had declined to receive a deputation on the subject:

"BROADWAY CHAMBERS, Westminster, April 6, 1903.

"MY LORD MARQUIS: I have the honor, by direction of the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society, to ask that a deputation from this society may be allowed to set before your lordship the grounds upon which it appeals to His Majesty's Government to take such action as may be practicable with a view to checking abuses that have grown up in the territory of the Congo Free State.

"The committee expects that a missionary now returning from the Congo will be in England about the end of the present month, and it is anxious that he should have an opportunity of detailing to your lordship some of his experiences as to the illtreatment of natives in the district in which he has been a resident for many years.

"It ventures to hope that your lordship will consent to receive this testimony in support of representations which have already been submitted on the subject, and that you will be so good as to appoint an early day in May at which the proposed deputation may wait upon you.

"I have the honor to be, my Lord Marquis, your lordship's most obedient servant,

"H. R. FOX BOURNE.

"The most honorable the MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE, K. G., etc."

"FOREIGN OFFICE, April 21, 1903.

"SIR: The Marquis of Lansdowne has received your letter of the 6th instant, asking that a deputation from the Aborigines Protection Society may be allowed to set before his lordship the grounds upon which the society appeals to His Majesty's Government to take such action as may be practicable to check the abuses which are reported to have grown up in the Congo Independent State. You further mention that a missionary is expected to arrive in England from the Congo about the end of the present month, and that the committee of the society is anxious that he should have an opportunity of detailing to his lordship some of his experiences as to the illtreatment of the natives in the district in which he has been resident.

"I am directed by Lord Lansdowne to state that, in his opinion, the first step should be to communicate in writing to this department the information collected by the missionary referred to, and I am to add that, as these matters are not under the responsibility of His Majesty's Government, an official proceeding so formal as a deputation would be inappropriate.

"I am, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

"F. H. VILLIERS.

"The SECRETARY OF THE ABORIGINES PROTECTION SOCIETY."

"BROADWAY CHAMBERS, Westminster, May 5, 1903.

"MY LORD MARQUIS: I have the honor, by direction of the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society, to acknowledge the receipt of your lordship's letter of April 21, replying to the committee's request that a deputation might be allowed to set before your lordship its views concerning affairs in the Congo State.

"I am to tender herewith the statement, drawn up by the Rev. W. M. Morrison, which your lordship has consented to receive as a first step toward any inquiries that His Majesty's Government may be willing to institute on the subject.

"With reference to the concluding portion of your lordship's letter, I am respectfully to submit that, in the committee's opinion, Great Britain, as one of the signatories both of the Berlin general act of 1885 and of the Brussels general act of 1892, is in common with the other signatory powers, clearly responsible as regards the upholding of the provisions of those acts. It is further submitted that the flagrant violations thereof by the administrators of the Congo State, especially in respect of the opening of the basin of the Congo to free and civilizing commerce and the protection and improvement of its native populations, which are more particularly stipulated for in the first, fifth, and sixth articles of the Berlin act and the second article of the Brussels act, call for such intervention by His Majesty's Government, and by the other Governments whose honor and interests are involved, as may lead to restraint of the appalling abuses now existing, and may insure observance of the humane and equitable requirements of the acts in question.

"I have the honor to be, my Lord Marquis, your lordship's most obedient servant,

"H. R. FOX BOURNE.

"The most honorable the MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE, K. G., etc."

STATEMENT BY THE REV. W. M. MORRISON.

I am a missionary of the American Presbyterian Congo Mission, and have been located for the greater part of the past six years and a half at Luebo, a large native settlement at the head of navigation of the Lulua River, which is one of the longest tributaries of the Kasai, which is in turn the longest southern tributary of the Congo River, being about 1,200 miles almost due east from Banana on the west coast.

Before my arrival on the Congo I had often read and heard of the humane and liberal government which had been so auspiciously begun by King Leopold II, and I felt that it would be a great privilege to labor under a Government alleged to be so just in its treatment of all—natives, missionaries, and traders alike. I had, however, been in the country only a few days when I began, with deep sadness, to realize that things were not as they had been represented. While going along the old caravan route between Tumba and Stanley Pool I almost hourly met caravans of boys and men carrying heavy loads of rubber and ivory down to Tumba, to be there shipped on to Matadi by rail. Upon inquiry I found that the greater part of these men had been forced into the service of the State. From that time on to the present my intercourse with and knowledge of the State have only tended to increase the suspicion then formed that the published protestations of philanthropy are not really sincere.

[It will be my object in this statement to present not general accusations but a few of the many specific charges of injustice which have come under my own personal notice. So confident am I that my assertions can be verified that I am willing, if this is desired, without previous consultation with them, to give the names of numerous witnesses who will, I feel certain, bear testimony to the statements I make.] The names of these witnesses I leave with Mr. H. R. Fox Bourne, the secretary of the Aborigines Protection Society. I must say that, owing to the absolute impossibility of justice being done in the Congo State courts (if, indeed they have any real courts at all), I should not consider satisfactory an investigation conducted by the Congo government alone.

If, however, an impartial court, composed of other than Congo officials or those for any reasons peculiarly sympathetic to the Government, is appointed for the investigation, and the fear of State intimidation is thus removed, I am confident that every charge will be established. When it is remembered that all evidence in such cases is taken in secret by a State officer, that no one else is permitted to be present or even to bring out from witnesses evidence not asked for by him, and that the evidence thus secretly taken is left unsealed in the hands of the State official, it can be easily seen that there is every possibility—in my mind a strong probability—of the suppression of material evidence.

Some of the incidents which I am to relate have been reported to the State; some of them have not been. My policy, and that of our mission, has been to keep as quiet as possible about these things, and to give offense to the State as seldom as possible. I say offense, because, instead of appreciating our reports to them about matters which they profess to be so anxious to remedy, the authorities appear to resent it and to assume toward us an attitude of unfriendliness.

My observations have, for the most part, been confined to a limited area about Luebo and its vicinity. This region has, until the past year, been kept open to free trade, five trading houses having been located at Luebo. Consequently, I am inclined to think that this has been a section much more favored than other regions where the State has compelled the natives to make rubber. You can readily infer, if such things as I relate were done in a favored section, what must have been done in regions exploited entirely by the State. In fact, native reports often come to us of the hardships to which they are subjected in the Lusambo district, some days' journey to the east; and I have often seen State steamers come down loaded with rubber from Lusambo.

The cases of cruelty to which I shall now call attention have either come under my own direct observation or have occurred so near to me, and within the knowledge of my colleagues, in whose truthfulness I have absolute confidence, that I have no hesitation in vouching for them.

I. In the year 1895 an officer named Fromont came to Luebo, followed as usual by a squad of native soldiers, together with carriers and camp followers. Just as he entered the town, natives came running to me saying that the soldiers were pillaging their villages. I had often heard that on the march they were permitted to do this; so I went at once to the scene of the disturbance, found the villagers fleeing to the forests and the soldiers in full possession of a village which they were busy looting, having already severely wounded an innocent woman. I went at once to the officer, who was at the house of a trader only a few yards distant, and demanded protection for the people from the outrage of his soldiers.

He professed not to know that they were doing anything of the sort, the presumption clearly being that it was the usual custom for them to do such things when on the road, and that they had not been warned to make an exception at Luebo. And I may here state that at Luebo, even when an officer is present, we have often had the greatest difficulty in keeping the soldiers from looting and otherwise abusing the native population. The latter know from bitter experience that it is useless to resist the soldiers. They also know that, with perhaps a few exceptions, they would only be even worse treated if they appealed to the State officer for protection.

When this man Fromont had been at Luebo for some days, natives came to me with the report, which was also verified by the statement of a trader whose name I am in a position to furnish, that Fromont intended to compel the entire Baluba population of Luebo, consisting of several thousands, to remove to Luluaburg, the State post five days distant. Upon hearing this I went to the State officer about it. He confessed that the report was true, but gave as excuse for his intention that the people of Luebo did not work, and that he wanted to take them to Luluaburg, where they would have to work.

I protested to him that the natives of Luebo worked for the mission and the several trading companies, and that many of them had even gone far away down the Kasai River, where they had willingly accepted contract to labor for the traders. I also told him that the people of Luebo doubtless worked more than the many thousands of Zappo-Zapps already at Luluaburg and under the control of the State. I told him still further that to tear the people away from the homes which they had built and the large plantations which they had just laboriously made was not only most cruel and inhumane, but was a distinct violation of rights which were guaranteed to the natives under treaties. I also told him that if he persisted against my protest in thus disturbing the natives of Luebo, I should not only report the matter to Boma, but should feel it my duty to publish the fact to the world.

When he saw that I was in earnest he was most surprised. Evidently he was not accustomed to such interference with his plans. When he saw what I would do, he compromised the matter, taking away only a few Zappo-Zapps who belonged to Luluaburg. He also took the names of the chiefs, so that he could demand tribute of food for himself, soldiers, and carriers when he or other State officials might come again. Thus it was that this officer was deterred from perpetrating an outrage which would have resulted in much cruelty, hardship, and, doubtless, bloodshed.

While Fromont was at Luebo several of the soldiers invaded without notice, the private sleeping apartments of two of our lady missionaries, on the pretense that they were searching for a woman who had fled to the house of the missionaries for protection.

During this same visit a village of Batetela people was burned, by whose orders I could never exactly find out. The natives reported that it was done by order of Fromonts.

II. In the months of August and September of the year 1899 occurred, about three days from Luebo, one of the most shameful affairs that has come within my knowledge. By way of explanation it is necessary to say that at the State post of Luluaburg, which is about five days' march from Luebo, is located a large village of people called Zappo-Zapps.

They are cannibals, and were brought from far to the east and settled there by a State officer named Paul Le Marinel about the year 1890. Ever since their coming to Luluaburg they have been a terror to the whole surrounding district. In fact, having guns and being known to be cannibals and very brave warriors, they have all these years been the great slave dealers and slave raiders of the district. Perhaps half of the 7,000 or 8,000 people at Luebo who have been or are now slaves have been caught by the Zappo-Zapps in their numerous raids. Quite a large number have been caught by State soldiers, while a goodly number have been seized by the famous State "friendly" at Lusambo, named Penia Mutambo.

Some few have been caught in petty fights between villagers. The State must of necessity know of the many thousands of slaves who have passed, and are now passing, through the hands of these Zappo-Zapps. The only possible explanation is that the State and the Zappo-Zapps—many of whom, by the way, are my personal friends—are in alliance in the matter. Up to the time I left Luebo, slaves caught in the regions to the east of Luluaburg and Lusambo are almost daily exposed for sale, and always by the Zappo-Zapps. Either the latter themselves have done the raiding, or it has been done by some of the "sepoy" about Lusambo, who have then sold the slaves to the Zappo-Zapps.

This digression from the incident which I am proceeding to narrate was necessary in order to more fully explain who the Zappo-Zapps are and what is their relation to the State. The circumstances, briefly stated, are these:

During the last days of July, 1899 (or about that time), news reached us at Luebo that a large band of Zappo-Zapps, under a famous warrior chief named Mlumba Nkusa, was proceeding into the Bena Pianga country, not far from one of our mission stations, in order to collect tribute and get stores for the State. Upon hearing this news I wrote at once to our missionary at Ibanj, the Rev. W. H. Sheppard, F. R. G. S., warning him to be on the lookout for trouble. He had not long to wait, for soon the news began to come in from the region, only one day from the station, that the Zappo-Zapps had established themselves in a strong stockade near a village named Chinyama, from which they were almost daily sallying forth to catch slaves, demand tribute from villagers, and kill all who dared oppose them.

This condition of affairs went on uninterrupted by the officer at Luluaburg, though only four—or at the most five—days distant. The greatest terror prevailed throughout the whole region, extending even as far as Luebo and beyond. Many thousands of people had deserted their villages and fled to the forests for safety.

At last word came to Mr. Sheppard that the Zappo-Zapps had treacherously invited a large number of the prominent chiefs of the region to come inside the stockade, and that there they had been shot down without quarter.

The Mission then asked Mr. Sheppard, who was also a friend of many of the Zappo-Zapps, to go and carefully investigate the whole affair, taking with him some reliable native men who could, if necessary, corroborate the statements he made.

Mr. Sheppard saw along the way several burnt villages, also some wounded persons. He reached the well-arranged stockade, and was received in a friendly way by Mlumba Nkusa and his 500 or more followers. Inside the stockade Mr. Sheppard saw and counted eighty-one human hands, slowly drying over a fire. Outside the stockade he counted more than two score bodies piled in a heap. Some of these bodies had the flesh carved from the legs. Upon asking what this meant he was informed by Mlumba Nkusa that his people had eaten the flesh. Mr. Sheppard also saw several Albini rifles and a pistol, with cartridges—all of which natives are forbidden to have. Mlumba Nkusa said plainly that he had been sent by the State officer at Luluaburg and that he had already dispatched to him 16 slaves.

Upon receiving Mr. Sheppard's account of the affair, I, as legal representative of the mission, made a report of the affair to the officer at Luluaburg, charging him with the responsibility, and demanding the immediate recall of the Zappo-Zapps. I received from him in reply the usual bluffing note, denying having anything to do with the affair.

In a few days a judge came and summoned me to Ibanj to establish the charges I had made. With the judge were the commissaire of the district and a young military officer in charge of the soldiers and numerous carriers.

On my way to Ibanj I found all the villages on the road deserted and the people hiding in the forest, being even more frightened now that white State men had come into the community. One village, named Kabow, through which the State men had passed, was not only deserted, but was almost torn to pieces. I may here state that I saw three such villages through which the State men had passed a few days later, and they too had been looted and every possible form of damage and desecration done. I asked a soldier why they treated the villages in this way. He replied that the State men told them to do it in order to make the natives more afraid of the State.

Upon my arrival at Ibanj the so-called investigation was begun; but it was from the first painfully evident that the judge, who was writing down the evidence to send to Boma, was doing all in his power to free his fellow-officer, even attempting to influence witnesses by making an argument in favor of the officer charged. I was permitted to hear some of the evidence in this case, but I was afterwards told by another judge that the Government had reprimanded his colleague for permitting me to hear the evidence.

The investigation over, these officers came to Luebo. After remaining for some days at the latter place, completely demolishing the village in which they stayed, two of them proposed to go to the village of Chinyama, where the out-

rage had been committed. They started, but upon attempting to sleep at a large native village only two hours from Luebo, they were shot upon by arrows by some of the villagers who were lurking near and evidently did not wish to see their town destroyed.

For some mysterious reason these officers retreated to Luebo, and they were crossing the river to go on to Luluaburg by the southern route when a native woman belonging to Luebo came in severely cut in a number of places. She said she had been attacked on the way by some of the villagers of the town which had shot at the State officials. I knew instantly that it meant war upon us at Luebo, for the people of that village have always been rather difficult to get along with, and they considered the State men to be our friends because they were white.

I immediately dispatched a messenger after the State men, telling them that, as they had come into the community and made this trouble, they must now stay and protect us.

They came back and ordered more soldiers from Luluaburg, the accused officer coming with them. His name was Dufour. This latter went on a punitive expedition, but to a village far distant, which, he alleged, had given him some insult on the road. He only passed through the village which had fired on the officers. A mutiny arising among his soldiers, he returned to Luebo, and in a few days went on to Luluaburg. It was, however, many months before the country quieted down again.

But what became of those who committed the outrages at Chinyama? M. Dufour was completely exonerated, and all the blame was put on Mlumba Nkusa, who, they said, had gone raiding on his own account.

What punishment, then, was given Mlumba Nkusa? They say he was kept in confinement at Luluaburg for a few weeks. I know that not many weeks after the occurrence he was at Luebo. It was there commonly reported by natives from Luluaburg that the reason why he was not taken away and severely punished was because the Zappo-Zapps, knowing that Mlumba Nkusa had been treacherously dealt with, were on the eve of revolting, and this would have been a most serious affair, seeing that their number, it is estimated, is about 25,000 or 30,000, and that they have many guns and know from long experience how to use them.

III. In the spring of 1899 a State officer visited the village of a great chief named Lukenga, about five days from Luebo. Mr. Sheppard and myself, being friendly with many of the villagers, were called to come to them at once. As we had long waited to pay a visit to this village we went immediately.

Upon arrival there we found the whole community in the greatest excitement. We were told that the State men had fired upon them; so they went out with their bows and arrows to defend their village. They reported 14 men killed. Without leaving them any word as to the reason for his visit, the officer departed almost immediately; at any rate, he was not there when Mr. Sheppard and I reached the place. This officer was from a State post (Isaka) on the Sankuru River.

IV. About a year later another officer (or perhaps the same one) again paid a visit to this village, killed its chief, and, from native reports, which we have every reason to believe to be true, also killed a great number of men, women, and children, carrying away a large quantity of booty. It was utterly impossible for any of the missionaries to go to see the full extent of the outrages; we only know that the village, a large and prosperous one, was entirely broken up, and it is only within the past few months that the people have begun to return to the old site. This same officer, some weeks after the event, was on his way down river to go home. Not knowing that we were friends of the village thus outraged, he proceeded to tell us how the people, as they were being fired upon, ran about crying "Shepite! Shepite!" They were calling for their old friend, Mr. Sheppard, to come to their assistance. He also said that he had obtained a splendid lot of ivory and many curios.

V. Now, however, the attitude of the State toward the village and its new chief there has turned to the other extreme. The chief has been made a friend of the State; several soldiers are placed at his command, and he is empowered to impress his whole tribe, composed of several scores of villages, for tribute for the State post at Isaka. Naturally this young chief soon became arrogant, and was not slow in making abuse of his powers. Only a few days before I left Luebo it was necessary for our mission steamer to go on a three weeks' trip to Isaka to rescue from the hands of this chief a native who had long been attached to our mission at Ibanj, and who had been treacherously invited by the chief to pay him a visit, and had, upon reaching the village of the chief, been most cruelly outraged and abused. The chief had been permitted to return to his village, so I presume, so far as the State is concerned, the matter is ended. But this is only a concrete instance of the barbarities resulting from the "chefferies" system.

VI. During the months of June, July, and August of last year we had at Luebo—and in fact throughout the region between Luluaburg and Luebo—another reign of terror. A new officer, named Deschamps, had just come into power at Luluaburg.

During my absence he came to Luebo and there, without warning to the chiefs or villagers, sent out his soldiers to catch men by force wherever they could be found. The people fled at once to the forests for safety; some of the women and children, as is their custom in such times of fear, found refuge about the Mission premises. He went away with a number of men thus caught. Upon my return to Luebo, only a few days after the departure of the officer, and finding the whole community naturally in a state of unrest, I made complaint to the authorities about the matter. Scarcely had my letter been dispatched when another officer, named Duce, sent by Deschamps, came to "recruit" soldiers, as he said.

I went to him, and in person demanded protection for the natives, and urged that none be taken by force. This M. Duce promised, and I in turn told the natives what he had said. Within a few days, however, he received imperative orders from his chief, Deschamps. Consequently he began catching the people by force. They fled to the forests for safety; but day after day, for perhaps a week or ten days, the soldiers scoured the woods in search of men. They succeeded in catching about eighteen or twenty, and these I saw taken away under guard, tied about the necks with ropes.

When I began to make trouble about the matter some of the men were returned, but some were never given up. Only the day before I left Luebo the old chief of the village came to me and begged me to try to find and send back his boys whom the State had taken away.

This who affair I reported to the native protection commission appointed by the King some years ago, of which the Rev. George Grenfell is the secretary, asking it to see that the natives were protected in their rights. The only answer I received was that the State had established forced labor by law, and that doubtless the officers were acting entirely within their powers, the commission thus sheltering itself and the officers guilty of these outrages under a form of legality.

VII. I have been for six years at Luebo, and during the greater part of that time have acted as an intermediary for the natives in their troubles with the State. I was most deeply saddened, as the time for my departure drew near, to see the anxiety which many of them felt. They often came asking me "Who will now protect us from the State?"

VIII. Upon boarding the train at Leopoldville, on 25th March last, I found three truck loads of slaves being sent down to Matadi under guard of soldiers. There were, in addition, a dozen or more with chains around their necks, evidently prisoners.

At the several stops I had some conversation with the captives, and found that they were Baluba and Batetela people from the vicinity of Lusambo, only a few days east of Luebo.

Upon being asked what they were doing so far from home, one of them replied that the state officer at Lusambo had sent their chief word to bring tribute. Upon going with a number of the villagers to the post, they told me they were seized, put on the river steamer, and brought down to Leopoldville, where they had slept one night; they had then been put on board the railway and were going they knew not where. They seemed, naturally, in great anxiety, and asked me repeatedly if there was any food or water in the country to which they were going.

Upon reaching Matadi on 27th March I was met at the station by Doctor Sims, who is a member of the Commission appointed to make report of atrocities done to natives. As the slaves were getting off the train Doctor Sims remarked to me, "Do you see the slaves of the State?" Where they were taken I do not know. I may here point out that it is the custom, when men are made into soldiers, to take them to a distant district from that in which they were born. For example, in passing through Boma I saw Baluba soldiers who had been brought from the Kasai district. I had free conversation with them.

I could give further instances of outrages done in the name of civilization and philanthropy, but it would make this statement too long. I shall only close by referring to another matter of vital importance, which shows in another aspect the State's set policy to infringe upon the rights not only of the natives, but also of foreigners who have gone to the Congo for commercial or religious purposes. I refer to the fact that concessions or grants of land, however small, can now no longer be obtained from the State by other than favored individuals or corporations. The State is dividing up the country among great concessionnaires, with exclusive rights of trade by the companies to which the concessions are given. There is now very little free land not given out to such companies to exploit. It is also to be noted that in most, if not, all of these companies the State controls half the stock. You can thus see that legitimate trade, except in the small regions from Banana to Stanley Pool, is practically shut out.

I know of one man, an Englishman named Pierce, who was representing a Belgian company, who lived for over a year on my station at Luebo, trying to get only a few square yards of ground on which to build a house and engage in legitimate trade. This was absolutely refused, and he had at last to go away without securing his concession.

Not only are concessions refused to traders; they are also refused to missionaries. It will thus be seen that the State has reached almost the farthest point to which it can go in closing up the country, short of absolutely expelling us from the concessions which we already hold.

W. M. MORRISON.

LONDON, 4th May, 1903.

MEETING ON THE KONGO QUESTION.

At the meeting which was held at the Royal United Service Institution, Whitehall, on Tuesday, May 5, 1903, the chair was occupied by the Rev. John Clifford, D. D., LL. D., and among those present were the Right Hon. Sir Charles W. Dilke, Bart., M. P., Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Bart., M. P., Sir W. Brampton Gurdon, M. P., Messrs. Thomas Bayley, M. P., Herbert Samuel, M. P., H. J. Wilson, M. P., Robert Whyte, and E. D. Morel, Sir John Smallman Smith, Col. J. G. B. Stopford, Count de Cardi, Prof. N. C. Frederiksen, of Copenhagen; Messrs. E. Banks, A. E. Ruskin, and William Wilkes, of the Congo, and Messrs. E. Wright Brooks, F. W. Fox, Travers Buxton, and Fox Bourne.

Mr. Alfred Emmott, M. P., had written: "I am very sorry I can not be at the meeting on the 5th instant on account of a previous engagement. If I had been present I should have gladly availed myself of the opportunity you offered me of saying a few words on the commercial aspect of the Kongo question. The main point to bear in mind in regard to possibilities of trade expansion in tropical countries is the necessity of developing their exports by regenerative methods. The chief export now is rubber, and its sources are being rapidly depleted, whilst the peculiar methods of collection adopted are depopulating large areas.

The rubber is sold in Europe. Its proceeds pay the taxes and make the profits of the concessionnaire companies, but the balance of all the exports is only sufficient to pay for £1,000,000 worth of imports, and of these a considerable portion consists of guns and ammunition. Sir Henry Stanley many years ago promised us £20,000,000 of trade per annum. Our exports are £125,000 at present. Apart from the glaring inhumanities which have been perpetrated in the name of civilization, apart from the clever creation of monopolies, where a policy of no monopolies was promised, there remains the crass stupidity of a system which dries up the sources of production. It is not too late to stop this now, if only Europe would awake. The only plan is for those who care about it to keep it prominently before the public of this country.

