

Also, paper to accompany bill for the relief of estate of Green Guest, of Dekalb County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Levi Jones, of Marshall County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

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

Also, petition of John H. Wisdom, asking reference of post-office claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Elizabeth Blakemore, of Cherokee County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CASSEL: Petition of Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Strasburg, Pa., for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Petition of J. W. Lawrence et al., of Keene Hill Grange, favoring any law favorable to parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COCKRAN of New York: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Patrick C. Casper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Julia Davis, sister of William Galvin, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Edward Donnelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: Petition of Marshall Council, No. 232, United Commercial Weavers, favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Red River Lodge, No. 359, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Gainesville, Tex., favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Garfield Division, No. 219, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Marshall, Tex., favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Dr. James Saunders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William H. Leonard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Solomon Spradling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 17505—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition for restriction of immigration, from Washington Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Windber, Pa.—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Marine Review, favoring the shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Forest City Creamery Company, of Rockford, Ill., favoring the Quarles-Cooper bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Steel Roll Manufacturing Company, of Chicago, favoring increase of power of Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Railway Employees' Twentieth Century Club, of Illinois, favoring legislation compelling use of safety appliances and block system by railways—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of Reeves & Co., of Columbus, Ind., favoring bill H. R. 16560—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HITCHCOCK: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth Davis, wife of William R. Davis, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of G. W. Perkins, of Chicago, against a reduction of tariff on tobacco from the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of R. L. Campbell et al., favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLUTTZ: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of W. L. Bryan, of Boone, N. C.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KYLE: Petition of J. R. Wilson et al., favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the International Cigar Makers' Union, of Chicago, against a reduction of tariff on tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petition of citizens of Indian Territory, favoring removal of restrictions on land sales in Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NEVIN: Petition of Mrs. T. B. Flower et al., favor-

ing the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. L. B. Flower et al., against intoxicating liquor selling in Oklahoma and Arizona under any form of Government—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of the common council of Milwaukee, against closing Fairweather opening of breakwater—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the Cigar Makers' International Union, against a reduction of tariff on tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James W. Still—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: Paper to accompany bill for the relief of Maggie M. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of G. W. Perkins, of Chicago, against a reduction of tariff on tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 23, 1905.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved.

DISTRICT MUNICIPAL BUILDING.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, requesting that the limit of cost for the construction of the municipal building for the District of Columbia, authorized by section 6 of the public building act, approved June 6, 1902, be increased from \$2,000,000 to \$2,500,000; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. LODGE presented the credentials of WINTHROP MURRAY CRANE, chosen by the legislature of the State of Massachusetts a Senator from that State to fill the vacancy in the term ending March 3, 1907, caused by the death of George Frisbie Hoar; which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that Senator Crane, who is now present, may be sworn in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will present himself at the desk and the Chair will administer the required oath.

Mr. CRANE was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. LODGE, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the credentials of ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE, chosen by the legislature of the State of Indiana a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1905; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. PERKINS presented the credentials of Frank P. Flint, chosen by the legislature of the State of California a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1905; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. CRANE presented the credentials of HENRY CABOT LODGE, chosen by the legislature of the State of Massachusetts a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1905; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented the credentials of PORTER J. McCUMBER, chosen by the legislature of the State of North Dakota a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1905; which were read and ordered to be filed.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on House bill 14623, the Philippine government bill, may be withdrawn and that it may be returned to the conferees. There is a correction necessary to be made in the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the conference report on the Philippine bill may be taken from the Calendar and returned to the conferees on the part of the Senate. The Chair hears no objection, and that order is made.

Mr. LODGE subsequently said: A conference has to be held on the bill (H. R. 14623) to amend an act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," and to amend an act approved March 8, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," and to amend an act approved March 2, 1903, entitled "An act to establish a standard of value and to provide for a coinage system in the Philippine Islands," and to provide for the more efficient administration of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes. One of the conferees on the part of the Senate on the original conference, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] is absent from town, and I do not know how soon he will return. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair may appoint a third conferee on the part of the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the absence of the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the Chair will appoint the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A remonstrance from the legislature of New Mexico against the statehood bill has been received. It was heretofore received in the shape of a telegram and it has already been read and printed in the RECORD. Therefore, nothing further is probably necessary to be done in relation to it.

Mr. KEAN. Let it lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The memorial will lie on the table.