The Reverend Doctor Clifford, chairman, in opening the proceedings, said: "I am privileged to occupy this chair by the circumstance that I am one of those who have recently had occasion to direct public attention to the condition of things in the Kongo Free State. Only a little while ago I had no very definite and clear acquaintance with the affairs of that important part of Africa. Listening to speeches which were made by Mr. Robert Whyte and Mr. Silas Hocking at the congress of free churches two months ago I discovered that there were facts with which I ought to be acquainted, and therefore I devoted myself to the investigation of all the literature I could get together, so that I might know what had been taking place. Of course, I had heard rumors of oppressions, exploitations of land, cruelties, and atrocities, but I regarded such occurrences as incidental to the savage conditions of life obtaining in that district, and what might be expected, as things are amongst us, when a civilized people invades the realms of savagery.

"But looking into this literature, I speedily discovered that European civilization entering this district has been the creator of a system which has become almost, I may say, of necessity the source and spring of the cruelties and oppressions that have occurred there during the last fifteen or sixteen years. I found that there was a system to which our own Government, along with certain other governments of Europe, had committed themselves by express treaty; a system which had issued in the appropriation of some 800,000 square miles of territory hitherto occupied by the natives, and that that had been done without any reference to the customs which had probably become as law among the peoples dwelling there, without the slightest offer of compensation to the peoples exploited, and without any regard whatsoever to their choice or to their preference. I further found that not only had the lands themselves been appropriated, but also the produce of those lands—the ivory and the rubber—and that the system was of such a character as to open the way for the creation of trading companies which have been empowered to levy taxes upon the people, and are undefined as to the amount that may be taken in rubber or in ivory.

"I found, again, that those trading companies are numerous, that they exist by the authority of the State, that the State takes something like 50 or more per cent of the profits of each trading company, and, finally, that the State employs an army of natives to the extent of some 15,000 men or more, who are forced into the service of the State and used for the purpose of carrying out its projects. So it seems to me that the system is as certain to produce the evils of which we complain as are the clouds to give us rain, and that therefore the evil we have to deal with is not an atrocity here or a cruelty there, but the system itself out of which all these oppressions proceed.

"In looking for evidence, I have not restricted my attention to that which has been produced, some will say, in the interests of the natives.

"I have been anxious to get at all the facts of the situation, and therefore I have turned my attention to the evidence of the Belgian Government, which

has been circulated in this country—as far as I can gather, circulated abundantly. So anxious are people to put me right, that I have no fewer than three copies already. I have read one of those copies. Well, I find that the case presented in the book of Mr. Fox Bourne or in that of Mr. Morel can be substantiated in its essential points from this very book, which is presented as a book defending the action of the Kongo Free State. I gather from this evidence that those atrocities are still going on. Father Cambier may be called as a witness to the fact that heads are cut off, hands are cut off, and so on.

"Moreover, I find it is possible from the self-same book to show that the system which is at work, so long as it is permitted to exist, can only be expected to produce results of this kind, and therefore I hold that it is our duty to bring about, at the earliest possible moment, a termination of this system.

"To appeal to the King of the Belgians seems to me—I do not know how it may appear to those more intimately acquainted with the operations of the King of the Belgians than I am—a hopeless task. And I feel that the only course possible for us to undertake with any expectation of doing any real service is that of urging our own Government and, through our Government, the other European powers that are contributory to this present cruelty, to take action in reference to the Berlin general act. It is, therefore, a matter of rejoicing to me, and to you also, I am sure, that Mr. Herbert Samuel has secured a night for the introduction of this matter in the House of Commons, and we may expect an illuminating debate.

"What is necessary is that the country should understand the situation. At present a good many of the people of this country—most of the people I think I may say—are in the condition in which I was two months ago. Rumors they have heard, but definite and certain knowledge they do not possess, and we ought to use every opportunity in our power to make our fellow-citizens acquainted with the actual and horrible state of affairs. I hope that out of the action to-night some such results may come. We have the opportunity of listening to one from the field, the Rev. W. M. Morrison, who has been there more than six years. He will speak to us as one who knows the facts at first hand and whose evidence we are most desirous of hearing. I have the greatest pleasure in introducing to you Mr. Morrison, from the Kasai district, who will speak to us of his work in that neighborhood, and of what he knows of these Kongo atrocities."

The Rev. W. M. Morrison then addressed the meeting as follows: "Doctor Clifford, in the general statement he has made, has presented to you so correctly the true situation of affairs in the Kongo Free State that little more remains for me than to give you some concrete examples which have come under my own personal observation. You all know that about the beginning of the eighties there was a great desire on the part of the European powers to acquire possession of land throughout Africa. As a result of this, and as a result of the discoveries of Sir H. M. Stanley and others, the Berlin conference was called for this purpose. It arranged for the partition of a great part of Central Africa, and the organization of what is known as the Kongo Independent State. This had been started, as you know, by the King of the Belgians prior to the Berlin conference, but it was not fully recognized as an independent power until the year 1885.

"The Government of the United States of America, of which I am a citizen, took the lead in this recognition, and hence I feel that my country is particularly responsible for the situation of affairs in the Kongo Free State to-day. It is my purpose, when I return to America, to explain the position as speedily and effectively as I can to the authorities at Washington, in the hope that my fellow-citizens will unite with you in England to bring to an end the atrocities that have been and are being committed in the name of civilization and humanity.

"You are aware, Doctor Clifford, that we preachers do not exactly feel comfortable unless we have a text, and therefore I propose to-night to take as my text an article from the general act of the Berlin Conference, in which the different powers—England, America, France, Germany, and, in fact, all the powers of the civilized world—joined in a solemn compact, and in the organization of the Kongo Free State guaranteed to the natives and foreigners alike certain rights and privileges. The sixth article of this Berlin act was as follows: 'All the powers exercising sovereign rights or influence in the State territories pledge themselves to watch over the preservation of the native populations and the improvement of their moral and material conditions of existence, and to work together for the suppression of slavery, and especially of the slave trade; to protect and encourage, without distinction of creed or nation, all religious, scientific, or charitable institutions established and organized for these objects, or intended to educate the natives, and bring home to them the advantages of civilization. Christian missionaries, men of science, and explorers are likewise to be the objects of special protection. Liberty of conscience and religious toleration are expressly guaranteed to the natives as well as to foreigners. The free and public exercise of the observances of every creed, the right to build edifices for religious purposes, and to organize religious missions of every creed shall be subject to no restriction or impediment whatsoever.' If ever anything was written plainly and simply, that is. Well, I am going to prove to you to-night that those guarantees have been broken in every essential point.

"But first, in view of the remarks just made by Doctor Clifford, let me point out that the divergencies and contradictions in statements published as to the condition of affairs in the Kongo are due to the fact that these statements come from very different sorts of informants. Some are travelers who, in passing through the country along its great highways, see nothing of what is going on in the interior. Others are State officials, commercial men, and Protestant as well as Catholic missionaries, who, from the circumstances in which they are placed, have inducements to do what they can in suppressing the truth. One of the functions of the Catholic missionaries is to take charge of the children handed over to them by the State after they have been obtained in ways that I can not explain to-night.

"It is enough to say that to one mission, near to my own station, as many as 1,700 children who had fallen into the hands of the State, as the result of raids of the State soldiery from time to time, are stated to have been intrusted. With regard to the Protestant missionaries, I may say generally that their policy seems to have been to see just as little as they could, and to speak just as little as they could about what they could not help seeing. I am sorry that it should be so, and I must confess before you here to-night that during the last six years I have sometimes myself felt almost afraid to speak.

"But I have spoken out on several occasions. You may remember, perhaps, that about two or two and a half years ago reports of some horrible atrocities that occurred near Luebo, in the Kasai district, appeared in the English papers. On that occasion I felt it would be a wrong to humanity, a sin resting upon my conscience, if I did not speak out and let the world know the true condition of affairs. On the other hand, there are some who have, perhaps, gone to the other extreme and have kept their eyes closed and their mouths shut. Their excuse is that they have been afraid to speak, so sovereign is the power which controls the Kongo, and from which there is no appeal. The word of the King who sits in Brussels is absolute in the Kongo State. We missionaries know that if he speaks the word we shall all have to leave to-morrow. Those 15,000 soldiers of whom Doctor Clifford has spoken will be sent to expel us. Hence we are afraid to speak.

"And here let me say that it has given me great pleasure in the past two or three days to read the resolutions which were adopted by the Baptist Union. After that I begin to see the light. The Baptist Missionary Society, being one of the strongest and most influential of all the missionary societies at work in the Kongo State, holds, perhaps the key to the situation, and if the heads of that society can be prevailed upon to act, and the men on the spot to speak out, I

believe there will be such a revelation as will stagger the whole world. I say this because I believe to-day that there is not, perhaps, in all the world a Government that is so wicked and so iniquitous in all its relations, both to the natives and to foreigners, as the Government of the Congo Free State. I am not even prepared to make an exception of Turkey.

"Contradictions of testimony are partly due, perhaps, to different conceptions as to what constitutes an infringement of the rights of natives. Probably what I may consider an infringement upon the rights of natives another man may not consider an infringement at all. I derive my view, however, from the guarantees according to law. By law the natives are guaranteed inalienable rights of residence and home, also an inalienable right to the produce of their labor, willingly given. These are what I consider to be the fundamental rights of the natives. On the other hand, there are persons willing to admit that the State has a right to enact laws compelling the natives to serve at its stations and in its military department, to labor in plantations and on board steamers, and on any other work it appoints.

"I have a letter in my hands sent to me by the Natives Protection Commission, which was appointed by the King about seven years ago, when these atrocities first came to be known. I have a letter from two members of that commission to whom, nine months ago, I complained of atrocities and outrages committed in my own station. They simply reply, in effect, 'Well, you can do nothing, because the State has forced-labor laws.' Can not do anything! They admit the right claimed by the State to outrage the natives, and I can not make any appeal against the outrage because it is sanctioned by law. Therefore, I have come to you in the name of the millions of black men in Central Africa, and I ask you if the Congo Free State has the right to commit outrage. ('No!')

"Now, what is the attitude of the State toward us when we make representations of this state of affairs? You know there are constantly coming from Brussels protestations of righteousness and justice, and of a willingness to hear any complaints we have to make. But what is their value? I have never made a single complaint to the State of outrages against natives without receiving back a curt and almost insulting letter. If an investigation is promised, let me give you an illustration of the way in which it is conducted. Only last summer I reported an affair that happened at Luebo. Three months afterwards the judge, as they call him, came to investigate. He spent half a day examining me. The next day, accompanied by another missionary, I went to the court to hear the evidence and to bring out such evidence as might be necessary, because I have the honor of being the legal representative of our mission in the Congo Free State.

"I felt, as representing the mission, that I had a right to hear the evidence given, and the right to elicit such evidence as I felt sure the officer of the State would not bring out of his own accord. When I asked that I might have the privilege of hearing the evidence of my colleague, Mr. Hawkins, the State officer refused. He said, 'No; you can not hear the evidence of Mr. Hawkins.' I answered, 'Why not? I am representing our mission in this affair.' I said, 'Evidence taken in secret will not be worth the paper on which it is written.' He replied that, as a matter of courtesy, he would permit me to hear the evidence of Mr. Hawkins, but that he would not allow me to hear the evidence of the natives. I said, 'If you won't permit me to hear the evidence of the natives, intimidated as they are by your soldiers, I will go out into the civilized world and will tell the facts.' Well, here are some of the facts."

Mr. Morrison then related in detail most of the occurrences set forth in the statement submitted to Lord Lansdowne by the Aborigines Protection Society, and remarked that, while for obvious reasons he withheld the names of his witnesses from the Congo government, if an impartial international committee were appointed to investigate the situation, the names of his witnesses would be forthcoming.

Mr. Morrison, in concluding, said that the Times had aptly described the present government of the Congo Free State as an "anomaly," while the Spectator styled it an "anachronism." He added: "I protest against those hypocritical protestations of righteousness and justice that come from the ruler in Brussels. We want to see some administration of justice. We are tired of words, mere words; we are tired of the denial of such horrible facts as I have related to you to-night. The King of the Belgians is afraid of an impartial international inquiry, and, pending it, he wants to get all he can out of the country so cruelly misgoverned. In the name of humanity, in the name of the defenseless natives in the Congo Free State, in the name of the men following honest commercial industry in that state, I plead to the English nation to come to our rescue."

The Right Hon. Sir Charles W. Dilke, Bart., M. P., then moved the following resolution: "That this meeting, having heard the statement of the Rev. W. M. Morrison, earnestly appeals to His Majesty's Government, as one of the signatories to the Berlin and Brussels acts of 1885 and 1892, to use its influence with the other signatory powers toward securing the humane and equitable treatment of natives in the Congo Basin which was guaranteed by those acts." He said:

"Mr. Morrison began by describing the foundation of the Congo State. Many of us pursue this subject with as much vigor as we can command, because we feel a certain responsibility for that foundation. I do not share that responsibility, but it is felt by most of those with whom I associate in this society.

"Personally I was concerned in the proposal to keep Portugal—which had the best rights, if any rights exist—on that coast by means of a treaty which would have given us, I think, security for trade and for commercial enterprise. But the chambers of commerce and Parliament and our antislavery friends were all for the King of the Belgians at that time. Hence we were prevented making a treaty which, in the case of such a weak power as Portugal, would have given us securities for trade and for the carrying out of the stipulations agreed to. Moreover, we should have been in a position to protect the natives in a country which our people had discovered, and which the prime minister, Mr. Disraeli, refused to take over when the native chiefs guaranteed it to us. This country that they handed over to us was, with the concurrence of the Antislavery Society and the Aborigines Protection Society, handed over to the King of the Belgians. It was handed over in the full belief of those whom I have named that they were doing, under the circumstances of the case, what was best for the advantages of trade and civilization, and especially for the protection of the native races.

"Now that Congo Free State was founded in the name of Almighty God. All Europe sat round table and recognized it as a kind of antislavery society. The European powers brought it into existence as a sovereign State in the name of Almighty God on behalf of the natives of the country. In the most express terms that condition is repeated over and over again throughout the Berlin act.

"I suppose that no defender of the Congo State will dare to say that the stipulations of the Berlin act are observed in the Congo State. I have never seen any attempt among its defenders to make out that the treaty provisions are observed. The whole district lies within what is known as the Free Trade Zone, and there is the most absolute and express prohibition of the creation of monopoly or of favor throughout the whole of that vast region. No one pretends that those stipulations are observed, or that they are not violated in a manner absolutely grotesque. Nearly the whole of that vast territory has been handed over to concessionnaire companies, and even the remainder—not so handed over—has, by decree upon decree, been made the absolute possession of the State, has been taken from private persons and handed to the State, with powers given under these decrees, making the State the absolute master not only of the persons but also of the property of the natives within those districts.

"No one, I say, pretends that the stipulations of the Berlin conference are not absolutely violated; but when we point out what these decrees must mean, as regards the condition of the natives, what the system must mean, the answer is: 'Oh,

yes; but we take great pains to punish all offenses which grow from this system which you describe. Every injury is inquired into.' I brought this matter before the House of Commons in April, 1897, mainly on the nature of the system which Doctor Clifford described from the chair. We had not then such evidence as we have to-day as to the atrocities which must result from such a system. We had, however, the extraordinary evidence of Doctor Hinde, now serving under the foreign office in British territory, set forth in a book which has never been questioned by representatives of the Congo Free State.

"No doubt has been cast upon the testimony of Doctor Hinde in 1897. That testimony showed that in all cases of conquest of fresh parts of territory the work was done by the use of cannibal tribes from other regions. Even the best of the officers in the employ of the Congo State have admitted that when they have been marching about the Congo district with cannibal forces, those forces were rationed on the bodies of the people whom they killed in war. That fact has never been denied. When it was brought before the House of Commons in April, 1897, no answer was made. There were one or two members of that House in close relations with the Congo State, and yet no answer was made.

"I think we may take it as established that by its extraordinary decrees, by a mere stroke of the pen, natives have been deprived of their entire property, and that the State has habitually employed cannibal troops and forces with the horrible consequences described. Wherever these troops have been stationed they have, of course, raided the country round in the manner you have heard described by Mr. Morrison.

"We are now in possession of such evidence as from the nature of things we had every reason to expect concerning the working of what is called the 'sentry system.' The Congo State has lived, and still lives very largely, upon rubber. It is the great rubber-exporting district of the world—the rubber that is increasingly used in all the appliances of civilization. That rubber is mainly obtained in small quantities from the natives for a wholly insufficient payment, in some cases for no payment at all. And it is obtained by planting upon the people native sentries of the wildest kind, picked from distant parts of the country, men quite different from those among whom they are stationed. These men terrorize the locality. They are commanded by so-called 'officers'—not men whom we think of as officers, but men who have served in the Belgian army, old soldiers of that army, who have been sent out. Being enterprising men and brave men, accustomed to carry their lives in their hands, they are promoted to be lieutenants, but they are the very last kind of persons likely to deal tenderly with the natives in newly occupied countries.

"Those are the officers, and the men are savages brought from other districts and armed with rifles and ammunition. Having overcome the people of the neighborhood, the sentry demands rubber, and if the natives do not bring it in quickly enough he sends for other parties of men and raids the district. Habitually the tale of the sentry is testified to by the sending in of hands to prove how many have been killed.

"It is only by force of overwhelming evidence that I have been driven to the conclusion that this is really done. Immediately after the debate in the House of Commons in April, 1897, there came from the Congo State a Swedish missionary, Mr. Sjöblom. We heard him in a room not very far from here, and I undertake to say there was not a single person present who was not constrained to believe every syllable he uttered.

"His statement has never been shaken in any way. The Congo Free State, which never hesitates to attack as far as it can those who expose its misdeeds, has never ventured to say that Mr. Sjöblom was a liar. He saw with his own eyes the hands that had been cut off, and testified to what he saw, and to the circumstances he knew, with such straightforwardness that no one who heard him could disbelieve his testimony.

"It is only public forgetfulness and carelessness that prevents these facts being universally recognized. I am quite sure there is no weak point in them—nothing which exposes itself to attack.

"The Congo State has gone to great expense in sending to each of us four or five copies of a very ill-compiled work in its defense, consisting chiefly of quotations from persons whose names are supposed to carry weight. Some of these names do carry weight, but passages quoted are torn from their context; other passages are fraudulently used. The quotations will not bear the faintest examination. On every page in this book one sees contradiction and evident bad faith. As to several of the Englishmen whose names are used, I may state that I have seen them since the book was issued, and I have asked them, 'Is this your opinion of the Congo Free State?' The reply I have received has been, 'No, it is not; and my name has been used for a purpose contrary to my views.' Of others, whom I have not seen and whom I know, I undertake to say, on my own responsibility, that they can not be claimed as defenders of the Congo State.

"Now, what are we to do, and how far are we responsible? There are some people who think that the record of the past, our own record, is a very bad record, as bad as that of other people. I have given a great deal of attention to this subject. I have read the books of Mr. Fox Bourne and of Mr. Morel, and I have heard Mr. Sjöblom, and to-night Mr. Morrison, and I venture to say that all of us who have given much attention to this subject agree with what has been said to-night—that of all the Governments in the world that of the Congo State is by far the worst. Nothing can be compared with it, and whatever passes and exists in our own dominion and protectorates or in the territory of others—the Portuguese, for instance, which is beyond the reach of civilization—whatever bad examples we or others may have set, and whatever bad laws in relation to natives may exist, I am convinced they can not for one moment be placed on the same level with either the decrees or the practices of the Congo Free State.

"So far as other powers are open to evil influences in dealing with native races, it is the example of the Congo Free State that has largely affected them. Instance the French, who have ever had a high standard in their treatment of natives; but in the French territory which adjoins the Congo Free State, where, as Mr. Morel has shown, the stipulations are not being observed—in this French territory concessionnaire companies composed of similar men to those constituting the Congo companies, and partly of the same men, are exploiting the natives, and have failed to maintain the usually high standard of French policy in dealing with native races.

"Well, how far are we responsible? Some people know these things, and unwillingly say: 'Are we responsible? We can not go crusading alone in defense of native races.' We are very directly responsible. The antislavery people of this country are not, I am afraid, quite what their grandfathers were in the days of Wilberforce. The great Nonconformists in the days of our grandfathers were better and stronger men in dealing with questions of this sort than their descendants.

"It is the duty of all to speak out; but as regards our Government—as regards the United Kingdom—we are very deeply responsible. After we failed in making the treaty with Portugal, of which I spoke, this country took a leading part in founding the Congo State, under circumstances which I have referred to, and since that time we have granted leases to the Congo State, one of which leases is still in existence. The Congo State at this very moment administers a large tract of territory, which it holds from us by lease, in what is known as the Lado enclave. Our responsibility, therefore, is great, as also is that of all the European powers, and it is greater in our case than in that of any other power. Surely with our antislavery traditions in this country, and surely as leaders of European trade—we are the greatest traders in Africa—surely as one of the greatest African powers, we ought to be, at all events, the first to act, and to act promptly in this matter. If others are not ready to act, we should show that we are ready.

"Yesterday I ventured to put a question to the Government. Having regard to the forthcoming motion of Mr. Samuel, I asked the under-secretary for foreign affairs whether, before the approaching debate on the Congo State, it would be possible to lay before the House the recent reports of his Majesty's representatives in Africa as to the condition of the Congo State, and especially of the territories within that State which are subject to monopoly concessions, and whether his Majesty's representatives had been instructed to make independent inquiries as to the observance or violation of the stipulations of the Berlin Conference for the protection of the natives. The answer of Viscount Cranborne was: 'There is only one British consul for the Congo Free State. For various reasons he has been unable to travel to such an extent as to enable him to form anything like a full opinion on the condition of the State.'

"As I stated on March 11, it would be premature to consider the propriety of laying papers before Parliament. There have been no definite instructions on the points mentioned in the last part of the question, but they have in fact been the subject of repeated attention by the consul, and especially where native British subjects have been concerned." I take this to mean that there are such reports, and that they are highly unfavorable to the Congo Free State.

"I think it is the duty of our Government, whatever may be their desire to avoid international complications, to give us the fullest information on this subject.

"I am not concerned to deny that our trade interest is great, but apart from that interest our responsibility is great, and is great before the world. Now, Mr. Morrison praised the action of the Baptist Missionary Society. He praised, too, the action of our chairman in moving a resolution which differs in its form, in some degree, from what has fallen from our chairman to-night.

"I can not help thinking that that was a compromise resolution, and that the good parts represent our chairman's view, while the doubtful parts represent somebody else's. But the resolution, which is very strong, rightly treats the charges as proved. They are proved, sufficiently for our case, apart from any new evidence of Mr. Morrison. The uncontradicted part of the case is sufficient to justify us in treating the charges as proved. While the resolution to which I refer, passed at the Baptist Union assembly, calls upon Europe, and especially our own Government, to interpose, it also speaks of the duty of the Belgian Government to insist on an immediate inquiry into the charges preferred.

"I quite agree with Mr. Morrison that it is utterly useless to go to the government of the Congo State and ask for an inquiry. Mr. Morrison mentioned just now that he saw three truck loads of slaves—what we should call slaves, for they were taken by force 900 miles from their homes—they were seized and taken a great distance in this enormous territory, and put to forced labor. I call that slavery; it is more than domestic slavery—it is the old slave trade. He told us that when he saw this example of the slave trade with his own eyes, and called the attention of the existing commission of inquiry (upon which there are two English Baptist missionaries) to it, no good resulted. That commission of inquiry was founded by the Congo State simply as a means of shelving inconvenient questions, avoiding the investigations they professed to make.

"Just as in the case of Armenia there was an agreement that the powers should not call upon the Turkish Government—a better government than the Congo Government—to make inquiry into the alleged atrocities, so it is felt to be useless in this case to call upon the Congo Government to make any inquiry as to its own misdeeds. The only remedy for the evils we have heard described is the extirpation by the European powers of the rule which has made the Congo State what it is. That is, I am convinced, the only true remedy for evils which have been proved beyond all doubt. At all events, if we can not obtain that, let us be first to show that we feel the responsibility that is upon us to act as the conveners of Europe in calling the powers together to consider the situation which we know.

"Recognizing the rights of individual men, as Englishmen do, surely our duty on this occasion is to speak out that which is within us, and take upon ourselves a responsibility in this matter which we can not ignore."

Mr. E. D. Morel, in seconding the resolution, said that after Sir Charles Dilke's admirable speech, which covered the whole ground, there was little left to add. He desired, however, to thank the Reverend Mr. Morrison for his courage in coming forward and telling them all he knew, and for his bravery in opposing the representatives of the Congo Free State in Africa, possibly at some risk to himself.

He thought his conduct compared very favorably with that of some other people, whose extraordinary explanations and counter-explanations had been plentiful during the last few weeks. He did not wish to offend the susceptibilities of anyone present, but he could not understand how a missionary society with men in the Congo—earnest men, one of whom he knew, and from whom he had often heard, and from whom the society had often heard—he could not understand, knowing what their agents knew, how that society could act as it had done. He passed, however, from that to another side of the question.