Mr. ANKENY presented a petition of the legislative and finance committee of the Alaska Club, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to permit wood pulp and other manufactured products of timber to be exported from the Territory of Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. PROCTOR presented the memorial of Sarah J. Pike and sundry other citizens of Arlington, Vt., remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticanteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of St. Albans Division, No. 24, Order of Railway Conductors, of St. Albans, Vt., and a petition of Bellows Falls Division, No. 106, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Windsor, Vt., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Alderson, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Druggists' Association of Wheeling, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the Revised Statutes relating to patents on medicinal preparations; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented the petition of W. K. Cummings, of Wellsburg, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of Indians against the liquor traffic in the new States to be formed; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying that an investigation be made into the conditions existing in the Kongo Free State; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry army nurses of Upper Jay, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of army nurses; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of sundry pharmacists of Silver Springs, New York City, Yonkers, and White Plains, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the patent laws relating to medicinal preparations; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented petitions of the Women's Health Protective Association of New York City, of the New York Legislative League of New York City, and of the Woman's Republican Club of New York City, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the National Tea Association of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the compensation of United States tea examiners; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Hornersville, Howard, Rochester, and Vermillion, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of Local Divisions Nos. 311, 15, and 105, of Binghamton, Buffalo, and New York City, all of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; of Local Lodges Nos. 623, 287, and 252, of Newburg, Fishkill on the Hudson, and Norwich, all of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; of Local Divisions Nos. 56, 9, and 391, of Albany, Elmira, and Northport, all of the Order of Railway Conductors, in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Willsboro, Reed Corners, Saratoga County, and Falconer; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Friends' Church of Poplar Ridge, and of M. A. Du Mass, of Hannibal, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticanteen law; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GAMBLE presented the petition of M. A. Cawood and sundry other citizens of Ames, S. Dak., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Indian Territory when admitted to statehood; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Union of Washington D. C., praying for the establishment of a special court for juveniles in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation regulating employment of child labor, and also providing compulsory education in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEWART presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Dallas, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Indian Territory when admitted to statehood; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hornersville, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Synod of West Virginia of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, praying for continued prohibition in the Indian Territory according to the treaty pledges with the Five Civilized Tribes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEAN presented the memorials of Thomas H. Leonard, of Atlantic Highlands; Parker R. Bradley, of Orange; F. B. Lyon, of Trenton; C. H. Nevins, of East Orange; O. M. West, of Blairstown; J. L. Rice, of Bridgeton; D. H. Cranford, of Chatham; G. Allen Canfield, of East Orange; Frank Benjamin, of East Orange; H. W. Kice, of Wharton; William Maddil and Mrs. H. J. Conover, of Elmer; Frank M. Jeffery, of East Orange; Thomas Mathews and James Mathews, of Lumberton; William V. Jube, of East Orange, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Vineland and Cape May City, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticanteen law; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Eagle Brewing Company, of Jersey City, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Estabrook Steel Pen Manufacturing Company, of Camden, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of owners of trade-marks; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented petitions of Samuel Sykes, of Paterson; of Charles Kuehne, of Jersey City, and of the Retail Druggists' Association of Paterson, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend sections 4886 and 4887 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents on medicinal preparations; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of Palisade Lodge, No. 597, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Jersey City, N. J., pray-

ing for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

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

He also presented the petition of William P. Finney and 149 other citizens of Moorestown, N. J., and a petition of the Synod of New Jersey of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, praying for continued prohibition in the Indian Territory; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KITTREDGE presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Lead, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. TELLER presented a memorial of Local Union No. 306, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Pueblo, Colo., remonstrating against any reduction of the tariff on tobacco and cigars imported from the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade of Denver, Colo., remonstrating against any reduction of the tariff on raw or refined sugars imported from any country; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hornellsville, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to require certain places of business to be closed on Sunday in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Canon City; of the North Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Denver, and of the Star Sunday School, of Mesa County, all in the State of Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation for continued prohibition of the liquor traffic in the Indian Territory; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Real Estate Exchange of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the W. E. McGraw Lodge, No. 680, of Denver; of Snowy Range Lodge, No. 30, of Denver, and of Colorado City Lodge, No. 406, of Colorado City, all of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; of Local Division No. 186, of Denver, and of Seven Castles Division, No. 515, of Basalt, all of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; of Local Division No. 44, of Denver, and of Gold Coin Division, No. 375, of Florence, all of the Order of Railway Conductors; of Santa Fe Lodge, No. 244, of Pueblo, and of Pikes Peak Lodge, No. 215, of Colorado City, all of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, in the State of Colorado, praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a petition of the Pharmaceutical Association of Davenport, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the patent laws of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Exchange of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for untaxed denatured alcohol for industrial purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of J. J. Fast and sundry other citizens of Council Bluffs; of M. L. Ball and sundry other citizens of Winthrop, and of D. H. Philpott and sundry other citizens of Creston, all in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of Nancy M. Hill, department president of Army Nurses' Association of Iowa, of Dubuque, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of army nurses; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of W. H. Benson and 50 other citizens of Murray, Iowa; of B. F. Stockwell and 70 other citizens of Rowan, Iowa, and of the Presbyterian Synod of Iowa, praying for continued prohibition in the Indian Territory, according to the recent treaty pledges to the Five Civilized Tribes; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Druggists' Association of Portsmouth, N. H., and a petition of the Retail Druggists' Association of Chicago, Ill., praying for the adoption