There were, in his opinion, two ways in which tropical Africa could be made use of by Europeans—a right way and a wrong way. Tropical Africa was not a place for the white man, except as overlord. He could do nothing unless by cooperation with the native. The policy that had built up the large legitimate trade now carried on with the west coast of Africa had been conducted on these lines: On the one hand they had had the European merchant, and on the other the native. The merchant wanted to get something the native had, and the native wanted something the merchant possessed. Both were recognized mutually as owning that which the other wished to get. That was legitimate trading, and the right way to develop equatorial Africa. The other conception was a very different one. The attitude was adopted that the native did not own the products of his forests, which by decrees became vested in the European. That was the policy of the Congo Free State, and that was the system which lay at the root of all these abominations, which would continue so long as the system of appropriating the native's land and his property continued.

A negro was a man—more highly developed in some places than in others, but he was, before all, a man—and he must be treated as a man and not as a brute. If they treated him as a brute, by depriving him of his land and his property, they would have what they had got in the Congo. The whole question of the development of Equatorial Africa lay in a nutshell. Was the native to be recognized as the owner of the land and of the products of the land or was he to be deprived of both by specious decrees and driven to collect produce at the bayonet's point for what his European taskmasters chose to part with in exchange?

Mr. Morel went on to explain how abuses had been developed in the Kasai country and legitimate trading hindered, as had been done in other parts of the Congo State, until the whole of that vast territory had become a huge monopoly run by forced labor, and of which the medium of oppression was a native army of from 15,000 to 20,000 men, armed with weapons of precision. Sir Charles Dilke had said that we had a great moral responsibility in this matter. Yes, we had a great moral responsibility in this matter, and we had also a great practical question to consider.

Tropical Africa was probably the China of the future for the absorption of British manufactured goods, and, as business men, we could not afford to allow a huge country like that to be closed to our trade. Why should it be? What right had the King of the Belgians, or anyone else, to take a million square miles in Africa and close it to the trade of all nations? As Englishmen we had a right to protest against that, and to insist upon our Government remembering that commerce is the backbone of the prosperity of our country, and that we could not allow the markets of the future to be closed to us. He thought this was a matter in which Mr. Morrison, and other missionaries, and all merchants, and everybody interested in African questions, should join hands.

He did not think there had ever before been a case in which humanitarian and commercial considerations so coincided. Commercial interests were not always regarded as synonymous with humanitarian interests, but it was so in West Africa at any rate, where the merchant had a direct interest in the proper treatment of the native. In western Africa a common sense, humane policy meant a large trade, and so the closer the cooperation on a basis of mutual confidence between white and black, the better for both.

Mr. Thomas Bayley, M. P., in supporting the resolution, remarked that one of the things said by Mr. Morrison was that he began to see daylight on this question now that the Baptist Missionary Society was moving in the right direction. That society might have made mistakes in the past. People often err through ignorance, but when they became enlightened they gave up their bad courses and pursued the true and proper path. He thought that the stand which Doctor Clifford had now taken on this question gave far more hope of satisfactory action on the part of the Baptist Missionary Society than they had previously had, although they must ever remember that this society had sacrificed many valuable lives in the Congo Free State, and had done excellent work there through agents who devoted themselves to the cause of the oppressed natives.

If the society appeared to have gone to sleep for a while, there was hope that it would now arouse itself and take its old stand for Christianity, for freedom, for free trade, and the blessings of civilization. At bottom this question was very much one of free trade. An essential condition of the natives' deliverance from their present lot was that the freedom of trade in this Congo region, provided for in treaty stipulations, should be really secured. We only demanded our rights, and those rights could not be denied to a great nation like ours if they were sought in a proper, dignified, and determined manner. What were we doing on the eastern side of Africa? We were spending ten millions of British money in Uganda. Of that money he did not think we should ever get a penny back.

Why were we spending this money? Avowedly for the suppression of the slave trade and for the trade benefit that, it was hoped, our merchants would get in that immense territory. Well, we need not, for commercial advantages, spend a million sterling or £100,000, or any sum at all, if only our Government would be firm enough in the Congo Basin to say: "We will have our rights of free trade which Europe has guaranteed to us, and if you do not give them to us, we will put the present Congo Government on one side, and intrust the future control of the country to others who will bow to the dictates of humanity and justice." That was the proper position for us to take up as a nation.

We should claim what was ours by treaty and by right, and, failing a proper response, we should insist on other directors being appointed to administer the concern. All the great States are in the position of directors to-day. The King of the Belgians was only appointed managing director, but the board of directors, the true managers, are England, France, Germany, and the United States. Those who had made the Congo Free State could unmake it, and if the managing director was not doing his duty or was getting too much personally out of the concern, then his superiors must dismiss him and appoint somebody else. In his (Mr. Bayley's) opinion they could not afford their present managing director any longer, and he should like to see a new one appointed, a managing director who would deal with the country in a Christianizing way and with a due regard to the interest of the native, which was the greatest interest, and to the interests of civilization and the traders of this and other countries.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

The resolution was then put, and carried with one dissentient, the dissentient being Mr. C. H. de R. Hensler, who rose in the body of the hall and said: "I should like to ask why, if these atrocities really existed, the Baptist Missionary Society did not arouse the civilized world to a knowledge of the facts before?"

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps I had better answer that. Perhaps I know as much about that as Mr. Morrison, who has been in Africa. The answer of the Baptist Missionary Society's agents is that none of these atrocities occurred in the districts in which they are laboring. They have been dependent for their information upon hearsay, and that hearsay has not been sufficient to justify them in making representations to headquarters. That statement has been made again and again by missionaries at our Baptist meetings. The only reason why the information presented to us to-night has not reached us before from the Kasai and other districts is, so far as I know, because an attempt was first made to deal with the King of the Belgians. I have seen a letter sent containing a good deal of the information conveyed to us by Mr. Morrison to-night, and when that information was forwarded to the King the answer received was that it should be dealt with by his judicial council.

I presume that the waiting for the King of the Belgians to carry out that promise led to the non-reporting in our papers of the atrocities with which the King was made acquainted.

Mr. ROBERT WHYTE. As the person who wrote to the King of the Belgians, I may say that I think the facts were published at that time both in the English and in the American papers. The reply received from the King was that the matter was then under the notice of his judicial commission, and that it would in due course be dealt with. And I asked His Majesty to let me know the result of the action of the commission or of their report.

Sir C. DILKE, M. P. I believe that Mr. Sjöblom, the Swedish missionary, laid down his life in this cause. I have no doubt he sacrificed his life for his truthfulness on this subject. He wore himself out. He put his case before the governor-general and was threatened, in consequence, by many officers of the Congo Free State. He was threatened as to what would occur to him if he made those representations. He was specifically threatened with penal servitude for encouraging the natives not to obey the State and for inciting to rebellion—that was for a mere statement of facts which were not denied.

The Rev. W. M. MORRISON. There is another reason why information is withheld. From bitter experience the natives know it is better to remain silent about outrages on the part of State officers. They know they will fare worse by making revelations; so they calmly submit or flee. They dread the savage, cannibalistic soldiery, almost completely equipped with firearms. Their only refuge now is simply to run away to the forest.

Mr. HENSLER. Why has not Mr. Morrison brought the atrocities he mentioned under the notice of the Congo authorities on the spot?

The Rev. W. M. MORRISON. In my address I have mentioned that two or three of these charges were already brought to the notice of the government. I have done everything I could to bring the affair to the attention of the authorities, and I think I indicated plainly in my speech what has been the result of the investigations.

Mr. HENSLER. Is not Mr. Morrison a prejudiced party?

The Rev. W. M. MORRISON. I don't know why I should be. When I went to the Congo Free State in 1896 I went not knowing any of these things. I went with the highest expectations of splendid government because I had then only heard professions of philanthropy, justice, etc., that had emanated from Brussels. I went with the best possible intentions toward the government, and I have written that even to-day I am loyal to the government of the Congo Free State, if only they will give us justice.

Sir C. DILKE. The gentleman who is anxious for information will learn from Mr. Fox Bourne's book the date on which—the 24th of October, 1896—Mr. Morrison made charges, and the reply received was that the judicial commission had been informed of the charges, and Mr. Morrison reported the later cases to the representatives of his own country.

ANOTHER QUESTIONER. Would it not be fair to arm the natives with weapons with which to defend themselves?

The Rev. W. M. MORRISON. Well, you see, according to the act of Brussels, that is prohibited. Besides that, it would be very unjust, because if you arm the natives they would begin fighting with each other presently. I am still of opinion that, as far as possible, arms ought to be kept out.

The QUESTIONER. Would it not be possible to organize an army under white men to keep the cannibal and State soldiers in check and to guard the interests of the people? Would it not be possible to arm the natives so that they could defend themselves against aggression and cruelty?

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, M. P. I should like to ask Mr. Morrison one or two questions with regard to the specific cases he gave us. Did the officer who shot down the people, to whom Mr. Morrison referred, offer any explanation of his conduct?

The Rev. W. M. MORRISON. None.

Mr. SAMUEL. On what pretense were the men being taken down in the train? Were they recruits for the army, or simply intended for forced labor?

The Rev. W. M. MORRISON. I am unable to answer that question, as I saw no State official at all with reference to the matter. The last time I saw the men was when they got off the train at Boma under guard. I had no means of ascertaining what became of them after that. Some of the men, who I suppose were prisoners, were chained together with chains round the neck, perhaps a couple of dozen.

Mr. SAMUEL. Have you asked the King of the Belgians whether you can get land concessions—sites for missionary purposes?

The Rev. W. M. MORRISON. Yes; and I was informed that the Kongo Free State are not giving concessions of free land any more.

Mr. SAMUEL. And you offered to pay for land?

The Rev. W. M. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. SAMUEL. What about the Roman Catholics?

The Rev. W. M. MORRISON. After the refusal to concede land to us, on the ground that no more concessions were being made, I showed the Congo government, by a record in its "Bulletin Official," that in 1901 four concessions had been made to Roman Catholics at a time when they said no land was being granted. They could not give any explanation of that.

Sir W. Brampton Gurdon, M. P., then moved: "That this meeting expresses its pleasure that a debate on the Kongo question in the House of Commons has been arranged for the 20th of May, and urges all members of Parliament in sympathy with the object to give it their zealous support." He said he had very great sympathy with the remark just made about arming the natives in self-defense, if that were practicable. But it would take them all their time to effect this. In the first place, they must land their arms and face the Boma fortifications, and then take the weapons up the country. Even after that they could do no good unless they took a sufficient supply to enable them to defeat the whole soldiery of the Kongo State and assume possession of the entire country. Passing to the resolution, the mover said they were probably aware that it was only by ballot that members of Parliament could get an opportunity of bringing forward a motion, and Mr. Herbert Samuel had very fortunately secured a place for the 20th of that month. He knew that Mr. Samuel had given a great deal of attention to this Kongo question, and that he was a very good speaker. He did not think the motion could be in better hands. He could only hope that he would elicit a satisfactory answer from the Government, an answer that would silence the defenders of these outrages. He trusted that all members of Parliament interested in the question would be present, and that they would be able to show the Government and the country that they were earnest in this question of the good and humane government of the Kongo basin. He trusted that they would revert to the traditions of the days of Wilberforce and of their forefathers, who felt so keenly and earnestly on matters of this kind, and that they would be able to put a stop to outrages that were a blot on our boasted civilization.

Mr. F. A. Swanzey, of the London Chamber of Commerce, in seconding the resolution, said that, so far as the point of view of the merchant was concerned, Mr. Morel had put it very plainly. It seemed to him (Mr. Swanzey) that the merchants, whether they were interested in West or South Africa, were concerned above all others in seeing that the natives were properly treated, because it was from the natives they derived their wealth. He did not think it was the interest of the Kongo Free State to maintain the present state of things. It might be the interest of certain individuals, but that it should be the interest of a government, representing a nation, to carry on raiding such as now prevailed in the Kongo Free State, he could not believe. As regarded these terrible atrocities, he considered they were proved to the hilt; but whether they were proved to the hilt or not, they must conclude that from such a régime such results must follow. Where you have a system of huge monopoly—monopoly granted to concessionnaire companies empowered to purchase rubber from the natives—what do you find? You find these natives are forced to bring in rubber and to sell it to the concessionnaire companies at ridiculous prices. And, of course, such a state of things inevitably brings in its train these brutalities and enormities. It was the duty of our Government and of other governments interested in this matter and responsible for the right administration of this territory without delay to put the vile system down. It was not too late to do this. He was sincerely glad that Mr. Samuel had taken up this question and would bring it before the House of Commons.

The resolution was put, and passed unanimously.

Mr. Robert Whyte then moved a cordial vote of thanks to Dr. Clifford for presiding, and to the Rev. W. M. Morrison for his address.

Mr. Herbert Samuel, M. P., in seconding the motion, remarked that what he had to say on this question must be reserved for another time and place. Though this was a trading question, primarily and in the main it was a humanitarian question. In due course, no doubt, the interests of trade would be considered. There would also have to be considered a very important matter which had not been mentioned that night. Europe would be compelled to consider the question of the Kongo, not necessarily this year or next, but in 1907, for in 1890 the Brussels conference, at the request of the King of the Belgians, authorized the Kongo State to levy customs duties forbidden by the act of Berlin. The conference authorized those duties to be levied only for fifteen years after the signing of the Brussels act, and at the end of that time the whole position was to be reconsidered. Therefore, he (Mr. Samuel) thought they were well advised in stirring up public opinion in anticipation of that common action of the powers.

The motion having been unanimously adopted, the Rev. W. M. Morrison, in replying, expressed a fervent hope that England and the United States would ever be found the foremost advocates of justice and freedom throughout the world, and would unitedly seek to advance the cause of righteousness and of civilization.

The chairman, in acknowledging the compliment paid him, said that, so far as he was concerned, they need not have any misgivings about the Baptists. He should like them to bear in mind that while they had one resolution from the Baptist Missionary Society, they had another of a somewhat different kind from the Baptist Union, and the latter was precisely along the lines of the resolution passed that night. He had a theory, and he thought it was a sound one, that all societies and institutions were slow to move, and that only through individual initiative could they get any good accomplished on this planet. Hence it was not surprising to him that the Baptist Missionary Society had been a little slow in this matter; but he had no doubt that with a little prodding they would take the right position.

The meeting then terminated.

DOCUMENT VIII.—*Letter of Rev. John H. Weeks, Monsembe, Africa.*

BAPTIST MISSIONARY SOCIETY,
Monsembe, June 13, 1903.

Monsieur Le COMMISSAIRE DE DISTRICT DU BANGALA.

DEAR SIR: I wish to inform you that I arrived last Saturday at Monsembe to take up my residence again here after a furlough in Europe of eighteen months.

It distresses me much to see and hear that this town and others of this and neighboring districts are in a more deplorable state than they were two years ago. When we came to settle in Monsembe in 1890 there were over 7,000 people between here and Bokongo. In 1900 there were very few over 3,000, and now there are not many over 1,000. If the decrease continues at the same rate, in another five years there will be no people left.

Many things have conduced to this deplorable decrease in population.

Will you pardon me if I presume on my thirteen years' residence in this district and my twenty-two years' residence on the Kongo to point out to you what appear to me to be the principal reasons for the sad and alarming diminution of one of the finest tribes of the Kongo Free State?

They are, I think, as follows:

(1) The continual deportation of young men (and in a lesser degree of young women) to serve as soldiers and workmen for the State; and the very few that ever return home. As a consequence of this drainage of the young blood and strength of the districts there is a marked paucity of children, so that the deaths are far in advance of the births. Had the demand for men been levied in a fixed and regular manner, it might not have been so harmful. But it has been levied (so it appears to us) at the caprice of the authorities for the time being without any regard for population.

(2) The flight of the people from the river to get away from oppressive taxation. As an example of this I would mention the towns of Lobengo and Mantele, which a few years ago were large and prosperous towns, but are now simply grass and bush, with not a single person living in them.

(3) Sleeping sickness has undoubtedly carried off many, but from careful observation of this and other parts of Kongo, where I have resided, I think that this disease would never have taken such a hold on the people if they had not had their spirit crushed out of them by an ever-increasing burden of taxation that has taken the heart out of them and made life not worth living.

(4) The heavy burden of taxation, which for each person is becoming heavier and heavier because fewer are left to share it. It was some time in 1893 that the people in this district were first taxed, and the tax was then fixed, I presume, according to the population of the district. Since then three-fourths of the people have been deported, fled, or died, yet the tax has not been reduced one iota to relieve broken-spirited, diminished, and dying people. Again, in 1890-1895 goats exchanged hands for 100 to 150 rods; from 1896 to 1901 the price rose steadily to 800 rods, and now, in 1903, the price ranges from 1,500 to 2,500 rods. Yet, notwithstanding the high price of goats and the decrease in population, the tax in goats and fish, which was doubled in 1897, has remained the same ever since. I think you will see from this that the burden of taxation has become more than a dying people can bear if you wish to have any people left to govern.

(5) The imposition of whimsical fines, out of all proportion to real or supposed offenses, is sapping the life of the people. As an example of this, take the recent visit of "Mabata" (I regret that I can only give his native name) to this town. He quartered himself with over twenty soldiers and many paddlers, twice on a people that had broken no law and had refused no demand of the State. The second time he came, because food for his increased crowd was not forthcoming at once he took the chief, Mangumbé, appointed by the State itself, and carried him as hostage to his sleeping camp, some miles up river, until the food arrived. He also demanded from this Monsembe district of 300 people 8,000 rods, and although he was frequently asked the reason for such a demand, he never deigned to give one.

Among the 800 people that comprised the districts below us, viz., Bongwe, Malele, Bokomela, Mungundu, and Bokongo, he quartered himself and his men for over a month, which sadly taxed their resources, and in addition demanded and tied up people until he obtained nearly 50,000 rods from them.

Surely, if no proper explanation of this is given, we shall be within our rights in referring this matter to the authorities at Boma.

Have the delinquencies of these people been tried in a properly constituted court? Is "Mabata" a judge that he has power to impose such so-called "fines"? In addition to a tax that presses sorely, these unfortunate people are subjected also to irregular and capricious demands.

We pray you, for humanitarian reasons, to lighten the burdens of these people and to bring their taxation within their limited and decreasing means. It is heartrending to compare this district now with what it was in 1890. At that date in the Mungala Creek there were more than 1,500 people; now there are scarcely 200, and thus one can take district after district with the same sad tale to tell. In 1890 the towns were well kept, clean, and tidy, with neatly built houses; now they are ill kept and very slovenly, because at any moment the inhabitants fear they may have to flee to the bush for refuge or have their towns looted and burned through inability to meet some heavy demand. Then, also, there was some security for life and property, for men defended them by the strength of their arms; now there is no security for either.

In reply to some of the above statements, it may be said that the State pays for what the natives take to Bangala, but the remuneration paid is less than one-tenth of the real value. And the natives are forced to take produce to the State under threat of having their towns burned down and have to accept for their goods what is given them.

Again we pray you to do all you possibly can for the amelioration of these unfortunate people, that the remnant may not die out, but rather be fostered again in a strong tribe.

With every assurance of my best wishes,

Believe me to be, yours, sincerely,

JOHN H. WEEKS.

DOCUMENT IX.—*Notes of a journey by Rev. A. E. Scrivener.*

[Extract from notes of a journey to Lake Leopold II in July, August, and September, 1903, by the Rev. A. E. Scrivener. From the West African Mail, January 8, 1904.]

Just as the sun was setting we reached a large and imposing State post, a large quadrangle, say 300 rods square, surrounded by wattle and daub erections. I expected at least two white men would be resident, but was surprised to find only a retired soldier, with a few nondescripts to assist. There was a long house, which, I was told, had been the residence of a white man they called _____. I had heard before of this man from the refugees in the neighborhood of Bolobo, and was naturally curious to know more about him. But there was no need to probe or question.

From the work people about the post and the few wretched people in the miserable village adjoining the post came spontaneously stories of the most atrocious deeds and of murders of such a wholesale character that it was difficult to believe them. All round the post, which was splendidly situated and commanded fine views in all directions, were plentiful signs of the former population. This place, Mbolo, had been the home of some of the people near Bolobo, and I had heard many stories of the big villages and the many chiefs. But, alas! I could only hear of three very small villages, and later I heard from a white official that the total remaining population did not number 100, all told. * * *

I heard later on, when near the lake, that the famous or, rather, infamous — had been resident at Mbolo only seven months; that he had found it, as things go in this land, very well populated, and that he left it a waste. * * *

Soon we began talking, and without any encouragement on my part they began the tales I had become so accustomed to. They were living in peace and quietness when the white men came in from the lake with all sorts of requests to do this and that, and they thought it meant slavery. So they attempted to keep the white men out of their country, but without avail. The rifles were too much for them. So they submitted and made up their minds to do the best they could under the altered circumstances.

First came the command to build houses for the soldiers, and this was done without a murmur. Then they had to feed the soldiers and all the men and women—hangers on—who accompanied them. Then they were told to bring in rubber. This was quite a new thing for them to do. There was rubber in the forest several days away from their homes, but that it was worth anything was news to them. A small reward was offered, and a rush was made for the rubber. "What strange white men, to give us cloth and beads for the sap of a wild vine." They rejoiced in what they thought their good fortune. But soon the reward was reduced, until at last they were told to bring in the rubber for nothing. To this they tried to demur, but to their great surprise several were shot by the soldiers, and the rest were told, with many curses and blows, to go at once or more would be killed.

Terrified, they began to prepare their food for the fortnight's absence from the village which the collection of rubber entailed. The soldiers discovered them sitting about. "What, not gone yet?" Bang! Bang! Bang! and down fell one and another, dead, in the midst of wives and companions. There is a terrible wail and an attempt made to prepare the dead for burial, but this is not allowed. All must go at once to the forest. Without food? Yes, without food. And off the poor wretches had to go without even their tinder boxes to make fires. Many died in the forests of exposure and hunger, and still more from the rifles of the ferocious soldiers in charge of the post. In spite of all their efforts the amount fell off, and more and more were killed.

I could not hear of any white man being directly connected with this slaughter. It seems to have been the work of four or five soldiers sent to take charge of that district. I was shown round the place, and the sites of former big chiefs' settlements were pointed out. A careful estimate made the population of, say, seven years ago to be 2,000 people in and about the post within a radius of, say, a quarter of a mile. All told, they would not muster 200 now. And there is so much sadness and gloom about them that they are fast decreasing.

We stayed there all day on Monday and had many talks with the people. On the Sunday some of the boys had told me of some bones which they had seen, so on the Monday I asked to be shown these bones. Lying about on the grass within a few yards of the house I was occupying were numbers of human bones, in some cases complete skeletons. I counted thirty-six skulls, and saw many sets of bones from which the skulls were missing. I called one of the men and asked the meaning of it. "When the rubber palaver began," said he, "the soldiers shot so many we grew tired of burying, and very often we were not allowed to bury, and so just dragged the bodies out into the grass and left them. There are hundreds all round, if you would like to see them."

But I had seen more than enough, and was sickened by the stories that came from men and women alike of the awful time they has passed through. The Bulgarian atrocities might be considered as mildness itself when compared with what was done here. How the people submitted I don't know, and even now I wonder as I think of their patience. That some of them managed to run away is some cause for thankfulness. Many of the worst stories came from present employees of the State, who for a little inducement would be quite capable of repeating anything that has already been done. * * *

In due course we reached Ibal. I had heard already that which led me not to expect much in the way of buildings. There was hardly a sound of building on the place. The one white man, a clerk, apologized for the necessity, but said he thought I had better put up my tent. I might, he said, erect it under the roof of the partially finished house of the commandant. I saw this, but it was so dark and gloomy that I preferred to stay outside. My boys, however, elected to sleep there, but in the night had to move on on account of the rain coming through onto them. Why such dilapidation?

The commandant away for a trip likely to extend into three months; the sublieutenant away in another direction on a punitive expedition. In other words, station must be neglected and rubber hunting carried out with all vigor. I stayed there two days, and the one thing that impressed itself upon me was the collection of rubber. I saw long files of men come in, as at Bongo, with their little baskets under their arms, saw them paid their milk tin full of salt and the 2 yards of calico flung to the headmen; saw their trembling timidity and, in fact, a great deal that all went to prove the state of terrorism that exists and the virtual slavery in which the people are held.