of an amendment to sections 4886 and 4887 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents on medicinal preparations; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of the Douglas County Retail Druggists' Association, of Lawrence, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the efficiency of the Hospital Corps of the Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the National Business League of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the proper regulation of transportation rates; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Brightwood Park Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation providing compulsory education in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Trinity Christian Endeavor Society, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings, grounds, and ships; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a memorial of the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Wellsboro, Pa., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called "oleomargarine bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hortons, Pa., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Coudersport, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Philadelphia and Towanda; of Trough Creek Grange, No. 444, Patrons of Husbandry, of Shamokin, and of the Merchants' Protective Association of Shamokin, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Columbia County, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing continued prohibition in the Indian Territory according to recent agreements with the Five Civilized Tribes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Strasburg, Lopez, Reynoldsville, Rathmel, Lees Cross Roads, Mount Pleasant Mills, and Trevorton; of Washington Camp No. 592, of Gibraltar; of Washington Camp No. 102, of Steelton; of Washington Camp No. 171, of Carlisle; of Washington Camp No. 649, of Red Hill; of Camp No. 210, of Ickesburg; of Camp No. 46, of Minersville; of Camp No. 640, of Windber; of Camp No. 62, of Gordon; of Washington Camp No. 641, of Pottstown; of Washington Camp No. 455, of Brisbin, and of Washington Camp No. 99, of Wernersville, all of the Patriotic Order, Sons of America, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict the immigration of aliens into the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I present the petitions of certain of my constituents relating to a seat in this body of a Senator from Utah. In doing so, I deem it proper to say this: I have great respect for the petitioners, and I have great respect for the right which they exercise to send petitions here. At the same time I believe that they have not considered the fact that it is a judicial question which this body has to decide nor the further fact that the evidence bearing upon that question is not before this body at the present time.

Under such circumstances, had I the opportunity to advise them, I would say to them that I did not deem petitions upon such a subject to be an appropriate matter to send to the Senate, and I only present them because of my recognition of the honorable purposes which they possess and my recognition of the right which they have to send the petitions here.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator state the purpose of the petitions?

Mr. DANIEL. I stated that they relate to a seat occupied upon this floor by a Senator from Utah. They are the petitions of J. Earnest Thacker and other citizens of Norfolk, of Mrs. D. F. Swift and other citizens of Cape Charles, and of D. C. Perdue and other citizens of Norfolk, all in the State of Virginia.

Mr. CULLOM. I heard the remarks of the Senator, but I did not hear his statement in reference to the petitions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented a memorial of the Ancient

Order of Hibernians, of Marion County, Ind., remonstrating against the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lanesboro and Canton, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Indian Territory when admitted to statehood; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SPOONER presented a petition of the La Crosse County Retail Druggists' Association, of La Crosse, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation amending sections 4886 and 4887 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents affecting medicinal substances; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 245, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Ashland, Wis., remonstrating against any reduction of the tariff on cigars and tobacco imported from the Philippines; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. LONG presented petitions of T. T. Dunaway Division, No. 336, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Osawatomie; of Local Division No. 137, Order of Railway Conductors, of Osawatomie, and of Winfield Lodge, No. 245, Order of Railway Conductors, of Arkansas City, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Waverly, Kansas City, Nemaha County, Chanute, Council Grove, and Jewell City, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors in new States to be formed; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FULTON presented the petition of Mrs. Belle V. Shaw, of Oregon, praying that she be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Clark Walter, of Walla Walla, Wash., praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers in support of the bill to increase the pension of Henry E. Jones, of Portland, Oreg.; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Maj. Alfred F. Sears, of Portland, Oreg., praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Victorius G. Haag, of Stayton, Oreg., praying that he be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Alfred A. Woodin, of Portland, Oreg., praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Raauf W. Traver, of Forestgrove, Oreg., praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Lucy J. Bennett, of Portland, Oreg., praying that she be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Linn County Business Council, Patrons of Husbandry, of Oregon, praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the National Association of Retail Druggists of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend sections 4886 and 4887 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents on medicinal preparations and remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Newberg, Oreg., praying for the acquisition of the canal locks at the falls of the Willamette River, Oregon City, Oreg.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of naval vessels on the Pacific coast; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of La Grande, Oreg., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the adoption of a certain amendment to the suffrage clause in the statehood bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the appointment of incapacitated railway postal clerks as third-class

postmasters, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nebraska, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the States from disfranchising citizens of the United States on account of sex; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 406, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Colorado City, Colo., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the United Irish League, United Irish Societies, and the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Cook County, Ill., remonstrating against the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the American Forest Congress, praying for the protection and preservation of the forests of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a memorial of the legislature of Arizona, remonstrating against the union of that Territory with New Mexico in the new States to be formed; which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

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

A bill (H. R. 9824) granting a pension to William Hayes;

A bill (H. R. 15308) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Prewett; and

A bill (H. R. 8049) granting an increase of pension to John S. Parker.

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

A bill (S. 6439) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Conroy;

A bill (S. 3378) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Heck;

A bill (S. 2256) granting an increase of pension to John Spriggs;

A bill (S. 2986) granting an increase of pension to William Barkis;

A bill (S. 3662) granting an increase of pension to William A. Wilkins;

A bill (S. 6097) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Clark;

A bill (S. 2674) granting a pension to Ellen Orr;

A bill (S. 4681) granting an increase of pension to John H. Stubbs;

A bill (S. 2291) granting an increase of pension to William W. Rollins;

A bill (S. 6445) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie A. Holden;

A bill (S. 6098) granting an increase of pension to Seth Lewis;

A bill (S. 6605) granting an increase of pension to Simeon V. Sherwood; and

A bill (S. 6699) granting an increase of pension to Moses Frost.

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

A bill (S. 6446) granting an increase of pension to John McGowan;

A bill (S. 6444) granting an increase of pension to Melkert H. Burton;

A bill (S. 3023) granting an increase of pension to Sanford A. Henderson;

A bill (S. 6438) granting a pension to Cyrell Boutiette;

A bill (S. 6718) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Salg;

A bill (H. R. 17241) granting an increase of pension to David A. Miller;

A bill (H. R. 13082) granting an increase of pension to William E. Wheeler;

A bill (H. R. 5383) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shafer;

A bill (H. R. 5153) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Stewart;

A bill (H. R. 4942) granting an increase of pension to Adam Hand;

A bill (H. R. 2476) granting an increase of pension to Sampson T. Grove;

A bill (H. R. 1491) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Pembleton;

A bill (H. R. 968) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Young;

A bill (H. R. 963) granting an increase of pension to Ava D. Benjamin;

A bill (H. R. 606) granting an increase of pension to Vincent M. Cartwright;

A bill (H. R. 1324) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Skidmore;

A bill (H. R. 1445) granting an increase of pension to John Ellis;

A bill (H. R. 2469) granting an increase of pension to William Stone;

A bill (H. R. 14635) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Moore;

A bill (H. R. 15872) granting an increase of pension to Marvin Welton;

A bill (H. R. 7987) granting an increase of pension to Francis Scott;

A bill (H. R. 2946) granting an increase of pension to Albert Webb;

A bill (H. R. 2046) granting an increase of pension to Peter W. Kreeger;

A bill (H. R. 5286) granting an increase of pension to Obadiah J. Merrill;

A bill (H. R. 7074) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Sims;

A bill (H. R. 16109) granting a pension to Alice W. T. Groesbeck;

A bill (H. R. 15871) granting an increase of pension to John Leonard;

A bill (H. R. 14489) granting an increase of pension to John M. Porter;

A bill (H. R. 8708) granting an increase of pension to David C. Posey;

A bill (H. R. 4322) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Hay;

A bill (H. R. 666) granting an increase of pension to Eva M. Kingsbury; and

A bill (H. R. 5884) granting an increase of pension to Samuel K. White.

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

A bill (S. 1724) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. McCune;

A bill (S. 3914) granting an increase of pension to John W. Branch;

A bill (S. 1560) granting an increase of pension to William Sweet;

A bill (S. 3897) granting an increase of pension to G. H. Adams;

A bill (S. 4680) granting an increase of pension to Samuel T. Dixon; and

A bill (H. R. 7607) granting a pension to John W. Nye.

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

A bill (H. R. 5951) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. White;

A bill (H. R. 9906) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Dunn;

A bill (H. R. 15344) granting an increase of pension to William B. Atwater;

A bill (H. R. 15722) granting an increase of pension to David Guthrie;

A bill (H. R. 16807) granting an increase of pension to Elmer C. Jordan;

A bill (H. R. 16809) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Cotter;

A bill (H. R. 16311) granting an increase of pension to Morris Del Dowane; and

A bill (H. R. 15197) granting an increase of pension to Calvin C. Griffith.

Mr. McCUMBER (for Mr. FOSTER of Washington), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3349) granting an increase of pension to Morgan Dwyer, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. FOSTER of Washington), from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported

them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6381) granting an increase of pension to John Hamilton; and

A bill (S. 5813) granting an increase of pension to Herbert E. Farnsworth.

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

A bill (S. 5518) granting a pension to Bernard J. Boldermann;

A bill (S. 5819) granting an increase of pension to Samuel K. Long; and

A bill (S. 5253) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Mort.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6607) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Arkansas River at or near Van Buren, Ark., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6084) for the relief of George W. Green, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 6310) granting an increase of pension to Robert Clarke;

A bill (H. R. 16348) granting an increase of pension to Johnson Anderson;

A bill (H. R. 15850) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shadman;

A bill (H. R. 16715) granting a pension to Helen Calvert;

A bill (H. R. 16481) granting an increase of pension to Frederick M. Halbritter;

A bill (H. R. 5243) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Qualk;

A bill (H. R. 16506) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Gray;

A bill (H. R. 5821) granting a pension to Mary A. Johns;

A bill (H. R. 16683) granting a pension to Jesse Peters;

A bill (H. R. 15893) granting an increase of pension to James A. McClung;

A bill (H. R. 16173) granting an increase of pension to Allen Riggs;

A bill (H. R. 4900) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hodgson;

A bill (H. R. 4595) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Fortney;

A bill (H. R. 16194) granting an increase of pension to James Gwyn;

A bill (H. R. 3373) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Cochran;

A bill (H. R. 132) granting an increase of pension to James P. Griffith;

A bill (H. R. 16483) granting an increase of pension to James H. Silcott;

A bill (H. R. 5822) granting an increase of pension to Eveline V. Ferguson;

A bill (H. R. 16480) granting an increase of pension to Preston Glover;

A bill (H. R. 9860) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Colvin;

A bill (H. R. 4169) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Brooks;

A bill (H. R. 15760) granting an increase of pension to John W. Strayer;

A bill (H. R. 13620) granting an increase of pension to Silas W. Squires;

A bill (H. R. 9774) granting an increase of pension to James M. Prince;

A bill (H. R. 16108) granting an increase of pension to Andrew S. Ray;

A bill (H. R. 16303) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Tyler;

A bill (S. 6026) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Girard Nichols;

A bill (S. 5059) granting an increase of pension to Tobias Meader;

A bill (S. 5316) granting a pension to Thomas Pickford;

A bill (S. 5960) granting an increase of pension to John A. Sargent;

A bill (S. 6344) granting an increase of pension to Richard B. Dickinson; and

A bill (H. R. 15660) granting an increase of pension to Jacob R. Sharretts.