POST-OFFICE AT PORTLAND, OREG.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby directed to transmit to the Senate at his earliest convenience copies of all correspondence between the Department and its agents and contractors relating to the leasing and fitting up of the building now used as a temporary post-office in the city of Portland, State of Oregon, and of the action of the Department thereon; and also that he advise the Senate as to whether the proposal of Hartman, Thompson & Powers, of date February 16, 1903, for rented quarters for such building was or was not accepted by the Department, and, if so, whether such acceptance was based on the recommendation of any agent or agents of the Department; and also whether the building covered by the proposal of Hartman, Thompson & Powers was investigated and reported upon by any agent or agents of the Department prior to its acceptance by the Department, and, if so, the character of such report or reports; that he also advise the Senate as to the exact area in square feet of the ground floor, and also of each of the several floors of the building above the ground floor of the building actually furnished by Hartman, Thompson & Powers; also that he advise the Senate as to the date of the contract entered into between the Department and Hartman, Thompson & Powers, and the date when the Department notified the lessors, if ever, that there was any discrepancy between the character of their proposal and the building actually furnished and accepted by the Department; also that he advise the Senate as to whether the rent due said Hartman, Thompson & Powers for said building is being withheld by the Department, and, if so, for what length of time and for what amount has the same been withheld and the reasons for withholding the same.

CLAIM OF CHARLES SMITH.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby directed to advise the Senate, at his earliest convenience, as to whether the

claim of Charles Smith, late deputy collector of customs, Circle City, Alaska, of \$1,100 for compensation for services as such deputy from October 1, 1898, to March 31, 1899, and of \$600 for traveling expenses incurred by him as deputy collector during that period, amounting in all to \$1,700, has ever been by the Department approved for payment and reported to Congress, and if subsequently disapproved by the Department the reasons therefor; also whether said claim or any part thereof has been at any time referred for investigation and report to any agent or agents of the Department, and if any report or reports have ever been made thereon to transmit to the Senate copies of each thereof; and that he also transmit to the Senate copies of all papers on file in the Department relating to said claim or any part thereof.

PURCHASE OF CAMP SITES.

Mr. QUARLES. I present a letter signed by the Secretary of War relating to the necessity of the purchase of camp sites. I ask that the letter may be printed as a supplement to the report of the committee upon the camp-sites bill, which has been already reported.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection the letter which the Senator from Wisconsin presents will be printed as a supplement to the report on the bill named by him.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. QUARLES. I now ask leave to call up the conference report upon the army appropriation bill. I call the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] to the request I have just made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report on the bill (H. R. 10670) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes, is before the Senate. The report was read in full and discussed yesterday.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, there is a provision in this report as to Senate amendment numbered 29 to which I object. I observe that the conference report makes a considerable change in the language of the amendment as it was put in the bill by the Senate. I want to move that the Senate concur in the report with an amendment. I want to strike out a portion of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That can not be done.

Mr. TELLER. Can we not nonconcur with an amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That can not be done.

Mr. TELLER. Then, Mr. President, I move that the Senate nonconcur in the report; and I want to state why I make that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado moves to disagree to the conference report.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I was under the impression that I could move to nonconcur with an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No amendment is admissible. If the Senator desires an amendment adopted, the only way is to reject the report.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I take it that the Senator from Colorado has one thing in view, and that is this particular matter to which he has referred. I take it he does not seek to reject the entire report, but for the purpose of moving an amendment he asks the Senate not to accept the report. I think that is the attitude of the Senator. He does not oppose the whole report or action upon the bill, but he wishes an opportunity of offering his amendment, and so he asks that the Senate do not adopt the report. Of course if the Senate nem. con. agrees to that in order that the Senator from Colorado may offer his amendment, then after the amendment is offered and has been passed upon by the Senate, the report will be accepted and the bill will pass, or else the Senator's amendment will pass: but that is the only way under our rules that any Senator can secure the adoption of an amendment in such a case.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He can not get it in that way.

Mr. HALE. He can get a disagreement on that particular item.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He can get a disagreement on that, and then the conferees might change their report.

Mr. TELLER. Can I get an agreement on everything except the amendment to which I object?

Mr. ALDRICH. No.

Mr. HALE. The Senator can get an agreement.

Mr. TELLER. Can I get an agreement on everything else, and a disagreement as to this particular amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the intricacies of a conference committee are rather beyond me. I want to say that the Senate put an amendment in the bill similar to what the Senate has put in other bills on several occasions, to enable the President of the United States to retire certain officers with an increased grade, and it applies only to officers who were engaged in the civil war. I think the Senate has passed such a bill three or four times, but we have never been able to get it through the House of Representatives. The House on some occasions have limited the provision to those who should hereafter retire, leaving out many

meritorious officers who had already retired, and finally the committee of conference put it in this shape, to which I object:

That any officer of the Army below the grade of brigadier-general who served with credit as an officer or as an enlisted man in the regular or volunteer forces during the civil war prior to April 9, 1865, otherwise than as a cadet, and whose name is borne on the official register of the Army, and who has heretofore been, or may hereafter be, retired on account of wounds or disability incident to the service, or on account of age, or after forty years' service, may, in the discretion of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, be placed on the retired list of the Army with the rank and retired pay of one grade above that actually held by him at the time of retirement: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to any officer who received an advance of grade since the date of his retirement or who has been restored to the Army and placed on the retired list by virtue of the provisions of a special act of Congress.

Mr. President, the objection I make is to this language: "On account of age or after forty years' service." I desire, if I can ever get where it will be in order to do so, to move to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty." I will say that I believe that will include about five officers who are on the retired list and who are excluded from this provision.

Under the provisions of the existing law a large number of army officers have been retired and appointed to one grade above what their retiring grade was supposed to be, and perhaps the next day they have been placed on the retired list. A great number of colonels have been made brigadier-generals, and a large number of subordinate officers have been made colonels. I do not myself complain of that. It was the only way by which the additional rank could be conferred.

Mr. President, every man who has served his Government as an officer has an ambition to have a grade higher than that at which he has been serving as an officer. It carries with it not only the distinction of a higher grade, but it carries with it, Mr. President, what I think is of some importance, but not as much to the generality of the officers as that of rank—it carries additional pay; and the pay of a retired officer is not high after all. But forty years' service, exclusive of a cadetship, is more than a nation, having proper regard for the services of its officers, ought to exact. If we have not made the general rule of giving additional grade, we have gone so far in it and have given so many grades that it seems to me, in order that there shall be no invidious distinction, we ought to give it to all the officers who have had that kind of service. As I have said, if you put this at forty years, you will probably exclude five or six. I believe, with a little reflection, I could name about five, and I think I have had correspondence practically with every man who would be shut out by this provision requiring forty years' service.

What I want to do, Mr. President—and I propose to ask the sense of the Senate on it—is to say to the other body that we will accept their modification—which I do not entirely like—provided we shall be allowed to provide that the men who have served thirty years on the active list and who have been retired either on account of age or on account of physical disabilities shall have the opportunity of being promoted one grade above that to which they would be otherwise entitled.

There are, as I said, these few persons who were not retired by the military board because of disabilities; but, recognizing their disabilities, they said to the Department that they were unable to continue longer in the service of the Government and that they desired to be retired. Thereupon, on their application, the Government, without first sending them before the board, allowed them to retire.

Mr. CULLOM. Does the Senator see any particular reason why the limit should be made forty years instead of thirty?

Mr. TELLER. There is not any reason for the limit unless the purpose is to shut off certain men. Thirty years of active service is long enough for any officer who has done his duty to be deserving of the kindly regard of the nation he has served.

If it is possible to get where we can have a vote on the question whether the time shall be thirty years or forty years, I want to get it. I believe public sentiment everywhere would sustain us in insisting that the rule should not be more than thirty years instead of forty years.

Mr. President, I want to make the proper motion if I can, and if I can not get a vote on thirty years now I want to get a vote that will be a practical instruction to the committee of conference to stand for thirty years as against forty years.

Mr. CULLOM. If we defeat the conference report, we shall then have a chance to get it.

Mr. LODGE. We could reject the conference report, and then instruct the conferees.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I believe we do not instruct committees of conference. We have had a great deal of discussion about that question heretofore in the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. I did not want to move to instruct the committee. I will trust the committee. If the Senate will indicate its wish to have thirty years fixed instead of forty, the committee will then take care of it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If I understand—but the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. ALLISON] knows better than I do about it—the rejection of a conference report upon the discussion of an item in the report is considered equivalent to an instruction of the Senate to the conferees, but we have not, as I understand it, formally instructed our committees of conference.

Mr. ALLISON. We have not, I believe, Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me—

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

Mr. TELLER. I yield.

Mr. ALLISON. I want to suggest to the Senator that the acceptance of this conference report—

Mr. QUARLES. We can not hear the Senator, and I am very anxious to hear what the Senator from Iowa says.

Mr. ALLISON. If this conference report shall be agreed to and the matter thus disposed of for the present, it does not foreclose in any way the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] from dealing with the four or five meritorious persons of whom he speaks at some other time, and dealing with them in a way that ought to be satisfactory: but I suggest that we will still find difficulty, after we shall have rejected this report, in accomplishing at this time what the Senator desires, from the fact, as I understand it, that we have put an amendment on this bill with reference to this item which the House disagreed to and have persisted in disagreeing to. Therefore I believe the best way—if I may be permitted to make a suggestion to the Senator from Colorado, who has really had more experience than I have in these matters—is to agree to the report, and then the Senator is not foreclosed from dealing with this subject either at this session or at some future one so as to do justice to those officers.

Mr. QUARLES. I think, under the circumstances, it is due to the Senate that they should understand exactly not only the present situation of this legislation, but what took place in the committee of conference since this matter was intrusted to your committee. Let me say, in the first place, that when this bill came from the House it had no clause in it whatever relating to the matter of retirement.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator is mistaken, I think, or else I am. Did the committee report that retirement clause?

Mr. QUARLES. On page 16 of the original bill, numbered 29, you will find the amendment of the Senate printed in italics, where it appears for the first time in the bill.

Mr. TELLER. I think the Senator is correct; I was mistaken, but the Senate committee proposed an amendment which we modified somewhat.

Mr. QUARLES. Certainly. That amendment was a very liberal one and allowed this increase of grade to all retired officers below the grade of brigadier-general—that is, all field, line, and staff officers, as we phrased it, below the grade of brigadier-general—with creditable records who served during the civil war. Those were the only conditions that the Senate amendment imposed upon the discretion of the President regarding this matter of an increase of grade.

When the conference came on the House conferees objected to this provision entirely, and it resulted in a complete disagreement between the two Houses, which was reported severally to the Houses. Then we had a second conference, when the House conferees still insisted that this provision should not go into the bill at all; but finally they went back to the House and obtained an amendment there to the bill providing substantially what is known as the "Dick bill." They brought that back to conference, and that, on examination, was found to preclude this increase of grade to any officer of the Army who, since the Spanish war, had received two promotions, although he had earned those promotions in the usual course of service.

To that, of course, your conferees could not agree. And thereupon the House conferees yielded that point and yielded several other propositions. So we pruned down the amendment until it took the form in which you find it in the present conference report.

Now, your conferees looked into this matter, and we found that the clause of which the Senator from Colorado is complaining would leave out only some five or six meritorious officers who had retired under the thirty-years clause, having had thirty years' service under the law whereby they asked for retirement, and it is not made compulsory on the part of the President. We thought that, rather than to have a further disagreement between the two Houses, it would be better for us to concede this, and then, as we concluded, we could from time to time, if necessary, pass special bills for these five or six meritorious cases.

I do not think there will be any trouble about it whatever. But we thought that you would desire that we should agree to this, although it was not satisfactory to the Senate conferees, rather than have the bill fail. That was the way in which the matter stood—we could either accept this or let the bill fail.

Mr. CULLOM. If only five or six persons would be included, if it were thirty instead of forty years, does the Senator think that the inclusion of the five or six men would result in the failure of the conference?

Mr. QUARLES. That was the exact attitude of the conferees on the part of the House. They yielded to us first on the proposition as to whether there should be anything in the bill on the subject; secondly, as to the provision of their own amendment, yielding three or four different points on that. Then it came to a point where they would yield no more.

Mr. CULLOM. It seems to me rather an unreasonable sort of attitude for those gentlemen to assume. When the inclusion of only five or six men would clean up the whole list, I am surprised that there should be hesitancy to agree if the House conferees would agree to any number of years of service.

Mr. QUARLES. I would remind the Senator that we had seventy-five propositions where we were in disagreement. The Senator knows that in all such cases conciliation has to be practiced in order to reach a conclusion, and the attitude of the House on a great many propositions and the attitude of the Senate have their influence when you come to the final propositions that have to be considered.

Mr. ALGER. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me?

Mr. QUARLES. Certainly.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. President, I advised the acceptance of this compromise. I shall be very glad to join in taking care, under separate bills, of these five or six old soldiers who I know should be cared for, but, feeling that there was danger that we might not agree, I thought it best, so far as my counsel was concerned, to advise the acceptance of this agreement.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I observed what the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] said about special bills. After some experience in this body I know the difficulty of getting through a special bill. If I were as young as I was when I entered the Senate, I might hope to see those bills pass, but in the nature of things I can not be here long enough, in my judgment, to see them pass. I do not believe that if I live out my term I shall see them pass, unless I can secure the assistance of the Senator from Wisconsin who has just addressed the Senate, and of the Senator from Michigan. If I could secure their support, I believe I could pass the bills for these meritorious cases, for I think they are just as meritorious as any that will have the benefit of this bill.

Mr. QUARLES. I wish to say to the Senator, if he will permit me to interrupt him—

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. QUARLES. That as the Senate Committee on Military Affairs is now organized there will be no question about a unanimous report on each one of those cases, and I do not think there will be any trouble at all in passing the bills through the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. What I want to accomplish is in part accomplished by this amendment. I do not wish to jeopardize even what we have secured, for I know something about the difficulty the committee has had. I understand from those who are wiser in this matter than I am that the proper motion in this case is to concur. If we do not concur, then the matter is open.

Mr. CULLOM. To agree.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from Massachusetts says "concur." I am yielding to him because I think he knows more about it than I do. I do not care to call for the yeas and nays on this matter. If the Senate thinks it ought to concur in the report, I will take the pledge of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ALGER], who promises his assistance at the next session, and of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. QUARLES], who speaks for the committee, and we will try to take care at the next session of Congress of the cases which I greatly regret we could not take care of in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee of conference.

The report was agreed to.

SUNDY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CULLOM. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has left the Chamber temporarily and asked me to call up the sundy civil appropriation bill, I do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the sundy civil appropriation bill, which will be read by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 14416) making appropriations for sundy civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes.

UNION STATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 14901) to provide for payment of damages on account of changes of grade due to construction of the Union Station, District of Columbia, which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, this is an important bill. The work is going on at the Union Station. The Senate committee has reported a similar bill, which is now on the Calendar.

I request the Senator from Illinois to permit me to ask consideration for the bill.

Mr. CULLOM. Will it lead to any debate?

Mr. GALLINGER. It will lead to no debate whatever.

Mr. CULLOM. I yield.

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

The bill was read the second time at length; and by unanimous consent 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.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the bill (S. 2793) to provide for payment of damages on account of changes of grade due to construction of the Union Station, District of Columbia, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

PRACTICE OF MEDICINE IN THE INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask the Senator from Iowa to yield to me for the purpose of calling up a bill in relation to matters in the Indian Territory. It is a House bill, and is of immediate and seemingly pressing importance. I am sure it will lead to no debate whatever. I wish to ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. ALLISON. I will yield to the Senator if the bill leads to no debate. I should like to go on a little while during the day with the sundy civil bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. If it leads to any debate, I will withdraw the request.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11963) regulating the practice of medicine and surgery in the Indian Territory.

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

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator from Minnesota, who is not in his seat, proposed an amendment, to which I have no objection, and that is the insertion of the words "Christian science" at the end of line 15, on page 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "massage," in line 15, section 16, page 7, insert "Christian science."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am not going to interfere very seriously with the consideration of this bill, but I wish to call attention to one or two facts in connection with it.

I have had something to do with the enactment of laws in my own State and the District of Columbia regulating the practice of medicine. We have always insisted not only that a practitioner should have a diploma, but that likewise he should be subjected to an examination by a medical board, which boards exist in all the States and in the District of Columbia and in the Territories, unless it be in the Indian Territory. I do not know whether such a board exists in the Indian Territory, but I notice that the pending bill provides that any person having a diploma may practice medicine in the Indian Territory.

Mr. President, the requirements are very strict in this bill, and properly so, as to the course of instruction. They shall be instructed in—

Anatomy, physiology, chemistry, toxicology, histology, pathology, hygiene, materia medica, therapeutics, obstetrics, bacteriology, medical jurisprudence, gynecology, principles and practice of medicine and surgery, and specially requiring clinical instruction in the last two named of not less than four hours per week in each during the last two courses of lectures.

That is a very proper provision.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the bill drive out of practice the Indian medicine man?

Mr. GALLINGER. I was coming to that point.

When a man or woman takes that course and gets a diploma he or she ought to be pretty well qualified to practice medicine, the requirement being for four years' course of study and instruction in those various subjects. But, Mr. President, when we come to the proviso, we find that when these accomplished and educated physicians get there they come in competition with herb doctors who are not required to attend a course of lectures, who are not required to know anything about pathology or hygiene or materia medica or surgery or anything else except herbs, and they are exempted from the provisions of the proposed law. So this educated man comes in direct competition with an herb doctor, who has not been required to spend an hour in a medical school. He also comes in competition with the osteopath, who is not required to take an examination.

The educated physician comes in competition with a masseur, and, according to the amendment just adopted, he comes in competition with the Christian Science healer. It is an extraordinary proviso to go in a bill providing for the regulation of the practice of medicine in any part of this country or in any civilized com-

munity. I think there are doubtless conditions in the Indian Territory different from those in any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, but if we commence in Congress by legislating to exempt those classes of people from the law I do not know why, when they ask us to do it in the legislation in the States and in the District, we ought not likewise to do it there and here. I do not object to the consideration of the bill, but I wanted to state the peculiarities of the proviso, which really ought to be stricken out.

Mr. ALLISON. I yielded for the consideration of this bill—

Mr. GALLINGER. That is all I have to say.

Mr. ALLISON. Under the idea that it would not lead to debate. If it leads to no further debate, I will allow the bill to proceed.

Mr. SPOONER. Has the Senator from Wyoming the bill in charge?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I have.

Mr. SPOONER. I wish to ask the Senator whether the bill would not be improved as a literary production if the letter "y" were added to the word "osteopath," in line 15 of the last page.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I think not; "osteopath" being an adjective, and referring to the "treatment" following.

Mr. SPOONER. Does it mean osteopath treatment?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I suppose that is what it means.

Mr. SPOONER. I think it should be "osteopathic" treatment.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Possibly so.

Mr. SPOONER. But as the bill is a matter of grave importance I do not care to delay it.

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.

PHARMACY IN THE INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. BERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if he has in charge a bill regulating pharmacy in the Indian Territory. I have had many letters respecting the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I have it in charge, and I intend to call it up at the earliest opportunity. I have the bill in my desk now, and I would ask the Senator from Iowa to yield, but for the fact that I have trespassed upon his time so far this morning. The bill should be brought up, as it is of great importance.

Mr. ALLISON. At some other time I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reading of the appropriation bill will be proceeded with.

RAILROADS IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. ALLISON. I have agreed to yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. LONG] for a bill which he informs me will not lead to debate.

Mr. LONG. I desire to call up the bill (S. 5454) permitting the Ozark and Cherokee Central Railroad Company and the Arkansas Valley and Western Railway Company, and each or either of them, to sell and convey their railroads and other property in the Indian Territory to the St. Louis and San Francisco Railroad Company or to the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

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

MONUMENT TO COMMODORE BARRY.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask the Senator from Iowa to yield to me for the passage of a short bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I will yield to the Senator if the bill leads to no debate.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I think there will be no debate. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1547) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry.

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

That there shall be erected in the city of Washington, D. C., a statue to the memory of Commodore John Barry; and for the purpose of procuring and erecting said statue with a suitable pedestal, and for the preparation of a site, the sum of \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the same to be expended under the direction of a commission to be composed of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, and the Chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. That the commission herein created is empowered to select a site for the statue authorized by this act on ground belonging to the Government: *Provided*. That said statue shall not be located in the grounds of the Capitol or Library of Congress.

Mr. KEAN. I should like to refresh my memory in regard to history, and I ask to have the report read.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. There is a very brief report covering only one page. If the Senator from New Jersey insists on having it read, I ask that it be read.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will be able to state briefly the contents of the report.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I shall hardly dare to undertake to describe the patriotic service of this Revolutionary officer as it is done so well here in one page of the report. It is far more thrilling than any appropriation bill, and I hope the Senator from Iowa will hear the report read.

Mr. KEAN. I think the report might be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Very well.

There being no objection, the report submitted by Mr. HANSBROUGH on the 6th instant was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That there shall be erected in the City of Washington, D. C., a statue to the memory of Commodore John Barry; and for the purpose of procuring and erecting said statue with a suitable pedestal, and for the preparation of a site, the sum of \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the same to be expended under the direction of a commission to be composed of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives.

"SEC. 2. That the commission herein created is empowered to select a site for the statue authorized by this act on ground belonging to the Government: *Provided*. That said statue shall not be located in the grounds of the Capitol or Library of Congress."

John Barry was born on the seacoast of County Wexford, Ireland, about 1745. He left his home at an early age for Philadelphia, and is recorded as "clearing" from that port in 1766 as captain of a schooner. In 1769 he was elected a member of the "Society for the Relief of Poor and Distressed Masters of Ships," and in 1774 was made captain of the *Black Prince*, a merchant vessel. In 1775 he was placed in command of the *Lexington*, which had just been fitted out by the Continental Congress, and for which "he gave up the command of the finest ship and best employment in America."

Speaking of his selection, Bailey's American Naval Biography says:

"At this interesting crisis it became important to select officers whose valor and discretion, whose experience and skill, could give the utmost efficiency to our insignificant means of defense and annoyance. The rare union in Commodore Barry of these qualities recommended him to the notice of Congress."

On April 11, 1776, he brought into the port of Philadelphia the *Edward*, and he is said, in Preble's *Origin of the Flag*, to be the first who "bore the continental flag to victory on the ocean." This was followed by several other victories, recounted by Henry Fisher, Caesar Rodney, and Josiah Bartlett.

In February, 1778, Barry, with four rowboats, captured two ships and a schooner in the lower Delaware, of which exploit Frost's *Naval Biography* says:

"For boldness of design and dexterity of execution it was not surpassed, if equaled, during the war."

Part of the captured stores were forwarded to Washington, at Valley Forge, who wrote:

"I congratulate you on the success which has crowned your gallantry and address in the late attack on the enemy's ships."

In 1778 he was attacked on the *Raleigh* by a superior force, but succeeded in running his vessel on shore. In Watson's *Annals* the fight is called "a noble and daring defense." Later he was placed in command of the *Alliance*, so named in honor of the unity existing between America and France, the best ship ever owned by the Continental Congress, and sent to convey Commissioner Laurens, Thomas Paine, and Count de Noailles, brother-in-law of Lafayette, to Paris. On his return voyage he captured the *Atlanta* and the *Trepassy*, and was severely wounded.

In November, 1781, he was intrusted with the conveyance of Lafayette to France. He had the honor to fight the last battle of the Revolution, in which he whiped the British frigate *The Sybil*.

His prizes for one voyage alone sold in the French ports for \$2,310,000, and helped to cause the British merchants to petition for peace.

While the American fleet was compelled to be idle in the Delaware, Barry recruited a company and served in the battles of Trenton and Princeton.

On the acknowledgment of independence Barry returned to the merchant service, where he remained until 1794, when our commerce being threatened by Algerine pirates and by the war between England and France, it became necessary that "a naval force should be provided for its protection." To command this force President Washington, on June 3, 1794, nominated six captains, Barry being named first in the list. He was given, by courtesy, the title of commodore, which was not legally established until 1832. When the naval forces were reduced under Jefferson, Barry was one of the nine captains retained. He remained in the service of the nation until his death, at Philadelphia, on September 13, 1803.

After his demise, Mr. Dennis, editor of *The Portfolio*, a literary journal of the period, wrote:

"His eminent services during our struggle for independence, the fidelity and ability with which he discharged the duties of the important stations which he filled, give him a lasting claim upon the gratitude of his country."

His epitaph was written by Dr. Benjamin Rush, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, and recites in part that—

John Barry
was born in the County of Wexford
in Ireland;
that America was the object of his
patriotism, and the theatre of
his usefulness.