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

A bill (S. 2031) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Gay;

A bill (S. 6188) granting an increase of pension to William Sartwell;

A bill (S. 4573) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Buck;

A bill (S. 6475) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Slater;

A bill (S. 3953) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Sanborn;

A bill (S. 6586) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Campbell;

A bill (S. 4814) granting an increase of pension to Marcia H. Edgerly; and

A bill (S. 6728) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Cowing.

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

A bill (S. 6526) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Cox; and

A bill (S. 6348) granting an increase of pension to Richard Edmund Hyde.

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

A bill (S. 6025) granting an increase of pension to Belle K. Theaker;

A bill (S. 5322) granting an increase of pension to Perley B. Dickerson;

A bill (S. 2464) granting an increase of pension to John Aylers;

A bill (S. 5234) granting an increase of pension to John R. Leavens; and

A bill (S. 4123) granting an increase of pension to George Simms.

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

A bill (H. R. 4552) granting an increase of pension to Orin P. Stoffer;

A bill (H. R. 2781) granting an increase of pension to Alta Mira Parsons;

A bill (H. R. 15864) granting a pension to Margaret La Parle;

A bill (H. R. 16259) granting an increase of pension to John Walz;

A bill (H. R. 4676) granting an increase of pension to James B. Judson;

A bill (H. R. 16263) granting an increase of pension to Llewellyn Niles; and

A bill (H. R. 16594) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Kryer.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1452) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Forkner, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (H. R. 16053) granting an increase of pension to Florence Emery Blake; and

A bill (S. 6554) granting an increase of pension to Martin Gillett.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4619) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Bartleson, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (S. 6550) granting a pension to Jane Johns;

A bill (S. 6654) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Dampier;

A bill (S. 6549) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. West;

A bill (S. 6548) granting an increase of pension to Livincy Walker; and

A bill (S. 6553) granting an increase of pension to Orlando Kennedy.

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

A bill (S. 4101) granting an increase of pension to James H. Cate; and

A bill (H. R. 2191) granting an increase of pension to William C. Pollard.

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

A bill (H. R. 16666) granting an increase of pension to Alfreda B. Coburn;

A bill (H. R. 13170) granting an increase of pension to Ruth M. Shepley, now Haskell;

A bill (H. R. 4194) granting a pension to Elizabeth Nellan;

A bill (H. R. 3286) granting an increase of pension to Jacob F. French;

A bill (H. R. 4873) granting an increase of pension to John McKenzie;

A bill (H. R. 3002) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Tillinghast;

A bill (H. R. 723) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Smart;

A bill (H. R. 16894) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Connor, alias James Boone;

A bill (H. R. 1573) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Hurd;

A bill (H. R. 15782) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Warner;

A bill (H. R. 15781) granting an increase of pension to Granville F. Plummer;

A bill (H. R. 15786) granting an increase of pension to Horatio W. Longa;

A bill (H. R. 15783) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Richards;

A bill (H. R. 15784) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wingate;

A bill (H. R. 15930) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cray; and

A bill (H. R. 8859) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Esty.

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

A bill (H. R. 16171) granting an increase of pension to Sarah D. Tarver;

A bill (H. R. 16904) granting a pension to Louis Sherard;

A bill (H. R. 15802) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Field; and

A bill (H. R. 16172) granting an increase of pension to Georgia A. Warren.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5233) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Reynolds, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (S. 4073) granting an increase of pension to Comfort W. Watson;

A bill (S. 4886) granting a pension to Mary A. Massey;

A bill (S. 5903) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Duffy;

A bill (S. 3722) granting a pension to John W. Victor; and

A bill (S. 6171) granting an increase of pension to Fannie C. Avis.

Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3044) granting a pension to Lucy McEntee Andrews, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (S. 6346) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Sheppard;

A bill (H. R. 16157) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Martin;

A bill (H. R. 15030) granting an increase of pension to David Rothschild;

A bill (H. R. 17093) granting an increase of pension to Felix Monaghan;

A bill (H. R. 14140) granting an increase of pension to William Y. Clinton;

A bill (H. R. 16200) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Hark;

A bill (H. R. 16199) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McGuckian;

A bill (H. R. 16124) granting an increase of pension to John Morgan;

A bill (H. R. 10712) granting a pension to Henrietta Weidner;

A bill (H. R. 16945) granting an increase of pension to Alvin B. Franklin;

A bill (H. R. 16087) granting an increase of pension to Harriet H. Brady;

A bill (H. R. 16704) granting an increase of pension to Michael Lewis;

A bill (H. R. 15855) granting an increase of pension to Loren Austin;

A bill (H. R. 15733) granting an increase of pension to Peter Horth;

A bill (H. R. 3799) granting a pension to Emma Cortright;

A bill (H. R. 15732) granting an increase of pension to Edwin O. Pierce;

A bill (H. R. 5123) granting a pension to Maria Eldred, formerly Maria Olmstead;

A bill (H. R. 16387) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Mathison;

A bill (H. R. 16141) granting an increase of pension to John Parks;

A bill (H. R. 16077) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Clark;

A bill (H. R. 16442) granting an increase of pension to Catherine E. Ray;

A bill (H. R. 16125) granting an increase of pension to Eugene C. Moger; and

A bill (H. R. 7000) granting an increase of pension to John White.