In the Revolutionary War
which established the independence
of the United States
he took an early and active part
as a Captain in the Navy
and afterwards became
Commander-in-Chief.

He fought often and once bled in
the Cause of Freedom.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported as a substitute by the Committee on the Library.

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.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES FROM TARGET PRACTICE.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator from Iowa will yield to me—

Mr. ALLISON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. There is a little bill, Senate bill 4236, which I should like to have passed.

Mr. ALLISON. Being a little bill, I hope it will not lead to debate.

Mr. HALE. If it does, I will withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 4236) to pay claimants for damages to private property by reason of mortar practice at Fort Preble, Me., during the fall of 1901, as reported by a board of army officers constituted to ascertain the same.

Mr. SPOONER. Will not the Senator from Maine make some explanation of the bill?

Mr. HALE. I can not unless the Senator from Iowa will consent. I agreed that if it gave rise to debate I would withdraw it.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not think the Senator from Iowa will object.

Mr. ALLISON. I will yield for a brief explanation.

Mr. HALE. I will say in a few words to the Senate that there have been bills of this kind from all over the country where property of private citizens has been destroyed or damaged by the firing of heavy guns that have been put up by the Ordnance Department. Several of those claims have been sent to the Committee on Appropriations for embodiment on deficiency appropriation bills. I do not think that that is the proper place for them, and therefore instead of resorting to that I had this matter presented to the proper committee of the Senate, which, after an examination into the several amounts, has reported this bill. I propose to take my chance on getting it through the other House rather than to ask the Committee on Appropriations to put it on the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Will the Senator from Maine state what committee reported the bill?

Mr. HALE. The Committee on Claims. That is the proper committee. It is a claim. It is not a matter that ought to be put upon an appropriation bill. I did not resort to the Committee on Appropriations, but sent it to the Committee on Claims, which has reported the bill.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I think it needs a little more careful investigation than the subject can be given now, and I object.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator objects, then of course it will go over.

TIMBER FOR MINING AND DOMESTIC PURPOSES.

Mr. FULTON. I ask the Senator from Iowa to yield to me for the consideration of a short bill, one that will occasion no debate, I am sure.

Mr. ALLISON. I will yield to the Senator from Oregon, but I hope after this bill shall be disposed of I may be permitted to go on with the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. FULTON. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2994) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the citizens of Colorado, Nevada, and the Territories to fell and remove timber on the public domain for mining and domestic purposes," approved June 3, 1878, so that the provisions of said act shall be extended to and include the States of Oregon, Washington, and California.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

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

IRRIGATION IN CALIFORNIA AND ARIZONA.

Mr. ALLISON. I will yield to the Senator from California [Mr. BARD] to take up a joint resolution that was objected to on yesterday, but which I understand will now pass without objection.

Mr. BARD. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 71) requesting the Secretary of the Interior to institute an investigation relative to the use of the waters of the Colorado River for irrigation, and to report to Congress thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution was read yesterday in full. Is there objection to its consideration?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. TELLER. The word is not "requested," as it was read at the desk. It was amended yesterday to "directed." If it has not been changed, I move that amendment now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The title was not changed. It is all right in the body of the joint resolution. The title will be changed later on.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to institute an investigation relative to the use of the waters of the Colorado River for irrigation, and to report to Congress thereon."

CONSIDERATION OF CLAIMS BILLS.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me to make a request?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take up the Calendar of House and Senate private claims bills at 3 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not think we had better grant any requests for the order of business at the present time as to bills of which we do not know anything about the nature. I shall therefore object to any agreement.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will withhold his objection a moment, I will state my reasons for making the request, and then my duty will have been done.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will withhold my objection until the Senator states his reasons.

Mr. WARREN. As the Senator knows, we have not been to the Calendar in a regular way for some months now, and it is difficult to call up claims bills under unanimous consent, for they are usually objected to.

We have before us in committee a bill from the House known as the "omnibus bill." Under rules that the committee have heretofore adopted we only put such miscellaneous claims on the omnibus bills as have already had the consent of the Senate or House in the passage of the several bills, each standing alone. There are a good many matters not yet reached on the Calendar that ought to be cared for—bills that have been carefully considered by the committee and are on the Calendar, and if passed by the Senate could take their places in the omnibus bill. It is highly necessary that the omnibus bill should be completed, and therefore I want to get the consent of the Senate to consider the Calendar of private claims bills. If consent for to-morrow is not given, I will ask the Senator if he will state a time when the Calendar of private claims can be taken up?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is just what I object to, to fixing a time at the present moment for the consideration of any bills. There is a general desire, I think, that the appropriation bills and conference reports shall be disposed of, and it is impossible—

Mr. WARREN. My request is subject to both those.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is impossible, I say, at this time to indicate when a period will be reached that bills of the nature of those suggested by the Senator from Wyoming ought to be considered. Of course the Senator has the right at any time to move to take them up, or there will be no objection, I assume, to proceeding with unobjection cases upon the Calendar at any time when there is not an appropriation bill before the Senate. I think there will be no difficulty as to that arrangement, but it is extremely difficult to fix a time in advance for the consideration of any particular bills, and I suggest that it is better for the Senator from Wyoming to wait until he gets an opportunity to call up the bills.

Mr. WARREN. The opportunity, I will say to the Senator, will never arrive when the Senate shall be ready unless by an arrangement to take up the Calendar for claims bills.

Mr. ALDRICH. It seems to me that it is not feasible to make that arrangement now, but I suggest to the Senator that it can be done later on in the session. I shall feel constrained to object to fixing any time now to consider any particular bill.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to make one suggestion about unobjection bills. Bills ought not to be black-eyed or repudiated because objected to. They are very frequently objected to because a Senator wants to go on with something else, and the objection has no reference to the merits of a particular bill. There ought to be some time fixed so that we can take up the bills and act upon them; but I object to the suggestion to take up unobjection bills to the exclusion of those objected to for mere convenience. Meritorious bills are frequently objected to because other business intervenes. That is no criterion by which to measure bills.

Mr. WARREN. I would be entirely willing, in the first place, to have an agreement made subject to appropriation bills and conference reports, and first go over the Calendar for unobjection bills. I should be glad if the Senator from Rhode Island would

suggest some manner by which now or at some later time these matters may be dealt with.

Mr. ALDRICH. My experience has been that an omnibus claim bill demands and receives recognition sooner or later. I do not think the Senator need be alarmed, but that at some time in the course of the session his bill will be considered. The nature of the bill is such that it necessitates action, whether we consent to it or not. But I think it is too early now to ask for a time to fix a date, and I therefore, as I said, am constrained to repeat my objection to the suggestion made by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I will simply say that the omnibus bill has not been, and can not well be, reported to the Senate from the committee until work on the Calendar has been done. I have no intention of bringing in an omnibus bill until the Senate is willing to consider the Calendar, because it would be hopeless to try it, of course.

SUNDY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14416) making appropriations for sundy civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes.

The reading of the bill was resumed at line 8, on page 152. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous objects, Department of Justice," on page 156, line 6, after the word "available," to strike out "during the fiscal year 1905" and insert "until expended;" so as to make the clause read:

Enforcement of antitrust laws: That the balance of the appropriation of \$500,000 for the enforcement of the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, and other acts mentioned in said appropriation, made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1904, approved February 25, 1903, shall continue available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Judicial," on page 157, line 20, to increase the appropriation for payment of regular assistants to United States district attorneys who are appointed by the Attorney-General, etc., from \$310,000 to \$320,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 157, line 24, to increase the appropriation for payment of assistants to the Attorney-General and to United States district attorneys employed by the Attorney-General to aid in special cases from \$85,000 to \$135,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 159, line 17, after the word "dollars," to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That the money heretofore, or that shall hereafter be, appropriated for this purpose shall be expended in payment for such supplies only as have been, or shall hereafter be, purchased by the Department of Justice for distribution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 161, line 22, after the word "Attorney-General," to insert:

And for expense of care and medical treatment of guards who may be injured by prisoners while said guards are endeavoring to prevent escapes or suppressing mutiny, \$35,500.

So as to read:

For miscellaneous expenditures, in the discretion of the Attorney-General, * * * for pay of extra guards when deemed necessary by the Attorney-General, and for expense of care and medical treatment of guards who may be injured by prisoners while said guards are endeavoring to prevent escapes or suppressing mutiny, \$35,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "Legislative," on page 166, after line 15, to insert:

Purchase of bust of General Lafayette: For the purchase by the Joint Committee on the Library of a marble bust of General Lafayette, by David d'Angers, to replace the one destroyed by fire in 1851, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 166, after line 20, to insert:

Purchase of bust of ex-President Taylor: For the purchase by the Joint Committee on the Library of a marble bust of ex-President Zachary Taylor, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Public printing and binding," on page 170, line 4, after the word "Survey," to insert "and \$170,000 for the Census Office;" so as to make the clause read:

For the Department of Commerce and Labor, including \$30,000 for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and \$170,000 for the Census Office, \$500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A committee amendment was passed over on page 81.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from Iowa will allow me, I wish to ask him a question as to section 3 for information, if it is proper to do so now.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask the Senator if the construction of that section is that any additional conveyance is authorized to be used by any one of the Departments, provided the name be put upon it? Is that the only limitation? That section reads:

SEC. 3. No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used for purchasing, maintaining, driving, or operating any carriage or other vehicle, other than those authorized for personal purposes in section 2 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1905, unless the same shall have conspicuously painted thereon at all times the full name of the Executive Department or other branch of the public service to which the same belong and in the service of which the same are used.

The question I wish to ask the Senator, to make it a little more plain, is this: Is the only limitation upon a Department having such additional vehicles as it may see proper to secure or use, the fact that it shall have this painting upon it, showing the Department to which it belongs? In other words, is a Department authorized to have vehicles additional to those provided for in the act referred to in that section if it will simply put the name of the Department upon the vehicle?

Mr. ALLISON. As I understand the section, it is a limitation upon the appropriation contained in the pending bill.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. It is a limitation upon the authority to use any carriage or vehicle excepting those authorized in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act.

Mr. BACON. That is the question I asked the Senator.

Mr. ALLISON. That I understand to be the purpose of the section.

Mr. BACON. Here is the present situation: Under the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act certain vehicles and horses were authorized for each of the Executive Departments and possibly certain divisions of those Departments. Now that, of course, is fixed so far as that law can fix it.

Then, to guard the further use of money appropriated in this bill, section 3 provides that no additional vehicles or horses shall be used in any of these Departments unless there is painted upon such vehicles the name of the Department to which the same belongs and in which it is used. Therefore I ask the Senator from Iowa this question: Does the Senator understand whether the Department is authorized under this bill to use a part of the money herein appropriated for such additional vehicles as, in the discretion of the officers of that Department, may be required, if they will simply comply with this condition, which is to put upon the vehicle the name of the Department?

Mr. ALLISON. And if also such vehicles are used for a public purpose?

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. If they are used for a public purpose with this designation, I suppose they are authorized to be so used.

Mr. BACON. I will ask the Senator if it was not the intention of the executive, legislative, and judicial appropriation act to specifically limit the vehicles which should be used by the Executive Departments to the number specified in that act, and whether or not it is not necessarily the consequence of this section that that limitation is removed and that the Executive Departments have just as much liberty as they have heretofore exercised to employ all the vehicles they may desire, upon the simple condition that they will put the name of the Department upon the vehicle and use it for public purposes.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not so understand it; and if the language can be so construed, I hope the Senator will devise words that will execute the idea which he suggests.

Mr. BACON. Well, Mr. President, I am not parsimonious in my ideas as to what should be allowed the Executive Departments, but at the same time Congress has thought that it was necessary that there should be a limitation in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act. An investigation had been made as to what was required and what was proper for the Executive Departments to have the liberty to use and as to the amount of money which they should utilize in that direction, and there is a specification in that act, if I understand it, of the number of vehicles which they shall use and which each of the Departments shall have. Now, if that is so, if that act was carefully considered and if the number was properly apportioned to the different executive officers and Departments which they should use, why is it enlarged by this section? For unless I am very unfortunate in the construction of language it evidently does enlarge it, and enlarges it in an indefinite way, without any limitation whatever, except simply the condition that the vehicles should bear the names of the Departments and that they be used in the public service.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand this provision to be an additional limitation. I think the limitation is very well provided for. Of course it could be still more limited if it were necessary, but I do not think it is. The committee did not think it worth while to

insert any additional words to the restrictions provided for in the section.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me, this can not be an additional limitation to that which is expressed in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, because that was a specific limitation as to the number of vehicles to be used.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will allow me a moment, as I understand the limitation in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, it provides only that the heads of the Executive Departments shall be authorized to use carriages for other than public purposes, and that limitation is found in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act.

This section provides that in addition to that the carriages which are used shall not only be used for public purposes, but there shall be shown on some suitable and visible place on each of the carriages that they are used for public purposes only. If the Senator is not satisfied with that limitation and will suggest any other words, I shall be glad to accept them.

Mr. BACON. As I say, Mr. President, I have no desire to unduly restrict the Executive Departments; but it does seem to me that this section entirely removes all limitations and that the Departments can have just as many carriages as they please, provided they will put on each vehicle the name of the Department and guarantee the fact that it is only used in the public service.

If the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act did not provide for a sufficient number of carriages, then I quite agree with what appears to be the idea of the committee, that that number ought to be enlarged, and I am willing that they shall enlarge it to any extent that it can be shown it should be enlarged.

But I will call the Senator's attention to the fact that it was made to appear that there was great abuse in this particular, not so much from anything that occurred in this body as in the debates in the House of Representatives. It was a matter of public comment, and the Senator will probably remember a celebrated cartoon that appeared in a local paper, in which the carriages which were being used by public officers were represented as extending from the Capitol to the other end of the Avenue. Of course I have no doubt that that was a very gross exaggeration, but still it is a fact that it was recognized that there had been an abuse by the Executive Departments, or some of them—not all of them, I presume—that there had been in various Executive Departments some abuse of the unlimited opportunity which they had theretofore enjoyed and exercised of having carriages at the public expense.

Therefore it was, if I understood it correctly, that in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act there was an effort made to limit the number of carriages which they could use, so that, without unduly restricting the Departments, there should be no longer this abuse.

If we were mistaken then in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act and did not provide for as many vehicles as the public service properly would justify and require, then I am in favor of the enlargement to the limit which is proper; but the criticism, which I respectfully make and with very much hesitation—for I have the profoundest respect for the conservatism of the Appropriations Committee—the criticism which I make is that this bill entirely fails to make an additional limitation, as suggested by the Senator from Iowa, but that it makes an enlargement of a previous limitation in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, and not only that it makes an enlargement, but that it makes an enlargement which absolutely destroys all limitation, except the simple conditions which I have spoken of, that the vehicles shall have painted upon them the name of the Department to which they are assigned, and that they shall be used in the public service. That is the suggestion which I make.

The Senator says to me that if I am not satisfied, and if I will suggest so and so, he will agree. I simply desire to say that I have such very great confidence in the Senator from Iowa and the great committee over which he presides, that if, upon the suggestion I have made, he is still satisfied with the language of the bill, I should not presume to attempt to amend it.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for the compliment he has paid to the Committee on Appropriations, but according to my interpretation—and I do not speak for the committee, but for myself—this is a restriction. Under the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, of course no carriages can be used unless they are appropriated for, and under that act it was provided not only that they should not be used unless appropriated for, but also that they should only be used for public purposes, save and except that certain Cabinet officers should each be allowed a carriage for personal purposes.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. That applied to the appropriations under that bill.

Mr. BACON. The Senator refers to the bill of this year?

Mr. ALLISON. I refer to that bill of this year. That was intended, I think, to correct an abuse, if there was one.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. When this bill came to be considered it not only provided for those restrictions, but it also provided, as I understand this provision in the bill, that if there are in this bill appropriations for horses and carriages, they shall not only be subject to the restrictions which are now in existence, but also that the carriages shall have a placard showing the name of the Department.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me there, if it be true that there are in this bill specific provisions for additional carriages and horses other than those specified for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, then the construction of the Senator is correct, and I simply ask him if it is a fact that there are in this bill provisions for additional vehicles?

Mr. ALLISON. I understand there are a few not provided for in the legislative act.

Mr. BACON. Very well. Then the Senator's construction of it is—and it is important to make this statement, because I presume the departmental officers will be guided by the construction which is now stated in the Senate to be that intended—the construction of the Senator of this language is that it refers simply to the vehicles and horses which are otherwise authorized in the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BACON. Very well. Then I am very glad to have that statement, because it entirely clears the matter up.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in on page 5, after line 8.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

Detroit, Mich., post-office and court-house: For repairs and improvements to enlarge the accommodations of the post-office room in the post-office and court-house building at Detroit, Mich., \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in on page 27, after line 13.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 27, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

For purchase of specimens to supply deficiencies in the collections of the National Museum, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 39, line 22, I move to correct the total appropriation under the subhead "Immigrant stations, Department of Commerce and Labor," by striking out "thirty-six," before the word "thousand," and inserting "twenty-six," so that the total will be \$126,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in on page 150, after line 24.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 150, after line 24, it is proposed to insert the following:

International exposition at Liege, Belgium: To enable the Government to take official part in the international exposition to be held at Liege, Belgium, during the year 1865, \$25,000: *Provided*, That no liability in excess of the appropriation shall be incurred, and that the commissioners, to be selected by the Department of State, shall serve without compensation.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in on page 98, after line 4.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 98, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

To enable the Secretary of the Interior to cause to be made and completed, under the supervision of the Director of the United States Geological Survey, a railroad map of the United States, showing connecting lines in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico, on the scale of approximately 16 miles to 1 inch, which shall show State and county boundary lines; all lines of railways, with their names or other designations; all important cities and railway stations along such lines; important streams, mountain ranges, the depths of navigable waters near seaports, and such other facts as may be pertinent to such a map, \$20,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in on page 104, after line 8.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 104, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

Freedmen's Hospital: The appropriation of \$50,000 made by the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1864 is hereby continued for the fiscal year 1865: *Provided*, That the tract of land lying and being between Sixth and Fourth streets and between Pomeroy and College streets, in the city of Washington, D. C., containing approximately 11 acres of ground, be, and the same is hereby, retroceded to Howard University, upon the condition that the said Howard University shall make and execute to the United States a perpetual lease for the nominal rental of \$1 per annum, and that upon the

execution of such lease to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior, said Secretary shall cause to be erected on the ground so retroceded and leased the new hospital for freedmen provided for by the act above referred to.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no other amendments to present, and now ask to return to the amendments that were passed over.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment to offer an amendment?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COCKRELL. I want to offer an amendment, but before I offer it I want to read section 3 of the sundry civil appropriation act of March 3, 1893, in regard to the Chicago exposition, which is as follows:

Sec. 3. That not to exceed 50,000 bronze medals and the necessary dies therefor, with appropriate devices, emblems, and inscriptions commemorative of the said exposition celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, shall be prepared under the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury; and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prepare plates and make therefrom not to exceed 50,000 impressions for diplomas at a total cost not to exceed \$103,000. Said medals and diplomas shall be delivered to the World's Columbian Commission, to be awarded to exhibitors in accordance with the provisions of said act of Congress approved April 25, 1890, and there is hereby appropriated, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$103,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the expenditures authorized by this section.

I offer the amendment I send to the desk, to come in at the close of the bill. It does not appropriate a dollar. It provides for the coining of the medals, all the material to be furnished by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company.

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

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

Sec. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to prepare or have prepared suitable dies with appropriate devices, emblems, and inscriptions commemorative of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory; from which dies, under the supervision of the said Secretary of the Treasury, there shall be coined, at some mint of the United States, medals to be awarded by the said Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company to exhibitors, in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory by the United States," etc., approved March 3, 1901; that the devices, emblems, and inscriptions for said dies and medals shall be furnished by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company, and said medals shall be made and coined from such material as the said exposition company may, at its own expense, furnish; and authority may be granted by the Secretary of the Treasury to the holder of any medal properly awarded to any exhibitor to have duplicates thereof made at any time at any of the mints of the United States, from gold, silver, or bronze, at the expense of the person desiring the same; said medals shall be coined and the dies therefor prepared subject to the provisions of the fifty-second section of the coinage act of 1890, and all the provisions, whether penal or otherwise, of said coinage act against counterfeiting or imitating of coins of the United States shall apply to the medals struck and used under the provisions of this act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. Now I ask the Senate to return to page 81.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment on page 81 will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After line 12, on page 81, it is proposed to insert the following:

To acquire a site for and toward the construction of a fireproof building for committee rooms, folding room, and other offices for the United States Senate and for necessary office rooms for Senators, to be erected on square No. 686 in the city of Washington, D. C., bounded by B street NE., First street NE., C street NE., and Delaware avenue NE., \$750,000; and said site shall be acquired and said building constructed under the direction and supervision of a commission, which is hereby created, to be composed of three Senators, namely: Hon. SHELBY M. CULLOM, of Illinois, Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER, of New Hampshire, and Hon. FRANCIS M. COCKRELL, of Missouri, and said building shall be constructed in accordance with architectural plans to be secured by said commission in such way as they may deem advisable. The cost of said building, exclusive of site, shall not exceed \$2,250,000; the construction thereof and letting of contracts therefor, including employment of skilled and other services, shall be under the control of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, subject to the direction and supervision of said commission.

The said commission may acquire said site or any portion thereof by direct purchase, if the prices are reasonable; such portion of said site as can not be so purchased shall be acquired by condemnation, as follows: The said commission shall notify the Secretary of the Interior in writing of such failure, whereupon the said Secretary of the Interior shall, within thirty days after the receipt of said notice, proceed to acquire such portion of said site in the manner prescribed for providing a site for an addition to the Government Printing Office in so much of the act approved July 1, 1893, as is set forth on pages 648 and 649 of volume 30 of the Statutes at Large, and for the purpose of such acquisition the Secretary of the Interior shall have and exercise all powers conferred upon the Public Printer in said act.

The appropriations herein and hereafter made for said site and building shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Any vacancy occurring by resignation or otherwise in the membership of the said commission shall be filled by the presiding officer of the Senate.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I am opposed to the proposed amendment, but I intend to occupy only a short time in stating the reasons.

When the amendment was reached on last Friday, and before the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] had asked that it be passed

over, I had already said that it was not a gracious thing to appear here in opposition to a proposition intended for the convenience or comfort of members of this body. We all know how reluctant Senators have been to object to increased clerks, to increased clerk hire, to increased messengers, which have so often been asked for by the various chairmen of committees, and while there has been an effort made on rare occasions to limit the number and to limit the amount paid, yet I do not think any such effort has been very successful. In my judgment that practice has tended to create the impression that the Senate is especially extravagant in regard to officers in its employ.

But, Mr. President, those are small matters, in my judgment, as compared with this. I think this is an extravagance which surpasses anything I have ever seen offered in the Senate. Now, what is the proposition? The proposition is to appropriate in this bill \$750,000 to buy a block of ground lying just north of the Capitol grounds. It is also proposed to provide for an appropriation of not exceeding two and a quarter million dollars for the purpose of erecting on that land a building for committee rooms of the Senate and for offices for Senators and for the folding room connected with the Senate. The proposed amendment contemplates an expenditure of \$3,000,000, and yet I do not think there is a single Senator on the Appropriations Committee who does not believe that by the time the ground is purchased and the contracts made, or the land is condemned where agreements can not be made, and the building is finished, it will amount to \$4,500,000. I do not think the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Iowa, expects to acquire the land and build the building within the amount specified in the bill.

Now, it is proposed that the \$3,000,000 specified in the bill—\$4,500,000 as I say the building will eventually cost—shall be used to procure offices for the committees of the Senate and for the Senators on this floor. If it should cost \$4,500,000, it would be \$50,000 for each and every Senator who sits upon this floor. If it costs only what is stated in the amendment, it will be, in round numbers, \$33,000 for each and every Senator to build offices and committee rooms for the Senate alone.

In addition to that, it will be remembered that some fifty of the Senators, who are chairmen of committees, or most of them, perhaps all, have committee rooms within the Capitol building. There are forty Senators, I believe, who have rooms in what is known as the "Maltby Building." It is proposed to erect this enormous structure, costing this great amount of money, in addition to the committee rooms that are provided in the Capitol for the Senate, and to expend this money for a structure which, it seems to me, is extravagant beyond the wants and beyond the demands of the Senate or beyond what is reasonable.