MESSENGER FOR COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals be, and it hereby is, authorized to employ a messenger whose services shall be devoted exclusively to the business of said committee, and who shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,440 per annum until otherwise provided by law.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS AND REVIEW OF THE WORLD'S COMMERCE.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed by the Public Printer 3,000 copies of the Commercial Relations of the United States for 1902, 2,000 copies of the Commercial Relations of the United States for 1903, and 2,000 copies of the summary entitled "Review of the World's Commerce for 1903" (forming part of the Commercial Relations for 1903) for the use of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

MONTHLY SUMMARY OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report a joint resolution, and I ask for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 93) providing for the printing of the Monthly Summary of Imports and Exports published by the Department of Commerce and Labor was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That hereafter there shall be printed monthly by the Public Printer 7,500 copies of the Monthly Summary of Imports and Exports and other statistical information prepared in the Bureau of Statistics for publication by the Department of Commerce and Labor, 500 copies of which shall be for the use of the Senate, 1,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 6,000 copies for the use of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

That the joint resolution approved December 18, 1895, restricting the number of copies of the Monthly Summary to 3,500, shall be, and hereby is, rescinded.

Mr. SPOONER. How does the joint resolution originate? Is it a report?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is reported from the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SPOONER. Is it an original proposition or was the matter referred to that committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is an original report.

Mr. PLATT of New York. It came before the committee from the Department of Commerce and Labor.

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

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know but that this is a proper thing to do, Mr. President—

Mr. CULLOM. It ought to be looked into.

Mr. ALLISON. But it seems to be a new plan of securing public printing by these several concurrent and joint resolutions. I do not know but that it is a very important thing to do to print 7,500 copies of this Monthly Summary.

Mr. PLATT of New York. It is recommended by the Department of Commerce and Labor. That is all I know about it.

Mr. ALLISON. If they recommend the enlargement of this printing, that is very well, but I notice in the President's message a suggestion, which I think is an excellent one, that we are enlarging our printing too rapidly and that the expenditures for public printing are too great. I think, in view of that monition of the President, we ought to be careful about enlarging provisions for the printing of public documents.

Mr. PLATT of New York. The joint resolution is accompanied by a letter from the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor. I should like to have it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter of the Secretary will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 16, 1905.

SIR: I beg to transmit herewith a draft of a joint resolution relating to the printing of the Monthly Summary of Imports and Exports, prepared in the Bureau of Statistics for publication by the Department of Commerce and Labor, and to request that if the resolution meets with the approval of your committee it be introduced in the Senate. The purpose of the resolution is to provide for the printing of a larger number of copies of the Monthly Summary, the present issue being altogether insufficient to meet the growing demand for this publication.

The Chief of the Bureau of Statistics states that "nearly the whole of the edition allowed the Bureau, namely, 2,000 copies by law and 1,000 by requisition, is required to supply commercial and trade bodies, the press, libraries of and teachers in colleges and other educational institutions, and our foreign exchanges, leaving but a few copies for distribution among merchants, manufacturers, and other applicants. The demand for this report has increased very rapidly in the last few years, and one of the largest sources of the increased demand is found in professors and teachers in colleges and schools, in which departments have been established for the purpose of imparting information in regard to commerce."

No increase has been asked in the number of copies provided for the use of the Senate (500) and the House of Representatives (1,000), as it was deemed expedient to leave that matter entirely to the committee.

Respectfully,

V. H. METCALF, Secretary.

HON. THOMAS C. PLATT,
Chairman Committee on Printing,
United States Senate.

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

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I am not going to object to its consideration, but I desire to take this opportunity to concur in the remarks which have been made by the Senator from Iowa. I think that we are enlarging the printing of documents and other work at the Public Printing Office far beyond what is necessary or reasonable; that the expense has come to be alarming, and that there ought to be something done by the Committee on Printing, or by some other committee, which should limit the amount of printing which we are indulging in by resolutions passed without much consideration, often presented thoughtlessly, upon request. If Senators will go to our document room and to the folding room and see the tons of public documents which are there, never to be distributed apparently, and look into this matter they will become convinced, I think, as I am, that at least one-third of the printing ordered by Congress is utterly unnecessary, and I may say unwise.

I do not object to the consideration of the joint resolution, but I think that some committee ought to take up the matter and see if the amount of printing can not be reduced.

Mr. CULLOM. I should think that the time to begin is right now. I hope the joint resolution will go over, and that an actual start in the economy of printing shall begin. I ask that the joint resolution may go over for to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will go to the Calendar.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS AND REVIEW OF THE WORLD'S COMMERCE.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, as to the resolution adopted just prior to the presentation of this one I should like to make an inquiry. Is it a joint or a concurrent resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a concurrent resolution.

Mr. BACON. I understand that it relates to the printing of public documents at the request of one of the Departments and that the larger part of the publication would go to the Department, a small proportion of it coming to Congress. Am I correct?

Mr. TELLER. All of the copies are to go to the Department.

Mr. BACON. All of them are to go to the Department. It is evident that the matter has not been looked into by the Senate. Personally, of course, I concede that the Committee on Printing has properly looked into it, but it is also true that members of

the Senate should have an opportunity to look into the matter. I therefore shall make a motion to reconsider the action of the Senate in reference to the concurrent resolution, in order that it may be looked into. It may be that upon an investigation the Senate may concur in the judgment of the Committee on Printing; but up to this time it has not had the opportunity to consider it, and as one resolution has gone over, I move to reconsider the other.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wish to say, in justice to the Committee on Printing, that I know it considers resolutions for printing very carefully, and that it hesitates and declines to recommend in various instances resolutions which have been introduced for that purpose. But we have got into the habit of introducing resolutions to print anything and everything, and it seems to me that some limitation must be placed upon the printing ordered by Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia moves to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution just passed was agreed to.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I wish to confirm what the Senator from Connecticut has just said and to state that the Committee on Printing considers with a great deal of care everything that is sent to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from Georgia, to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was passed.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution goes to the Calendar.

SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION, JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF MISSOURI.

Mr. SPOONER. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12898) to create a new division in the eastern judicial district of the State of Missouri, to report it favorably with an amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill. It is a local matter, and the bill is only two pages long. It will take but a minute.

Mr. CULLOM. Let it be read.

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

The amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was in section 8, page 3, line 24, to strike out "nineteen hundred and four" and insert "nineteen hundred and five;" so as to read:

That this act shall be in force from and after the 31st day of July, A. D. 1905, and all acts or parts of acts so far as inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 6797) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Fredericksburg, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 6798) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Somerset, Ky.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 6799) granting a pension to Ezra Walker Abbott; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 6800) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Packman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CARMACK introduced a bill (S. 6801) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Benjamin Lillard, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BAILEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 6802) for the relief of the estate of Johnson Miller, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 6803) to regulate the practice of dentistry in the Indian Territory; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ALGER introduced a bill (S. 6804) granting a pension to

Mary C. Leefe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 6805) for the relief of Isaiah Heylin McDonald; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 6806) granting a pension to Aletha E. Reynolds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 6807) granting a pension to Lucy J. Bennett;

A bill (S. 6808) granting a pension to Belle V. Shaw;

A bill (S. 6809) granting an increase of pension to Clark Walter;

A bill (S. 6810) granting an increase of pension to Alfred A. Woodin;

A bill (S. 6811) granting a pension to Victorius G. Haag;

A bill (S. 6812) granting an increase of pension to Raauf W. Traver; and

A bill (S. 6813) granting an increase of pension to Alfred F. Sears.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 6814) for the relief of John Thurman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6815) for the relief of the heirs of M. C. Mordecai; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6816) for a light-house at Cape Arago, Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 6817) for the relief of E. A. R. Wyatt, heir of E. A. Wyatt, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. OVERMAN introduced a bill (S. 6818) for the relief of Hannah B. Sabiston; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GIBSON introduced a bill (S. 6819) for the relief of the executors of the estate of Charles E. Conrad, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. STONE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 6820) for the relief of Wilhelmina Sharp; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

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

A bill (S. 6821) granting an increase of pension to David T. Field (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 6822) granting an increase of pension to Archibald K. Eddowes (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 6823) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Webster.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 6824) to provide for the extension and enlargement of the public building at Lancaster, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6825) for the relief of the Corn Exchange National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6826) to pay the Insurance Company of North America and the Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania certain amounts found due them under act of January 20, 1885; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6827) to correct the naval record of Jeremiah Bosworth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6828) to amend section 4045 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 6829) for the purchase of a portrait of the late President William McKinley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 6830) granting a pension to Eliza E. Winters; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6831) granting an increase of pension to Michael Quill; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6832) to further prescribe the duties of the secretary of the district of Alaska, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 6833) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Morrell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KITFREDGE introduced a bill (S. 6834) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Lyman County and Brule County, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 6835) to equalize the rank and pay of certain retired officers of the Marine Corps; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 95) to create a commission to examine into the subjects of citizenship of the United States, expatriation, and protection abroad; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXPENSES OF INAUGURAL CEREMONIES.

Mr. SPOONER. I introduce a joint resolution, for which I ask present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 94) to enable the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States March 4, 1905, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That to enable the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States March 4, 1905, in accordance with such programme as may be adopted by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for extra police for three days, at \$3 per day, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$7,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, the same to be immediately available.

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

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

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

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. GAMBLE submitted an amendment authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Louisa Miller, a member of the Sisseton and Wahpeton band of Sioux Indians, for lands heretofore allotted to her in the State of South Dakota, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$51,000 for the pay of not exceeding 30 dental surgeons and providing for their appointment as acting assistant surgeons in the Navy, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PLATT of New York submitted an amendment authorizing an increase of the salaries of tea examiners at the various ports of the United States, not to exceed \$5,000 per annum, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McCOMAS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$22,500 out of any money in the Treasury of the United States belonging to the Osage Nation or tribe of Indians to pay Lorenzo A. Bailey, of Washington, D. C., for professional services rendered said Indians, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO STATEHOOD BILL.