Mr. President, a few years ago it was announced upon the floor of the Senate that a building known as the "Maltby Building" could be purchased at a very reasonable price. It was urged that if it was not purchased then it would increase in value. It was said that the building would be ample and sufficient to provide committee rooms and offices for every Senator in this body. Now we are told that the building is unsafe and has been condemned; that it is unfit to be used for the purposes for which we purchased it. I forget what amount of money was paid for it, but I do remember distinctly that those who urged it said at the time that it would be sufficient for all time to provide for every committee and for every Senator, and now, as I said, it is claimed that it is unsafe and must be abandoned.

But it seems to me that if the extension of the eastern front of the Capitol is made, as proposed by the House of Representatives and provision for which is contained in the bill now pending before the Senate, and if provision should be made elsewhere, as I have no doubt it will be, for the Supreme Court, there will be ample room within this building to accommodate every Senator who now has a committee room or an office in the Maltby Building. I say that I think this immense structure, provision for which is contained in the proposed amendment to an appropriation bill, is unnecessary. I think the provision in the bill, together with the committee rooms that may be secured when the House shall take possession of its new quarters, for which it has provided, will be amply sufficient to furnish committee rooms and offices for every Senator in this body.

Mr. President, I regret, as I said at the beginning, to stand here opposing a measure of this kind. I know full well what construction may be put by some upon the action of a Senator who does oppose it, but I believe it is wrong. I believe it is extravagant, and I believe that if we pass a bill here appropriating money to build offices and committee rooms for the Senate, costing even \$33,000 for every Senator here, it will tend to give color to the charge of extravagance which has so often been made against this body. For these reasons, while I regretted to differ with the majority of the committee of which I am a member, I said to its chairman that I did not believe the committee ought to propose the pending amendment at the present time; that I believed it

was extravagance, and that it was not best that it should go into the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BERRY. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a second?

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, if the Senate has the courage to vote for what it believes right I trust it will give me the yeas and nays. I know Senators here are willing to vote for the amendment, as they believe in it, and I think we ought to have the yeas and nays. I know the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] will vote for the call for the yeas and nays, for he is never afraid to vote for whatever he thinks is right.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, like the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], I believe in rigid economy in the expenditure of public money; but I can not concur with him in describing as useless extravagance a suitable provision for places in which Senators can perform their public duty. If this provided only places where the Senators might work, I should favor it, and I would particularly favor it when, in addition to working places for the Senators, additional and necessary committee rooms are provided.

The Senator from Arkansas has the honor to be chairman of a committee, and yet his committee room is located somewhere in the basement, so far from this Chamber that he can not find it if he should undertake to go to it this afternoon. So inconvenient is his place for working that the Senator has not sought it three times during the entire session. So excellent a public servant as the Senator from Arkansas is entitled to a better place for working than the basement of the Capitol, shut out from the light and the air. Such a place is not agreeable nor conducive to good work.

Not only so, but I happen to be located in the Maltby Building, to which the Senator has referred, and so crowded is it that when our constituents come to interview us on matters affecting the public interest, they are often compelled to wait in a hall until it may suit our convenience to see them. It is so crowded that when the Committee on Irrigation attempts to hold a session it is compelled to exclude everybody from what is called "a reception room" in that building in order to occupy that room for its meeting.

Now, it may be that the Senate has too many committees. It is sometimes said that committees have been created more for the benefit of the clerks than for the benefit of the public service. Certain committees never hold a session, but their clerks draw \$2,220 per annum, while the clerks of other Senators performing just as laborious and just as useful service draw \$1,500 per annum. I make no criticism of that. I assume that when the Senate creates a committee, the committee has a duty to perform, and I insist that the Senate shall provide a place where the committee can suitably perform its duties.

If the Senator from Arkansas is to judge by what a public expenditure may average to each Senator, the country would stand somewhat staggered when this Capitol was constructed, but nobody believes that the object in constructing this magnificent Capitol was to provide merely for the comfort of the men who hold the commissions of great States to membership in this body. They sought to make a building suitable for the home of the representatives of the people, and the people approve it. A man fit to be the ambassador of a great State in the highest legislative body of the world is entitled to a comfortable place in which to work, and the best is none too good for the Senators from Arkansas and other great States in this Union.

I commend the Senator from Arkansas for always striving to represent what he believes to be the sentiment of his people, but my judgment is that the people of Arkansas, though I know no more of them than a neighbor tries to know of his neighbors, would not want to tear down this splendid pile of marble which is the home of their representatives and rebuild it either of brick or logs. Neither do I believe the people of Arkansas want their Senators sent to a room little better than a dungeon as a working place. I do not know how it may be with other Senators, but I judge it to be with all others as it is with me—that the efficiency of the work corresponds in some fair degree to the surroundings under which the work is performed.

I am free to say that when one of my constituents comes to the Capitol of this Republic I prefer to have a comfortable place to which I may invite him. I do not propose any oriental magnificence that is not in keeping with the simplicity of a republic, but I do believe that every building erected by this Government ought to typify the Government itself—ought to be massive and to look like it would stand four-square to all the winds that blow.

It ought to be simple, if you please, but splendid in its simplicity, and if it is the judgment of the committee that has investigated this matter that it takes this much money to build a building suitable for committees and Senators, the people of this

country desire that kind of a building. Nobody wants a Senator who represents him either to live in a hut or to stop at a wagon yard in Washington. The people want their representatives to bear themselves as become the representatives of a great, a free, a self-respecting, and, if you please, a proud-spirited people.

The only difference between the Senator from Arkansas and myself is that he thinks all this could be accomplished with a smaller expenditure. I am myself not so sure that the amount the committee has provided is the least sum for which suitable service could have been secured, but as I am not sure on that point I withhold all criticism. I regret that the Senator from Arkansas, instead of merely criticising what he deems an extravagant appropriation, did not give the Senate the benefit of his judgment as to what would be a reasonable appropriation.

I am entirely sure that the Senator from Arkansas does not desire Senators of the minority turned out from the Capitol, and yet there is not room enough here for the minority and the majority, too. True enough, some of those whose excellent service has so endeared them to their people as to have been returned a sufficient length of time are provided for in the Capitol, and if I was ungenerous I might think that was one reason why they are not so much interested in relieving us from the building across the grounds. I know that is not the influence which controls the Senator from Arkansas. I do not believe such an influence would control any Senator here.

But I commend to the Senator from Arkansas the report of the Architect of the Capitol, submitted to this body in response to a resolution adopted by us, in which he describes the Senate Annex, commonly called the Maltby Building, as a fire trap. He practically declares that in case of a fire it would burn like a house of straw. Yet the Senator from Arkansas, as little as he may value the services of some of us located there, would not be willing to expose us first to the discomforts of it when it stands and to the danger of it when it may fall.

Mr. President, I can conscientiously say that I have never voted to waste a dollar of public money, because I regard it as a trust fund, which no man has a right to squander. What he possesses either by earning or by inheritance he may waste. That is his own, to be disposed of according to his views of duty to himself and to those dependent on him. But what is taken from the people of this land in the shape of taxes and covered into the public Treasury is a sacred trust fund, which no Senator has a right to waste.

During my fourteen years of public service I have never voted to misspend a dollar of public money. But if I shall be spared hereafter to serve twice fourteen years, I will never hesitate for an instant to spend a dollar that ought properly to be spent. I shall never hesitate to spend a dollar that will provide a proper public service.

Neither do I believe that in Texas or in Arkansas or in any other section of this country there is an element, respectable either in numbers or intelligence, that would have us deny ourselves or deny them any proper and suitable expenditure. The Senator from Arkansas does not dissent from this view, and the utmost difference that can exist between him and any of his colleagues is as to the extent of the appropriation and not as to the appropriation itself.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator has wholly failed to refer to the fact that I stated if the eastern front of the Capitol is extended, as is proposed by the House of Representatives in this bill, and then provision is made, as I understand the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] is trying to make it, for the Supreme Court in another building, there would be ample room within the Capitol for the Senators who are now in the Maltby Building.

The Senator fails, furthermore, to allude to the fact that there are fifty Senators already provided for in the Capitol, indifferently it may be as to some; and I may refer to my own committee room.

It is not such a committee room as I would be glad to have, but I usually do my work at the hotel where I board. But there are fifty Senators in this building who have rooms, either committee rooms or rooms otherwise. There are only forty remaining, and I put the question to the Senator from Texas himself, who is always fair and debates fairly, whether he does not think \$4,500,000, or \$3,000,000, which is covered by this appropriation here, is too much money to provide committee rooms and office rooms for the forty Senators now in the Maltby Building.

I repeat, Mr. President, I think it is an extravagant appropriation, beyond anything that has heretofore come to the Senate. I regret, as I said before, to oppose anything of this kind, and I have no purpose in it save and except I believe it is a wrong appropriation—an appropriation of a large amount clearly beyond what the necessities demand.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for calling my attention to the fact that I was about to over-

look his suggestion that ample accommodations could be provided by extending the east front of the Capitol.

Mr. BERRY. And which is provided by this bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Not authorized, but a commission is appointed, and the bill expressly provides that no money shall be expended until Congress appropriates it hereafter.

Now, as between the Senate building and the Capitol extension, I would not hesitate one minute in my choice. In the first place, the extension of the Capitol is more a matter of art and architectural beauty than of convenient and good working quarters for Senators. The three millions which it is proposed to spend on that Capitol improvement is out of all proportion, so far as practical results are concerned, when compared with the building which the Committee on Appropriations has provided for.

The Senator from Arkansas, moreover, is mistaken when he declares that that improvement would provide for all the Senators now located in the Maltby Building. It is estimated that there would be about twenty-eight additional rooms on the Senate side of this new improvement.

Mr. CLAPP. Will the Senator pardon me a moment?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. That would involve the idea that the court would still remain here, would it not?

Mr. ALLISON. It would.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes: it would.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Iowa says that is true. Not only would there be but twenty-eight additional rooms, but some of them dark and not satisfactory places to work in. So after we had spent \$3,000,000 providing twenty-eight single rooms, we would still have twelve or fourteen Senators not provided for; and it must be remembered that we are soon to have four more, according to one view, and eight more, as I hope.

Forty need workshops: twenty-eight would be supplied, leaving twelve to stand out-of-doors, and that twelve to be joined by the four or eight, as the wisdom of Congress may decide, from the newly admitted States. To spend \$3,000,000 for twenty-eight rooms, and with no committee rooms, is incomparably worse than to spend \$3,000,000 for rooms for fifty Senators with committee rooms and offices in addition.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. I wish to state to the Senator that there is in this bill a provision, put there by the House of Representatives, providing for the extension of the eastern front in any event.

Mr. TELLER. No.

Mr. BERRY. I say the House put it in.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, yes: the House put it in.

Mr. BERRY. That is what I stated, if the Senator from Colorado will permit me. Now, that is their proposition. It has nothing to do with the other proposition except that we are together to spend \$6,000,000 if we provide for both, because that provision is in the bill. It is not stricken out either by this amendment. It is changed and modified—architects are provided for, a certain commission from the House and the Senate is also provided for, no further appropriation is to be made until after they report, etc.—but it still stands in that provision; and I take it for granted that the House of Representatives is going to insist upon extending the eastern front of the Capitol without regard to what may be done for the convenience of Senators.

But the amendment proposed by the committee applies alone to Senate committees and offices for Senators and certain folding rooms connected with the Senate. The eastern front applies to the entire Capitol, to the House of Representatives, to the country at large. It is an extension of this great building, of which the Senator has spoken, and is not intended alone to make committee rooms. The House had no such thought.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have no doubt when the question comes back from this commission to the Senate I shall find myself at agreement with the Senator from Arkansas in voting against the expenditure of \$3,000,000 for the Capitol extension, because it must be remembered that the House of Representatives has already had the good judgment to provide itself with a building for offices and committee rooms; and when the Senate imitates the good judgment of the House and provides for itself, there will be absolutely no excuse for the Capitol extension, unless it be one merely relating to its architectural appearance.

It may be that instead of a new public building which is sometimes proposed, to be called a "temple of justice" or a new home for the court, Congress in its wisdom will provide better quarters for the Supreme Court and continue it under the Dome of this Capitol. If that shall be proposed, it will raise another question as to a suitable chamber for the Supreme Court. So far as an appropriation to improve the Capitol is concerned, I will join the Senator from Arkansas, then, in voting against the expenditure of that \$3,000,000, because I do not believe it will be justified by any useful public purpose.

In addition to the twelve Senators in the Senate Annex who would be unprovided for under the Capitol extension and the four or eight Senators who will come to represent the newly admitted States, some six or eight Senators, like the Senator from Arkansas, occupy rooms in the basement of this Capitol, so damp and dark as to breed disease. Thus there are twenty Senators—

Mr. BACON. There are very many more than eight, counting the crypt.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Georgia says there are more than eight. I happen to know of Senators who need to be relieved, and I intend to vote to relieve them in spite of their opposition. I do not intend that the Senator from Arkansas shall be compelled to call the Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress together in a committee room that he could not find if he starts out from the Senate Chamber this afternoon without a page to guide him. The Senator from Arkansas and at least seven others ought to be provided for in a better way.

It is small wonder that the Senator from Arkansas, according to his own statement, does his work at the hotel where he lives. He is justified in doing it anywhere rather than in that little room located so far away and reached by such a circuitous, difficult route that he can not find it.

But some of us in the performance of our duties find it necessary to have more books about us than we find it convenient to keep or to carry to the taverns where we live. Some Senators know how it ought to be without troubling themselves to search the books, but a good many of us are not willing to trust our own conclusions until we have examined the authorities. Senators who, compelled to have the aid of books, and sometimes many of them, find it impossible to work in their rooms at the hotel; and those of us who find it necessary to summon to our assistance the wisdom of the dead as embodied in books are not permitted to carry those books, as I have said once before on this floor, into our committee rooms at the Maltby Building.

They tell us that the floor or the walls, or perhaps both the floor and the walls, have been so disjoined and are so out of level and plumb as to render it unsafe to carry into the building the ordinary books which a Senator desires to keep within easy and immediate reach.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] would not want to keep a colleague like myself confined to a house where it was impossible for me to carry the books which I need to consult. Other Senators—I say that without offense—can afford to rely upon their own judgment or conclusions reached without the aid of what others have thought or said or written, but all of us are not that fortunate.

I am free to say that for my part I count it no disparagement to my intelligence that I generally go to the books first to lead me to my conclusions, and even to confirm me when I have reached a conclusion before consulting them. I am never so well satisfied with any conclusion I have reached as when I find it in accordance with the choice and master intellects of the ages gone by; and I am not alone in this course of study. Other Senators need aid as well as I do, and to require me or them to work where we can not have the benefit of books is to deny to our constituents our best efforts.

No Senator desires to do that. I am sure that every Senator here knows that when each of us has done his best our conclusions are none too wise. When we have wrought under the most favorable circumstances, remembering that our work projects itself into the centuries for good or evil, we ought to work under conditions that insure the wisest conclusions.

Mr. President, I have seen a committee of the Senate conducting investigations, crowded into a committee room almost to suffocation. Would it not be wise that when the Senate provides this building there shall be rooms in which the people of this country may be permitted to come and hear the testimony, when testimony is taken, and hear the arguments, when arguments are made, concerning vital questions in which they feel an interest?

But, Mr. President, I am uselessly consuming the time of the Senate to argue this question longer. The only difference between other Senators and the Senator from Arkansas is one of degree, not of principle. He thinks the appropriation extravagant. I, myself, regret very much that a proper building could not be erected for less. I would not vote a dollar more than is necessary, nor would I vote a dollar less.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, if the Senate will bear with me for a moment, it is with some hesitation that I vote against the report of the committee; but I will put my vote upon an entirely different ground from that upon which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] places his.

I fully agree with the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] that our constituents want us to have proper accommodations. They want us to have proper opportunity and surroundings in our labor here, and I would not hesitate to vote for the amendment no matter how many millions it involved; but I do believe the

genius of the Senate ought to be able to devise some means by which ninety Senators can be accommodated under the roof of the Capitol.

Take the House with its great body and it is necessary that it should go outside and erect another building; but with only ninety Senators, or ninety-four or ninety-eight, if the eight ultimately come, with the Supreme Court removed from this building to quarters such as it ought to have and such as it never can have in the Capitol building, with the library of that court removed, I believe room enough could be found under this roof to accommodate the members of the Senate instead of compelling us to go chasing underground on trolley cars, as this amendment proposes we shall do. As one of the unfortunates who is rapidly becoming web-footed from traversing the underground galleries here, I wish to say that a reasonable expenditure would keep rain out of that part of this building and make that part of it very comfortable for all.

Mr. President, it may be presumptuous to set up one man's judgment against that of the committee. I know the architects say the Capitol ought not to be extended. I do not want to question the motive of any man, but I can readily understand how an architect would prefer to put up a new magnificent building rather than to be employed on an extension of the Capitol.

It is said the Supreme Court does not want the extension, because the extending the Capitol does not, as it is now considered, involve putting up an additional building for the court. I believe if that court realize that Congress has put up a building for them, such as they ought to have, they would very gladly vacate this building.

So, Mr. President, for one I shall vote against this amendment, believing that instead of going outside and putting up a building for Senators we should go outside and put up a building for the Supreme Court and rearrange this building so as to furnish offices under this roof for members of the Senate, and not require them to go from one place to another seeking places of business.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, it seems to me that we ought not to provide in this bill for both the Capitol extension and this new building. I think if we adopt the amendments which have been suggested by the Committee on Appropriations, that will be precisely what we as a Senate should do.

The provision for the Capitol extension is already in the bill, and it is left in the bill; the committee has not struck it out. The committee has modified it, but still the provision for the Capitol extension will remain in the bill whatever the conference committee may do. If the Senate committee amendment passes, the work will not be constructed until the commission has received plans and submitted them to Congress, but still there will be a committal of Congress to that work.

Now, I do not think we ought to have both the Capitol extension and this building.

Mr. CLAPP. Will the Senator pardon me a moment?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. Do you not think the time has come when the Supreme Court of this country ought to have better quarters than they have?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. Do you think it can be obtained except either by the erection of a building outside or enlarging and extending the front of the Capitol building?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I am not at the present moment committing myself to either of these plans or to the question of another building for the Supreme Court. I want to leave that for the present. I want to consider just what we are doing now.

Mr. CLAPP. If the Senator will pardon me, that is just what we want to consider. I understand the Senator to say that if this plan to erect an additional building for the Senate is carried out he does not think the other ought to be. That leaves us, then, with the present condition as to the Supreme Court.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Put it the other way, if the Senator pleases, that if that Capitol extension is carried out I do not see any necessity for this new building.

Mr. CLAPP. Except for the Supreme Court.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. We can erect a court building somewhere else. But I should like to state what I had in mind.

Mr. TELLER. I want to call the Senator's attention to the last proposition which he made, that no plan for the extension of the Capitol provides for Senators, and that it is impossible to do so under any plan that has ever been submitted.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I think that if we could get twenty-eight new committee rooms it might be possible to pretty well provide for the Senators, that is, if they were in addition to the rooms which we already have. I have one very small room, and I am sure I would not trade that small room for a suite of rooms, however magnificent and commodious they might be.

Mr. BAILEY. Nor divide it with one of the twelve or fourteen Senators who are unprovided for.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. But what I intended to say was that I think, if we adopt this amendment of the Committee on Appropriations, we are going to commit ourselves to the Capitol extension sooner or later. The commission which is provided for is to employ architects and to bring in plans. They, to be sure, have to be approved by Congress; but nevertheless this provision will stand that the Capitol extension is to be completed according to the original plans of Mr. Walter, with such modifications and extensions as may be suggested by the proposed commission.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senator from Connecticut will observe that the sum of \$500,000 is appropriated to carry on the work to which he has just been directing attention.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. There is more than that in it.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator will allow me to make a suggestion.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. I propose to move an amendment modifying the sum, so that the architects will understand what is proposed by the committee. I shall offer an amendment inserting either \$50,000 or \$75,000, instead of \$500,000.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator from Maine permit me a moment?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. There is more in it than a mere appropriation of \$500,000, because it is provided—

And the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, subject to the approval of Congress as aforesaid, under the direction and supervision of said commission, is authorized to make contracts for said construction after proper advertisements and the reception of bids within a total sum not exceeding \$2,500,000.

Whether we approve any of the plans that this commission brings us or not, finally we must, if this legislation is passed, make this extension of the Capitol.

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

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not so understand. Taking the provisions of this amendment and construing them together, there can be no contract made under it as it now stands until after Congress shall have approved the plans.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I know that; but still we shall have legislation here which will commit Congress, as it seems to me, to the building of the Capitol extension whenever plans are suggested which Congress approves.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly when Congress shall agree to build it, then we shall build it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. No.

Mr. ALLISON. But I agree with the Senator that the amendment in form commits the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. To the final extension—

Mr. ALLISON. To the extension of the Capitol when Congress shall have ascertained what the extension is to be, but not before.

Mr. ALDRICH. Congress is not only to ascertain, but to decide.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Does the Senator doubt that Congress will eventually, after it shall have enacted this legislation, adopt some plans for carrying it out?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not doubt it, and I will not permit myself to doubt it, as I think it ought to do.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Then, Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa, at the head of the great Committee on Appropriations, as well as the Senate, will by passing this bill commit itself to the extension of the Capitol in some form. If the Senate is going to do that I do not think that we ought, in addition to that, provide for this building.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I do not agree at all with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] that because we have provided that this scheme for the extension of the Capitol—to which I am opposed entirely, root and branch—instead of being adopted now shall be put off until we can have a report by architects of what is contemplated, and until the Congress has adopted that or some other plan, commits us now to that proposition. I do not for one moment recognize that. I should like better, if I could have my way, to put through this provision for a building for Senators corresponding to that which we have already given to the House of Representatives, not to be so large and costly as that is, but to be spacious, handsome, near by, and, through modern methods of transportation, easily accessible to the Senate. I would desire that that proposition should go through, and that we should strike out entirely the House proposition.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. That would do.

Mr. HALE. As to the extension of the Capitol, I look with

dread, Mr. President, and with apprehension at any project, howsoever it may be sanctioned, by one body or the other, or by architects, as interfering with the simple and beautiful and almost perfect—so far as I am concerned. I will say perfect—façade of the east front of the Capitol. I shall never, for one, agree to any scheme that destroys that; least of all, to any scheme that projects into this intermediate space between the two wings of the Capitol a structure that fills it all up with projections, even farther out than the wings, and gives, instead of a beautiful, symmetrical, and gratifying front, a vulgar front, like that of common buildings; that fills up all this space between, and leaves everything else in darkness. I should never agree, for one, to vote for that; but would vote against it, if I voted alone finally.

But it is a great deal—as the House has put on a project for our doing this at once, ruthlessly, without consideration, without contemplation, and without investigation—it is a great deal to postpone that matter and to declare, as we have in this amendment, that it shall be submitted by the commission to architects, and that nothing whatever shall be done until it is reported exactly what the architects recommend, and that then nothing shall be done until Congress has adopted it.

While I would rather strike out the whole provision, as the Senator from Connecticut would, I do not agree that by postponing this matter and getting more information any Senator is bound to hereafter, whatever may be the report, vote for what, to my mind, destroys the beauty of this great Capitol.

If any Senator moves to strike out the entire provision of the House, I will vote for the motion; but if that can not be carried, it is the plan of the committee that we shall go on and provide for the building which we ought to erect for the accommodation of Senators, which it is proper that we should have, as the House has its great building, though ours will not cost more than half as much as theirs. I have no fear of being troubled with criticisms that we are doing an extravagant thing. But we can do that. The commission can take charge, can go on and condemn; and when we come together next winter, then we shall have a report upon this other and nearer and more vital and more important matter as to whether we shall commence the work of destroying this Capitol as it now exists.

I agree fully, Mr. President, with the reports that were made to the Senate when the two wings were put on this building—most enlightening reports—covering the whole subject-matter, in which this very subject was discussed and brought out. In a report made by the then Senator from Mississippi, Jefferson Davis, who had taste about these things, and Mr. Clark, of New Hampshire, they declared that in every step that was taken in building the two wings they bore in mind that nothing should interfere with the beautiful east front of the Capitol as it now exists, and that the two wings, by the light that they threw, would add to the charm of that wonderful façade that we all look upon with such pride and with such comfort. I may say I do every time I look at it. I am in favor of carrying out those projects—the very projects that they started upon.

The sketch that has been picked up has never had the indorsement and never been viséed by Mr. Walter. At the time when Mr. Davis and Mr. Clark were making their reports, declaring that they would not, under any circumstances, agree to anything that would interfere with this east front, Mr. Walter was making a report, as the Architect of the Capitol, and he never once intimated that he had any design or sketch that would destroy or cover and darken that east front.

It is assumed that these are plans which had been deliberated upon, perfected, studied out, and brought in by the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. Walter. There is not a particle of testimony that shows that that was a finished sketch. He struck out and designed three or four different plans, and one of these plans has been picked up, and it is assumed that it is Mr. Walter's plan; and, as I repeat, when the whole subject was up, he never, by word or phrase, intimated that that east front was to be desecrated or darkened or destroyed.

I should be in favor of striking out entirely this provision the House put in and going on to provide for our building, which they ought not to object to, as we did not object to their building; but if that can not be done, then I do not agree with the Senator from Connecticut that by postponing the matter and providing for further investigation and bringing it all before Congress we are committed to anything.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] does not feel as I do about that plan. We differ about that. That is a matter of broad ground on which we may differ; but I think the Senator would say that he does not consider that he or that anybody in the Senate is committed by this proposition to afterwards vote to destroy the east front of the Capitol.

Therefore, while, as I said, I would vote, and will do so now if any Senator makes the motion, to strike out the entire House proposition, yet if we can not do that, then we might certainly, in the interest of good legislation upon this project for saving the

east front of the Capitol, do better by adopting the amendment the committee has reported.

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

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand, there is nothing of Mr. Walter's plan save mere sketches. There is not a working plan of any kind.

Mr. HALE. They were never carried into effect; there is no intimation that they were anything more than stray sketches. He made two or three or four of them; but I can find—and I have looked over the literature on the subject and have read the reports made in the Senate and the reports made by the architect when the wings were put on the building—not only nothing that indicates that there was a plan to change the east front, but I find repeated assertions in the debates and in the reports that nothing should be done that would change it.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator if the model in the Rotunda is according to the plans of Mr. Walter?

Mr. HALE. No; that has been constructed on the basis of one of those sketches to which I have referred, and it has been assumed that it was Mr. Walter's deliberate plan and that he believed it could be done; but I find no testimony and no evidence has been brought to show that.

Mr. LODGE. That plan was a mere suggestion.

Mr. HALE. A mere suggestion; a thought he had in his mind.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine a question for information. I should like to know if this is not the actual situation: That if the new building to be erected across the street is built, will not that, as a practical proposition, prevent the extension of the Capitol for all time to come, no matter how we make up our minds hereafter?

Mr. HALE. I will answer that question frankly. I am in favor of the new building anyway, but I do not think that any extension of the Capitol, such as is contemplated by these plans, will give any relief to committees. There are too few of those rooms that would be light. A great wide space has got to be had in this projection for a centerpiece. The House rooms on the right-hand side will cover up that part, and the rooms on this side, with the exception of the great dark space, which can not be utilized, will be very few. Therefore, whether that building is erected or not, I am not in favor of this extension; but I am in favor of the new building, because it will be a relief to Senators who have not got good or safe quarters.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In common with many, or at least with some other Senators, I am not informed upon the merits or demerits of either proposition, but the question which occurred to my mind was this—and it has occurred to the minds of others—that if the building proposed should be erected across the street will it not have the practical result of preventing the erection of an extension to the Capitol for all time to come, no matter what might be our future judgment as to its advisability?

Mr. HALE. If the only object to be attained is in getting committee rooms, it would remove that object, undoubtedly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. HALE. But it does not in any way interfere with the general proposition that we ought not to interfere with the east front of the Capitol.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But that relates merely to the question of art; so that if the building across the street should be erected there would not for all time to come be any reason for the Capitol extension, except merely as a question of art and not of utility. Is not that the situation?

Mr. HALE. It is claimed by its advocates that the plan for the extension of the east front improves the Capitol; but I do not believe that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not know, and I have asked the Senator for information because, as I say, there are many Senators around here who are not informed; but it appears, to repeat the question, that if the new building is erected, that will have the practical effect of preventing an extension of the Capitol at any time in the future, no matter what the future judgment of Congress might be.

Mr. HALE. It removes one reason?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And leaves merely the reason of art?

Mr. HALE. Which I think ought to be the main reason.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And not the reason of utility?

Mr. HALE. Not the reason of utility.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The reason of art, in the first place, which it leaves is not so powerful as is the reason of utility.

Mr. BACON. I presume that it will be conceded by every Senator that there ought to be some additional accommodations for Senators, and it is simply a question as to what shall be done. Something evidently must be done. There are not now accommodations which are sufficient for Senators or in the use of which they can properly discharge their duties.

The presentation has been so fully made as to the necessity of this proposed building that I shall not dwell upon it at all. I

would not say anything now, Mr. President, but for the fact that the question has been suggested as to the propriety of the extension of the east front of the Capitol. I simply wish in a word to join most heartily in what has been said by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] as to the impropriety of any change to the east front of this Capitol.

I am not an architect, but it is not necessary that one should be an architect in order to be able to appreciate the beauty of the front of this Capitol. One may travel the world round and see no such public building, so beautiful in its architectural effect, as is this building when viewed from East Capitol street. I myself think it would be an absolute sacrilege, so far as I am able to judge of the question of architecture, to make the extension which is proposed by the plan which is now in the Rotunda of this Capitol.

I would not touch it or make any change in it. Much less would I make the change contemplated in the proposed extension. If anyone will take a stand on the east front of the Capitol, he must perceive that one of its chief beauties is found in the great Dome, and that the splendid colonnade of that east front, of which from that standpoint it seems to form a part, constitutes really a feature of its architectural effect. If you extend the east front, you destroy the effect of the Dome from any near point of view. Besides that, to my taste, the extension would destroy also the fine architectural effect of the beautiful colonnades to the right and left.

I would very much prefer that the provision for the extension of the Capitol should be stricken from this bill altogether. It is true that it does not make any definite and permanent provision for it. It is true that if the plans are not subsequently approved the work will not be undertaken; but I am so impressed with the fact that to change it in any particular is to destroy its beauty that, for myself, I would be glad to see no step taken in that direction, even in the way of an investigation.

I was about to ask the Senator from Iowa what was to be done with this \$500,000. I understood from him—I could not hear the Senator from Iowa distinctly—but I understood he proposed to reduce that amount to \$500. Was I correct?

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. BACON. I could not hear the Senator very well on account of the conversation around me.

Mr. ALLISON. I said fifty or seventy-five thousand dollars.

Mr. BACON. Well, for what purpose, I would ask the Senator from Iowa, with his permission, would the fifty or seventy-five thousand dollars be used if it is simply to provide for an investigation by this commission, with a report to Congress? I do not understand that that involves the expenditure of money.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator that it involves the study and preparation of plans in detail, including specifications for all the work that is to be done under the plans. Therefore it is a very great work to make the plans and the specifications covering all the details.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, it seems to me that that could be very well postponed if we are going to enter upon the work of the construction of this building for the Senate. The extension of the Capitol could not in any measure supply the demand that the Senate now has for additional accommodations for Senators. Whatever building is put up ought to be in harmony with this Capitol. It ought to be a building not for this year or next year or the next century, but, so far as we can anticipate, for all time.

I would be very glad if the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] would make the motion to strike this provision out altogether, but it seems to me that, even if it is not stricken out, we ought not to go to the expense of fifty or seventy-five thousand dollars for plans for the execution of which there would be little reason if we are to erect this proposed Senate building. The extension of the Capitol itself will not answer the demands of the Senate, and the extension itself would not do away with the necessity for the Senate building; but the erection of that building will do away with the necessity for the extension of the east front of the Capitol.

Mr. HALE. In order to test the sense of the Senate on the question of the extension of the Capitol, I will move to strike that provision out.

Mr. BERRY. I think it would be better to first take a vote on the proposition for an annex to the Senate, Mr. President.

Mr. HALE. Very well. After that vote is taken I will move to strike out the House provision regarding the Capitol extension.

Mr. BERRY. I ask for a vote on the question of the adoption of the amendment in regard to the new building for the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON obtained the floor.

Mr. TELLER. What is the question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment on page 81, providing for the erection of an annex for the use of Senators.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to say a word or two on that amend-

ment whenever the Senate is in order, so that anyone can be heard. It is impossible for us to know over here what is going on in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. TELLER. There is so much disorder that we must be in ignorance of what is going on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognized the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON].

Mr. ALLISON. Does the Senator from Colorado want to speak?

Mr. TELLER. I want to make some remarks; but I will wait until the Senator from Iowa gets through.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to say a word or two. The Committee on Appropriations considered this subject with as much care as possible, having in view such enlargement of accommodations and the situation as would accommodate Senators, the Senate, and the business of the country, which all of us here know is growing with great rapidity as respects its relations to the two Houses of Congress and to the Executive Departments.

It is manifest to us all, and has been manifest to many of us for some years, that it is impossible to do well, with convenience and with comfort, the necessary business of the two Houses of Congress. Since I have become a member of this Senate I believe the work of the Senate has grown threefold and more.

When I entered the Senate, during my first term, Mr. President, I was not permitted even to have an assistant to help in the work that I was called upon to do as a member of the Senate. It was some time before I had an opportunity in the work of committees, etc., of which I was a member, to even have a skilled laborer assigned to me to assist in the necessary work that I was called upon to do. That was only thirty years ago.

I have lived to see within my service here every Senator on this floor provided with a clerk at an adequate compensation. I have seen, and we now know, that, in addition to that, every Senator is entitled to a messenger. I am speaking now of those who are not chairmen of committees and who do not have a committee room. A clerk and a messenger are given to the Senators, because we all know that the public business requires that they shall have such aids in order to enable them to transact the business which their constituents require them to do in this Chamber.

I have always been in favor of giving Senators, whether they be chairmen of committees having committee rooms or otherwise, such reasonable aids and instrumentalities as will enable them to do the work of their constituents.

You may go into every committee room in this building, and you find the shelves and every nook and corner occupied by public documents connected with the everyday business of the Senate. There is not a committee room having sufficient space in it for the accommodation of the useful papers necessary to carry on the work of the committee. Now, what is true of the Senate and what is true of its membership discloses that this wing of the Capitol, occupied first in 1859, is wholly inadequate for the business of this great country of ours in 1904.

Therefore, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and partially responsible for the amendments and the measures that it projects into this Chamber for adoption or rejection, I am willing to take my share of the responsibility of everything that is proposed in this bill. We took up this question not only this year, but we had it up two years ago, when the House of Representatives made provision for a building outside of the House itself in order to accommodate its membership and its committees and to enable the Members of the House to perform their public duties by having instrumentalities necessary for that purpose. We undertook then to put on a provision here for the purpose of examining the question whether or not we should not *pari passu* with the House of Representatives have a building on the northeast corner. That fell through. The House of Representatives then wanted to enlarge the Capitol in the center, so that, in addition to securing accommodations in the new building, they would also secure accommodations in the Capitol.

I do not know by what law or by what authority it is, but the Capitol is divided into two parts. One part of it is south of the center of the Dome, and the other north of it. There is a comity, whatever we may say or whatever we may believe, that leads us at least to acknowledge that the Capitol belongs to the two Houses of Congress and not to one House. Therefore, in examining this question we should study it with reference to the present situation and what is necessary to improve that situation.

Senators have said in this debate that there is a desire on the part of the Supreme Court, representing one great branch of our Government, to vacate the Capitol, where they have been since the Capitol was constructed, in order to have a building of their own.

I do not speak for them and I do not know positively what they favor, but if I have a correct understanding with respect to their

view, it is that they desire to remain in the Capitol and not be banished to some other portion of the city for the purpose of having a temple of justice. I think it is to the interest of the public service that they should remain here if they so desire, and if we can make provision whereby they can be suitably accommodated we should do so. Their numbers are but nine, and they do not require very large accommodations, and it is not probable that that number will be largely increased, if it is increased at all. While they have not accommodations suitable to their situation and the work they have to do, yet it is very easy to provide in some way for additional accommodations for them without sending them out of the Capitol.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator understand that the Supreme Court is finding fault with its present quarters?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not.

Mr. HALE. They are content if we let them alone.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. Therefore, with our enlarged work and our enlarged necessities, if we are to retain the Supreme Court where it is, we have, in my judgment, an obligation resting upon us to provide suitable accommodations for the business of the Senate and the House, which is the business of the country.

The House has decided that for its convenience it requires not only what it has now, but space for the uses of the House and its committees plus the building it is now constructing. Whilst I believe that the building proposed by the House, in enlargement of the present Capitol, would in a great measure relieve the stress and strain we have here now, I agree with Senators that when that is done, if it is properly done, there will still be necessity for some rooms for the purposes of the Senate in addition to the Capitol. So I have no trouble and no scruple as respects the two things that are in this amendment—the enlargement of the Capitol and the construction of this building on the northeast corner.

That brings us to the consideration of the question whether we should or should not enlarge the Capitol. I do not lay very great stress on the fact as to what Mr. Walter said or what Mr. Walter did in 1855 regarding the extension of the Capitol. Neither do I lay special stress on the plans which he made in the year 1873-74. I only know that there was even then a pressure, as there was thirty years ago, for an enlargement of the Capitol or for some additional accommodations in other quarters. That necessity finally resulted in the purchase of the Maltby Building, which is wholly inadequate for the purposes intended.

Mr. President, I have changed my mind with respect to the center of the building and the construction proposed there. I had the idea that an enlargement of the building, by putting an addition on the east front, would impair the beauty and harmony of the building, but I have reason to believe that all of the architects, or all of them with very few exceptions, now believe that to make a suitable enlargement of the central building will greatly enhance the beauty of the Capitol and not impair it. That is the impression I gathered from the architects who appeared before the committee with respect to the House provision. And so understanding, the Committee on Appropriations have put in this bill provisions whereby the most eminent architects of our country shall study these questions and see whether or not the Senator from Maine is right in his belief that the beauty of this facade will be marred or impaired by the additional construction proposed. If it can not be done architecturally, it will not be done. If it can be done architecturally, I have no doubt of the importance of doing it. I have no doubt of its utility.

The Senator from Minnesota expressed what I am sure must be the view of most of the Senators, that they would greatly prefer to have accommodations for committee rooms at least in this building if those accommodations can be secured. I know of no Senator who has a comfortable committee room who is willing to exchange it for a place in the Maltby Building. I know of no Senator who would be willing to leave the Capitol, if he has a good committee room here, and place himself and his committee in the distant northeast building which we propose to construct.

Therefore I take it for granted it is important, both as a measure of utility and as a measure necessary to increase the beauty of the Capitol and not to mar it, that we should have an addition, or, rather, a central building, constructed here, not as the Senator from Maine says, to mar its beauty or impair any other portion of the Capitol, but which would add to its beauty.

Mr. HALE. Does not the Senator acknowledge, while he says he thinks the new plans would be as good or better than the old, that the filling up of the space entirely destroys the present facade?

Mr. ALLISON. We have no proposition before us to fill up that space. It is not a question of filling up space that is proposed in the model, if you call it such, of the front of the building.

Mr. HALE. I examined that model with Mr. Woods the other

day. It fills up almost the entire space between the two wings and projects farther out than either wing.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. HALE. Now, I say that can not be done. The Senator thinks it would be a better design than the present—

Mr. ALLISON. I have not said so.

Mr. HALE. I thought so.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly I have said nothing about the design.

Mr. HALE. I thought the Senator said it would improve it. Does not the Senator think it would destroy the present design?

Mr. ALLISON. I have said, and I repeat it, that I have enough confidence and faith in the skill of American architects to believe that they can so modify this plan as not to mar the present structure, but to add to its beauty and harmony as well as its utility.

Mr. HALE. And preserve the present eastern front?

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly. That is the object of it. If that can not be done, then, of course, Congress will not approve the plan. If we have no architects who can put the dome somewhere in the neighborhood of the center of the Capitol instead of limping on one side, and thereby add to its beauty, we had better reject the scheme we have here that Congress shall approve this plan.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I wish to ask a question because I am as uninformed as I am concerned. The Senator from Iowa knows all about the question—

Mr. ALLISON. I do not.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. While some of us know nothing about it. Suppose the new building is built with ample accommodations for the entire present membership of the Senate and all that may hereafter be added to it. Will that not as a practical matter have the result of foreclosing all possible extensions of the Capitol, whatever our future opinions may be about it? I am very willing myself, I think, on a vote to take the opinion of the committee, but it seems as the discussion goes along that that may be a pertinent question.

Mr. ALLISON. It is a pertinent question, assuming as a basis suggestions made by Senators. But as I understand, whatever we may do, if we build a building over there capable of providing for each Senator ample room, and in addition to that spacious committee rooms, if you please, still there would come up after we have passed away, or some of us at least, a desire on the part of Senators who may come here that they should have some committee rooms in the Capitol.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Assuming that to be true, does not the Senator think it would be better and more economical to proceed with these projects one at a time? They are both very large and involve a very considerable sum of money. We have demands for buildings for the accommodation of other branches of the service, and does not the Senator think it is enough for the moment for us to provide for the construction of the independent building for the use of Senators, for folding rooms and the like, a complement to the building in course of erection for the House of Representatives, and then, if need be, after this work is completed, take up consideration of the question of an extension of the Capitol?

Mr. ALLISON. I will answer the Senator as I understand the question. I think it is important that at as early a day as practicable we provide additional accommodations for Senators, and that is just what this amendment proposes, as we have it here.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. We propose now to do what? We propose now to provide a building on the north side of the Senate which shall in a measure be the counterpart of the building which the House of Representatives is now constructing.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. It is not proposed to make that less than sufficient to accommodate the present needs of Senators, is it?

Mr. ALLISON. It is supposed that the commission which is named in the amendment will provide a suitable plan for that purpose.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Ample in every respect?

Mr. ALLISON. Ample for what? Certainly it is not expected that the committee rooms in this wing are to be transferred to the new building in any great number. It is certainly important that every committee we can have in the Capitol should be placed here. Therefore the commission will provide a suitable building. Our other amendment to the House provision looks to a careful study, not so much by ourselves, not by people who have not devoted their lives to the study of architecture, but by the most eminent architects in our country, of the great question of improving and enlarging and beautifying the Capitol of our country, and at the same time providing such room as will enable the country to get the greatest benefit from the services of the great men who are sent from the various States to perform the work of the country.

That will take the architects some time. They will not be able to report a suitable improvement of this building, if they make the study of it they ought to make, until the next Congress convenes. I am not myself prepared to postpone this question five or ten years. I want to see it progressing intelligently, in order that whatever is necessary may be done by the two Houses of Congress to provide such accommodations as they require to transact the public business.

We have built a Library here at an expenditure of \$6,000,000, in round numbers, for the purpose of accommodating the people who come from every part of our country and for the purpose of accommodating the Representatives and Senators with respect to the literature which they need in their work. But we have thus far failed to provide ourselves with proper accommodations to do our work.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] made an observation a few moments ago which impressed me, and that was that a Representative or a Senator requires a lot of books about him in order to investigate questions which daily arise here and which are of the utmost importance. If Senators are to investigate the subjects, they must have about them books. With respect to the deficiency bill which is now under consideration in the Committee on Appropriations, we had a request from the Attorney-General that there should be provided an additional set of the Reports of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the Federal Reporter. He said there were only six sets in the Attorney-General's Office, and that each Assistant Attorney-General ought to be provided with a set in his own room.

If it be true that in the Executive Departments of the Government, with respect to the people who are the arms of the Attorney-General in the Department of Justice, they require these instrumentalities, is it not true also that Senators require them? That is impossible under existing conditions, and therefore I am in favor of enlarging the Capitol; first, because I believe it is necessary for Senators; secondly, because the coordinate branch with us in making the laws of this country have decided that it is important for them as well as for ourselves. Even if we had some doubt as respects the utility and the immediate and pressing necessity of the enlargement of the Capitol, I think we ought to have some regard at least to the comity that should exist between the two Houses.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator said he supposed the committee rooms in this building would be retained as committee rooms; that he was impressed with the remark made by the Senator from Minnesota that it was preferable to have committee rooms in this building.

Mr. ALLISON. So far as practicable.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator realizes, I take it, that each chairman of a committee having suitable rooms in this building will not require an office in the new building?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not want to commit myself on that question.

Mr. BERRY. Very well; if a man wants two offices in two different buildings, that is a proposition which has never been discussed. I put this question to the Senator from Iowa: He says he is in favor of the eastern front extension; that it will furnish a number of rooms necessary for committee rooms for Senators. There are about fifty Senators now who have rooms in this building, and the Senator thinks they would prefer those rooms rather than to go to the northeast corner. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not think that \$4,500,000—and he will not deny that it will reach that sum before we get through with it, but put it at \$3,000,000, if you will, which is the amount specified in the amendment—is an excessive amount to provide for the remaining forty Senators who are in the Maltby Building? Does he think we ought to have a building costing this enormous sum of money for the forty Senators remaining now in the Maltby Building? As I said a while ago, I do not think the Senator will say we will complete the building for \$3,000,000.

Mr. ALLISON. If I can remember all of the questions the Senator puts to me, I will try to answer them.

Mr. BERRY. If the Senator will answer such of them as he can remember, I will be glad.

Mr. ALLISON. I will answer that part of the question which stated as a premise that there are fifty Senators who have suitable accommodations in this building.

Mr. BERRY. I said who have rooms here.

Mr. ALLISON. Oh; rooms are a different thing. I want to provide, if I can, suitable rooms for Senators.

Mr. HALE. Has the Senator any doubt that there are at least a dozen, and I think more, rooms now here under the present arrangement which are occupied as committee rooms, in the terraces and those places, that are not suitable, and the occupants of which would be very much improved in accommodations if they had rooms in the new building?

Mr. ALLISON. I think probably they would be improved. The rooms in the new building, I think, would be an improvement on the rooms in the terrace.

Mr. HALE. I know myself there are here a dozen rooms occupied as committee rooms the occupants of which would be furnished improved accommodations in the new building. So the object of this building is not only to take care of men who have not committee rooms here, but of those who have not good committee rooms here. That is the proposition of the committee.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that perfectly. The Senator has emphasized what I am trying to say when I say that we need all the committee rooms we can have here that are suitable, and in addition to that I feel quite sure we will require a great amount of additional room in the new building.

I wish to say a word about the committee rooms in the Capitol. They are not suitable committee rooms, with a very few exceptions. There are but few rooms that are suited to the work that has to be done. The Senator from Arkansas saw proper to suggest that I would not like to change to any new building that was constructed or even to the central part of this building, if improved, the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman at this time. I would not.

Mr. BERRY. I did not say that. The Senator will pardon me. I said that he had said that those who had committee rooms here would not want to move.

Mr. ALLISON. I would not, but at the same time the room of the Committee on Appropriations lacks just what the Senator from Texas in his observations said was most needed—that is, it practically lacks having a private room where study can go on, where books and reports can be provided suitably and examined. The committee room is lumbered up, and it is from necessity almost a public room.

Mr. President, with great deference to other Senators, especially to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS], who has charge of legislation affecting public buildings and grounds in this city and elsewhere, in my opinion we will not provide a temple of justice within the next few years for the Supreme Court. I see no movement looking to that end. It will not come. They do not want to go, and as long as they prefer to stay here that pressure will not be upon us.

I wish to say another thing before I sit down, and that is with respect to these two provisions. I believe our first duty or our equal duty is to provide accommodations for Senators and Members of the House which will be equal at least to the accommodations afforded the Executive Departments of this Government. I do not know of the head of an Executive Department, except perhaps one or two, who is not amply provided with accommodations, and with better accommodations for the transaction of the public business than any Senator in the Capitol.

The Senator from Arkansas says that these two provisions involve four and a half million dollars. This is limited to \$2,225,000. I should have been willing to have made the limit less. The ground which is ample and which is probably necessary in many ways, outside of the building itself, will not cost to exceed \$750,000; so the outside cost of the building will be \$3,000,000.

The cost of the central building is limited to two and a half million dollars, and not \$3,000,000, in the bill. If the views expressed by the Senator from Maine and others are to prevail, then the central building will be much smaller than the building proposed to project away out in the center of the Capitol. If it is a much smaller building, it will cost much less money. So we can accommodate suitably the committee rooms in this building, the House of Representatives, and the Supreme Court, and also take care of the number of Senators in the new building who may require care.

Mr. President, I do not share the view of either Senator who has spoken against this central building as respects taking only one or the other. I am for both of them and for starting both upon their pathway, one more rapidly than the other, but both, in order that we may provide here suitable accommodations for ourselves and for those who come after us.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the primary purpose of this amendment—

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me to ask the Senator from Iowa a question?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. It is a question merely for information. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Iowa how many Senators will be accommodated in this building after the front is extended as proposed?

Mr. ALLISON. That depends entirely, of course, upon the plan which we have provided shall be most carefully studied. It may accommodate twenty-five; it may accommodate thirty-three; it may accommodate a less number. I know if it can accommodate even ten and will add to the beauty and harmony of this great structure, it ought to be entered upon, in view of all the circumstances surrounding the situation.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I asked how many would be accommodated all told, taking those who are accommodated now and those to be provided for by the addition.

Mr. ALLISON. In the two buildings?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Yes, approximately.

Mr. ALLISON. There are ninety Senators now, and I think there are forty-eight or forty-nine committees, so that Senators not having committees would be obliged to get suitable quarters for their work, which they must do and ought to do and which they would like to do, in the neighborhood of the Capitol.

So I should think there would be required some forty rooms in the building on the other side for committees, in addition to, say, twenty or twenty-five here, as we could find room. I think it is very important that we should have as many committee rooms as possible in this building.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I simply wanted to find out how many would have to be provided for in the new building.

Mr. ALLISON. That is a conjecture—an estimate.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, as I was proceeding to say, the primary purpose of the Senate committee amendment is to provide committee rooms or office rooms for Senators, or both. Now, there are two projects to meet that demand. One is to do what the Senate committee proposes to do—to construct a building. The other is to meet that demand by increasing the Capitol by the extension of the east front. If anybody has for a moment considered and given any attention to the last proposition, he must admit that it does not solve the difficulty. There will be some room, but of the whole number that anyone has claimed half must be surrendered to the House, and the other half will be practically dark rooms.

Mr. ALLISON. The two together will accommodate them.

Mr. TELLER. The two together, the Senator says, will accommodate them. But, Mr. President, we have no expectation that the House is going to divide that space with us. Years and years ago the line was drawn between the House and the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. I refer to our outside building and the number who will be accommodated here.

Mr. TELLER. I expect we will erect the outside building big enough to accommodate the Senate. How big that will be I do not know. That will be determined. But I do know, and so does the Senator from Iowa, and every other man on the committee and off the committee ought to know, that if you extend the east front you still leave the problem unsolved as to how you are going to take care of your membership. You leave a great number of Senators who are not treated as other Senators are treated even with the extension as proposed.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to say merely a word or two about the proposed extension. The Senator from Iowa says he has changed his mind—that he has heard some architect. I myself heard the architect before the committee the other day. There were six or eight of them who appeared before the committee, and there was not a single man of them who knew what Walter's plan was. Finally they said they did not believe that it was a fixed and determined plan of Walter's. Some of them said they could devise a scheme that would beautify the front.

Oh, Mr. President, I suppose you could find a carpenter out here who would agree to do that. I do not care what an architect says about this front, the public opinion and the world's opinion for fifty years has declared that it does not need any tinkering by anybody, whether he is an architect or anything else. There is not a public building on the face of the earth that has had more laudations of its beauty than the very building in which we are now, and when some man who labels himself as an architect because, perhaps, he has studied the question of drawing angles and corners comes here and tells me that he can beautify it and improve it I want first to see his work.

Mr. President, no great architect who has ever looked at this building has ever suggested any improvement on it by that process, by extending the front. Common sense ought to show every man that it puts the whole Capitol building out of its order and that the symmetry is destroyed.

If it had not been for the pressure for room you would not have heard of any demand for the extension of the east front of the Capitol. I have heard it here for years, first for the east front, and when public opinion would not approve of that, then it was for the west part of the building. Then, as I said the other day, we devised the crypt, which is not a fit place for anybody to stay in except the engineer who takes care of the engines down there, or something of that sort.

Mr. SPOONER. There are eleven Senators down there.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from Wisconsin says there are eleven Senators down there. Mr. President, I spent two years there. I spent two years in the Maltby Building. When I came here I spent two years looking around for a place, and finally I hired a room down on F street to transact my business in. I came from a law office in a small country town. I never have

had since I have been here accommodations which I would have regarded for a moment as suitable for a law office in a town of 3,500 or 4,000 people. I surrounded myself with books, when books cost four or five times what books cost to-day, and in the library in which I profess to have an interest there are several thousand law books, and none too much for the law office to which I formerly belonged and of which I am not now a member.

I am like the Senator from Texas. I can not do business without books. I heard a Senator the other day talking about a brilliant young man, who had studied law and who came to the bar. He did not seem to give much attention to books, and one of his brothers said to him, "Why, you ought to give more attention to the law books and study the law." "Oh," he said, "I looked over them and found that they said the law was as I thought it was, and I do not think I need go any further."

Mr. SPOONER. He did not go much further, did he?

Mr. TELLER. I guess he did not go much further, either. Mr. President, I am not one of those. I have my ideas of what the law is. I am like the Senator from Texas; I want to fortify myself and find out whether I am right or not. I find, occasionally, that the Supreme Court of the United States has said one thing is the law one day and subsequently it modified or revoked it. I want to keep in touch with those things. I think every Senator ought to have a set of the Reports of the Supreme Court of the United States in his office, where he can have access to them. Two-thirds of the Senate are lawyers, and always will be, probably, and it is upon the lawyers of the Senate we depend in law questions.

Mr. President, I am going to vote with the Senator from Maine, who moves to strike out all about the east front. I do not agree with the Senator from Connecticut that we commit ourselves to it; but I believe when you have a special building built you will cease to hear any demand from anybody for the extension of the east front. But, anyway, the proposition as it came from the committee is in a better shape than when it came from the House. What was that? That immediately we are to go to work and tear down the east front.

There is not a man living who knows what the architect would bring out of it. Now, I do not intend to be silent when a proposition is made that any man living shall be authorized to tear down that front and substitute something for it except as Congress directs him to do it. I know the people of the United States will hold us responsible if we allow some one calling himself an architect or calling himself what he pleases to make a botch of that work, as I believe would be the case if they are allowed to go on unrestricted and unrestrained and undirected.

I have taken great pride in this Capitol. I came here at an early day, long before I ever expected that I would become a member of this body or of any other connected with it. I stood around the building and looked at it. I was not an architect, but I do not need to be an architect to know whether the lines of a building are drawn with reference to symmetry and taste and beauty. That is a thing that is given to you by the Almighty, and you do not get it out of books. There never was an architect in the world who was not, if a great architect, like a poet, born. The men who built the great buildings of the world were great teachers of architectural beauty, and there are now in the world lines of architecture or systems of buildings that the world recognizes as a correct idea and a correct system.

This extension of the Capitol will find no parallel on the face of the globe. In all the great buildings that have been built in the history of the world there has been nothing like what is now proposed. It can not be classed with any order of architecture or class of buildings that mankind ever looked on before. Yet we are to have it, first, in the interest of economy, and then in the interest of a few traveling architects who think they would be able to do something to immortalize themselves. Mr. President, I believe they would—but not in the way they hope to do it—if they were allowed to have their way and perform the work they propose, to extend the building out 200 feet.

Mr. President, undoubtedly that part of the building could be taken down and a new one put up that would not greatly destroy the harmony of the building, but it would not be big enough to accommodate any considerable number of Senators. On the contrary, if you should do what ought to be done, if at all it is to be touched, you would have to keep close in the lines of the original building. I do not believe there is a first-class architect in the world who would tell you that he can improve the building. At all events, there has been no public demand that we should attempt to do that thing.

As I said the other day in committee, I repeat, if you allow profane hands to be put upon the building and it turns out not to be symmetrical and beautiful, and a building that does not receive the plaudits of the world, as this has done, you will hear a complaint from one end of the land to the other, and not from the masses, but from the best minds and best people of the land.

Mr. President, I want to address myself for a moment or two to the expense of this building. I know, of course, we have different ideas about the matter.

Like the Senator from Texas, I would not spend a dollar of the public money that was not properly expended; but I know a great nation like this is not bound down by the economy that individuals are bound down by. The buildings that we build for the nation should not be such as a man builds for himself either for business or for residence. It should be a building that will accommodate the necessities of the Government. It should be a building built, as the Senator from Texas says, strong, splendid, useful; and it should be built not for this year or the next or the next hundred years, but it should stand like the old buildings of Rome, for two thousand years.

Mr. President, if I had been a member of the Senate seventy-odd years ago I do not suppose I would have thought of expending \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 upon a house for Senators, but when I was born the population of this country was less than 12,000,000. To-day it is 80,000,000 and more. Senators sitting here will yet live to see that population doubled, and with the doubling population you will double the wealth and you will double the necessities of the Government for places of business here. You may not get more Senators than the Senator from Texas says you are going to get. It may be four and it may be eight more—

Mr. STEWART. How about Alaska?

Mr. TELLER. But, Mr. President, I believe there are Senators sitting here who will see more than eight additional Senators coming into this Chamber. Fourteen Senators have come into it from seven new States since I took my seat in the Senate. I can not say what the future will be as to Alaska, as the Senator from Nevada suggested, but I believe that eventually there will be a population there that will justify the admission of a State from Alaska. If we maintain our relations with Porto Rico, some day we are either to put Porto Rico by herself or we are bound to take her in as a State. Possibly, and it has been one of my hopes and one of my dreams, at some time this great country north of us, peopled with people like ourselves, of the same race and the same aspirations, may say to us, "Let us come in under your flag." They could do it, Mr. President, without loss of dignity. They could do it without loss of prestige. They could do it, I believe, to great advantage for us and for them. Suppose they asked us to accept them as a part of this great Republic, dividing them up into States, I should like to see this Capitol in such a shape that it could take them in when they came.

I do not believe in economizing to such an extent that we shall appear mean. I think since I have been in the Senate I voted not less than four or five times against a proposition to build a library building in this city. Why? Because no proposition came to us from the other body that was of a proper character. Finally, after rejecting bill after bill, we passed a law to build the present grand and magnificent Library building to which everybody who comes to Washington holds up his hands in admiration. The first Librarian of that building said to me, "I have seen every great library of the world. There are bigger buildings, but there is no such library building in its appointment, in its fitness, in its beauty, anywhere else under the sun."

Thousands and tens of thousands of people come here from our own land and look upon that building with pride and with pleasure. I want to see the public buildings in this great capital of ours built so that when the people come here they will look up to them with reverence and be delighted.

Mr. President, if the building costs \$3,000,000 or \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000, we are able to build it and ought to build it.

I have a committee room. I could get from my committee room in the proposed building almost as quickly as from the one in the Capitol. I have no privacy in it. It is a place where I must open the door for any man who comes from my State or any other on public business, or who desires a place to write or to read or to consult me or anybody else.

I say every Senator ought to have two rooms. Every Senator ought to have two rooms, one of them large enough to contain his library. I do not know whether the Government of the United States will supply each Senator with a library. I have for many years supplied myself with such books as I felt I ought to have. I can not put them in my committee room, and I am compelled to put them in my rooms at the hotel. I pack them up every time I go away and send them to some storehouse, and unpack them again when I come back. I say no Senator can do his duty here without more or less books of reference, without books of authority on the great questions that come before us day by day.

Mr. President, it is said one could not get from the building over there into the Senate in time to answer to a roll call. In my judgment, that would be one of the advantages in having Senators there. I say it is the duty of a Senator not to be in his committee room during the hours when the Senate is in session. It

is his duty to be here. I do not care what is up or what is being considered, it is the duty of a Senator to attend the sessions of the Senate and not be in his committee room. Early in the morning or after adjournment there is time enough for us to do our work in committees.

Mr. President, I would be very glad to see adopted, as I said, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine, striking out all about the east front; but if that is not done I do not believe, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] says, that we are committed to that scheme. We have appointed a commission. The Senators we have selected I am sure can not be objectionable to anybody, and I believe I can say, although in their presence, that they are men who are not going to allow any architects or anyone else to cajole them into doing a thing that ought not to be done.

The same may be said of Members of the House of Representatives who have been included in this provision after consultation with Members of that body.

Mr. President, when they have got right-thinking architects before them—and the commission are to select the architects—I believe we shall get a report from that commission that under no circumstances do they want or do we want to touch the east front of the Capitol.

I do not expect, Mr. President, that I shall ever have the advantage of this new building. My term of office will undoubtedly have expired before it is sufficiently completed to be suitable for occupation; but there will be others to occupy it.

I believe it is the duty of the Senate to provide what we ought to have provided years ago. As I heard a Senator say to-day, the House for twenty years knew that they ought to do just what they have done, but they were afraid of public criticism; and yet when they did it, Mr. President, there was not a suggestion from any place in the country that there had been any lack of economy or lack of judgment in so providing for their accommodation in the future.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I understand that there are not thirty of the ninety Senators who are properly provided for so far as their rooms are concerned. In other words, there are over sixty of the Senators not properly accommodated.

Mr. HALE. Not over twenty-five Senators are properly provided for.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senator from Maine suggests that there are not over twenty-five who are properly provided for.

Mr. TELLER. I think the last statement is more nearly correct than the first.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I am very heartily in favor of providing the most ample accommodations for Senators, upon whom a vast amount of work devolves and great responsibility rests. I do not think there is any difference of opinion among Senators upon that point. The only question which arose in my mind was whether it was advisable to carry forward both of these contemplated projects at the same time. The committee proposes by its amendment to go forward with the purchase of a site and the construction of a separate building for the use of Senators which shall be the complement of the building in course of construction for the House of Representatives.

It will take some years to complete it. It seems to me that it should be adequate for the reasonable present necessities of those Senators who are very inadequately provided for, and at a later date the work of extending the Capitol might be entered upon if that course, upon the most mature consideration, should be thought advisable.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not care to continue this discussion further. I think the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] has substantially said what I was about to touch upon, so I need not continue.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President—

Mr. STEWART. I should like to make a single remark.

Mr. CULLOM. I should like to be recognized for a moment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CULLOM. There is a good deal of necessity for an executive session this evening. There are many nominations that have not been disposed of for some days, and in addition to that there is a ratification of a treaty to be considered, which I am anxious to have attended to as soon as possible. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations whether he will not yield, that I may move an executive session?

Mr. ALLISON. I had hoped that we should be able to finish the sundry civil appropriation bill this evening, but I am willing, under the circumstances, to yield to the Senator from Illinois, as I am sure we can not finish the bill to-night.

Mr. McLAURIN. Will the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. STEWART. I want to say just a few words on the matter

which has been pending, but I will make my remarks in the morning.

G. W. HARDY AND JOSEPH LARD.

Mr. MC LAURIN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5245) to indemnify G. W. Hardy and Joseph Lard, of Scott County, Miss., for homestead land by granting other lands in lieu thereof. It will take only a minute. A similar bill passed the Senate in the last Congress.

Mr. CULLOM. I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has in part promised to yield to the Senator from Mississippi, so I will yield to him; but I give notice that I will not yield to any other Senator.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to grant to G. W. Hardy and Joseph Lard, Scott County, Miss., each 80 acres of the unreserved public land of the United States in the State of Mississippi, such as they shall, respectively, select and notify to the Secretary of the Interior, in subdivisions not less than 40 acres, in lieu of land held by them but awarded by the General Land Office to the Alabama and Vicksburg Railroad Company, and that such selection shall not be made of any land lawfully held by any other person at the time of such selection as a homestead entry, or to which any other person shall have at such time any lawful claim.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eighteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 20, 1904, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 12, 1904.

POSTMASTER.

ILLINOIS.

Frank E. Davis to be postmaster at Arlington Heights, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 19, 1904.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

James R. Parsons, jr., of New York, to be consul-general of the United States at Mexico, Mexico.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Albert D. Chamberlin, of Wyoming, to be register of the land office at Douglas, Wyo.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. James E. Abbott, Twelfth Cavalry, April 2, 1904.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Henry E. Robinson, Fourth Infantry, April 7, 1904.

To be majors.

Capt. Wilds P. Richardson, Eighth Infantry, April 7, 1904.

Capt. Charles H. Barth, Twelfth Infantry, April 7, 1904.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Robert W. Barnett, Thirteenth Infantry, April 7, 1904.

First Lieut. Pearl M. Shaffer, Thirteenth Infantry, April 7, 1904.

First Lieut. Laurence A. Curtis, Twenty-second Infantry, April 7, 1904.

First Lieut. David B. Mulliken, Twenty-ninth Infantry, April 7, 1904.

First Lieut. Peyton G. Clark, Thirteenth Infantry, April 8, 1904.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Clyde B. Crusan, Fourth Infantry, April 5, 1904.

PROMOTION IN THE MARINE CORPS.

First Lieut. Percy F. Archer, of the United States Marine Corps, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps, with the rank of captain, from the 31st day of March, 1904.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

To be assistant surgeon.

Harry F. Hull, a citizen of Colorado.

George L. Wickes, a citizen of New York.

William J. Zalesky, a citizen of Iowa.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Pay Inspector William W. Galt, United States Navy, an additional number in his grade, to be a pay director in the Navy from the 27th day of December, 1903.

Lieut. William C. Herbert to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1904.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Orin G. Murfin to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 11th day of October, 1903.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Clarence S. Kempff to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1904.

Ensign Charles W. Forman to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 28th day of January, 1904.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward Woods to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1904.

Ensigns Allen Buchanan and Frederick J. Horne, jr., to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 28th day of January, 1904.

Lieut. Hilary P. Jones, jr., to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 15th day of March, 1904.

Lieut. William R. Shoemaker to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 18th day of March, 1904.

Assistant Civil Engineer James V. Rockwell to be a civil engineer in the Navy from the 6th day of March, 1904.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Asst. Engineer Henry K. Spencer to be a chief engineer, with the rank of first lieutenant, in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Henry T. Powell to be a first assistant engineer, with the rank of second lieutenant, in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Joseph E. Sheedy, of Massachusetts, to be a second assistant engineer, with the rank of third lieutenant, in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Walter W. King, of Michigan, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 18, 1904.

Asst. Surg. Thomas F. Richardson, of Louisiana, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 11, 1904.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Joshua L. Chamberlain, of Maine, to be surveyor of customs in the district of Portland and Falmouth, in the State of Maine.

DISTRICT JUDGES.

William H. Hunt, of Montana, to be United States district judge for the district of Montana.

James B. Holland, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

CIRCUIT JUDGE.

A. N. Kepoikai, of Hawaii, to be judge of the circuit court of the second circuit of the Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Noah B. K. Pettingill, of Porto Rico, to be United States attorney for the district of Porto Rico.

William Wirt Howe, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana.

MARSHAL.

William R. Compton, of New York, to be United States marshal for the western district of New York.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Hattie N. Tabb to be postmaster at Thomasville, in the county of Clark and State of Alabama.

COLORADO.

Edgar E. Beckett to be postmaster at Lafayette, in the county of Boulder and State of Colorado.

Charles G. Pickett to be postmaster at Wray, in the county of Yuma and State of Colorado.

CONNECTICUT.

George P. Edwards to be postmaster at Collinsville, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

IDAHO.

John M. Butler to be postmaster at Shoshone, in the county of Lincoln and State of Idaho.

IOWA.

S. M. Brinton to be postmaster at Brighton, in the county of Washington and State of Iowa.

Evan B. Dowell to be postmaster at Indianola, in the county of Warren and State of Iowa.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William H. Pierce to be postmaster at Winchendon, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Martin E. Stockbridge to be postmaster at Dalton, in the county of Berkshire and State of Massachusetts.

Willis A. Taft to be postmaster at Oxford, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

MINNESOTA.

Charles S. Harden to be postmaster at Le Roy, in the county of Mower and State of Minnesota.

MISSOURI.

George W. Goins to be postmaster at Breckenridge, in the county of Caldwell and State of Missouri.

C. M. Harrison to be postmaster at Gallatin, in the county of Daviess and State of Missouri.

NEW YORK.

Charles G. Bacon to be postmaster at Northville, in the county of Fulton and State of New York.

Robert J. Buck to be postmaster at Watertown, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

Rufus Daggett to be postmaster at Utica, in the county of Oneida and State of New York.

Charles L. Dix to be postmaster at Forestville, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York.

George H. Emens to be postmaster at Clifton, in the county of Monroe and State of New York.

James A. Johnston to be postmaster at Marlboro, in the county of Ulster and State of New York.

Frank S. Kenyon to be postmaster at Adams, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

William McCarthy to be postmaster at Mineola, in the county of Nassau and State of New York.

OHIO.

William C. Hughes to be postmaster at New Straitsville, in the county of Perry and State of Ohio.

John McGuff to be postmaster at Creston, in the county of Wayne and State of Ohio.

Samuel F. Smith to be postmaster at Pomeroy, in the county of Meigs and State of Ohio.

Robert H. Wiley to be postmaster at Flushing, in the county of Belmont and State of Ohio.

OKLAHOMA.

Emily McKinley to be postmaster at Kingfisher, in the county of Kingfisher and Territory of Oklahoma.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Martin B. Allen to be postmaster at Honesdale, in the county of Wayne and State of Pennsylvania.

John H. Brubaker to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania.

William H. Fulton to be postmaster at Stewartstown, in the county of York and State of Pennsylvania.

Alvin A. Hazlett to be postmaster at Aspinwall, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania.

David D. Park to be postmaster at Lapark, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Charles J. Mulkey to be postmaster at Westminster, in the county of Oconee and State of South Carolina.

UTAH.

Stephen W. Ross to be postmaster at Lehi, late Lehi City, in the county of Utah and State of Utah.

VIRGINIA.

Beverly A. Davis to be postmaster at Rockymount, in the county of Franklin and State of Virginia.

WASHINGTON.

Ulysses E. Foster to be postmaster at Sedro-Woolley, in the county of Skagit and State of Washington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, April 19, 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.

STATEHOOD FOR THE TERRITORIES.

MR. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution of the House numbered 351, have had the same under consideration, and ask leave to report in lieu thereof the following:

"Resolved, That immediately after the adoption of this resolution the bill (H. R. 14749) entitled 'A bill to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States,' 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 4:30 o'clock p. m., at which hour, or earlier if said general debate shall cease earlier, a vote shall at once be taken upon the following amendments to said bill, which shall be considered as pending—that is to say, on page 5, in line 2, after the word 'marriages,' and on page 22, in line 25, before the word 'are,' insert in each case the words 'and the sale, barter, or giving of intoxicating liquors to Indians,' so that the closing sentence of the paragraph in each case as amended shall read: 'and that polygamous or plural marriages and the sale, barter, or giving of intoxicating liquors to Indians are forever prohibited'—and on the bill to its final passage, without intervening motion or appeal."

MR. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, this rule relates to the consideration of the bill proposing to admit to statehood Oklahoma and the Indian Territory as one State and Arizona and New Mexico as another State. The provision in the rule is for debate until half past 4 o'clock this evening, at which time a vote is to be taken on the bill and upon one amendment that is suggested in the rule and which relates to the sale of liquor to Indians. I have no disposition to occupy the time of the House. How much time does the gentleman from Mississippi want?

MR. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The usual time under the rule.

MR. DALZELL. I did not ask the previous question; I forgot that. I will yield to the gentleman such time as he wants.

MR. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Very well.

MR. DALZELL. Twenty minutes?

MR. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

MR. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi twenty minutes and reserve the balance of my time.

MR. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the attention of the country has been sufficiently called to the rapid fire, drastic legislation lately proceeding from the Committee on Rules.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been so long the mouth-piece of the Committee on Rules for purposes of this sort that his former urbane countenance has assumed here of late a Draconian expression.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps no matter of equal importance permanently and remotely to the American people has been pushed through in a manner like this. In order that the House may appreciate the importance ultimately and with regard to the future history of the country of the legislation now proposed, I wish to call its attention to some facts, but before that I want to say that in my opinion there is not an idea in the mind of gentlemen upon that side of the Chamber that this bill will become a law at this session of Congress; probably not an idea that it ever will become law. It is a pretext to satisfy the popular demand for statehood for Oklahoma and the Indian Territory and New Mexico and Arizona; a mere pretext, "apples to the eye and ashes to the taste." It is, in my opinion, purposely presented here in such a form as that it was known beforehand that it could not receive the approbation and votes of this side of the Chamber and will receive the votes of that side of the Chamber only for the purpose of holding up this pretext to the country.

What is proposed to be done here? Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that Montana has 145,310 square miles; Texas, 262,290 square miles; California, 156,172 square miles; Nevada, 109,740 square miles; New Mexico, 122,460 square miles; Arizona, 112,920 square miles, making for Arizona and New Mexico put together an area of 235,330 square miles, more than any State in the Union except Texas. Now, I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that these States mentioned, if these two are admitted as one State, will contain the enormous area of 908,823 square miles, and that Montana, Texas, California, Nevada, and the new State of Arizona, composed of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona, will for all time be limited in representation in the Senate of the United States to ten Senators, whereas the North Atlantic States, having all put together only 162,103 square miles; the South Atlantic States, having all put together only 268,620 square miles, making the