Mr. BERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 14749) 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; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. LONG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 14749) 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; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

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

Resolved, That the chairman of the Senate Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk for the period of one month, at a salary of \$100. And the Secretary of the Senate is authorized to pay said salary from the contingent fund of the Senate.

FUR-SEAL HERD OF ALASKA.

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

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish for the information of the Senate copies of all regulations and instructions given by him to the agents of the Department in charge of affairs on the seal islands of Alaska, and copies of all the reports to the said Department which said agents have made during the season of 1904 relative to the condition and management of the fur-seal herd of Alaska.

STATUE OF JOHN JAMES INGALLS.

Mr. LONG submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound in one volume the proceedings in Congress upon the acceptance of the statue of the late John James Ingalls 16,500 copies, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 1,500 shall be for use and distribution by the governor of Kansas; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to have printed an engraving of said statue to accompany said proceedings, said engraving to be paid for out of the appropriation for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

DETAIL OF RETIRED ARMY OFFICERS.

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

Resolved by the Senate, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate a list of all officers of the Army now on the retired list and who are detailed for service, giving the names of such officers, their rank, where located, and the service for which they are detailed.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17094) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, after line 7, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 23 as amended.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

Mr. GORMAN. Before the Senator addresses the Senate on his amendment, I wish he would kindly yield to me for a moment.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. GORMAN. On Saturday last I offered an amendment, which the Senate adopted, to the amendment of the committee on page 8, line 14, after the word "Congress," to strike out "in detail for each place in each insular possession." I now move to reconsider the vote by which that amendment to the committee amendment was adopted, with the intention when that is done to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland moves to reconsider the vote by which the amendment, which will be stated, to the amendment of the committee was adopted.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 14, after the word "Congress," the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, struck out the words "in detail for each place in each insular possession."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Maryland to the amendment of the committee was adopted.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. GORMAN. I now withdraw the amendment. I do so for the reason that it was offered hastily, and I now find that it rather destroys the purpose I had in view.

Mr. HALE. Now, Mr. President, to meet the object which the Senator from Maryland had in view, on which all of us are in accord, I move to amend the amendment of the committee by adding to the committee amendment the words which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Maine to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 15, after the word "possession," at the end of the committee amendment, it is proposed to add "with a statement covering the total cost of such work in each place when completed."

Mr. HALE. Now read the whole amendment as it will stand if my amendment be adopted.

The Secretary read as follows:

Hereafter all estimates for fortifications for the insular possessions of the United States, including all defensive work, and all ordnance and carriages and machinery, shall be made and submitted to Congress in detail for each place in each insular possession, with a statement covering the total cost of such work in each place when completed.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment of the Senator from Maine, it is intended to cover only the projects that are referred to in the last report of the Secretary of War, on page 13, as to four or five harbors, which include one in the Philippines, one in Honolulu, and so on.

Mr. HALE. It covers, Mr. President, every place for which next year the Department sends in estimates in detail. We shall know then not only where the money is to be spent, which we ought to know, but we shall also know what scheme they have in view for the completion of works in those places, whatever they are, for which the estimates are made.

Mr. GORMAN. But, as I understand the Senator's view—and it is mine—it is not intended by the amendment to enlarge the projects. I suppose now that we have insular possessions, everybody is in favor of the fortification of at least one of the great places—Manila Bay, for instance, and Honolulu—but not that we will by the adoption of this amendment make a suggestion for any enlargement of the projects that have already been referred to by the Secretary of War, or increase their number. I certainly do not desire to have it understood that there is even a faint suggestion that we shall go on and enlarge the projects, but only that we are to have a detailed estimate of the entire cost of the works already projected. I understand that is the effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Yes; that is the intention; so that we may know in detail all about them.

Mr. PERKINS. It is only just to the War Department that I should state that this information has heretofore been furnished confidentially by the Board on Fortifications and Ordnance to the Committee on Appropriations, but they have not deemed it advisable to publish it. I understand, according to the amendment which has been agreed to, that hereafter this information will be published in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. HALE. It will be submitted to the same crucible that all other estimates are. The Senate will then know that which it does not know—where the money is going, how much for each place, and what is the scheme for the final completion of the work. I do not think it is necessary that there should be anything furtive or secret about this matter. If there was any time when that condition existed, it has passed away, and Congress, which appropriates the money, ought to know where it is going and what the future has in contemplation for each place.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, the committee will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, there can be no intelligent and useful system of fortifications that is not based upon the consideration of all the places that ought to be, and necessarily must be, defended in time of war. You may fortify the Bay of Manila, and if you leave unfortified a large number of other places you have practically wasted the money you put into Manila Bay.

I understand, Mr. President, that the War Department has a system of fortifications to be applied to the Philippine Islands, but I have never been able to find out what that system is. An examination of the map would indicate to me that if we enter upon the fortification of those islands at all, if we are going to

make them halfway invulnerable, it should be done in a systematic way. That is why I complained on Saturday that nobody knew where this money proposed to be appropriated was to be expended, that nobody knew what its relation would be to the next appropriation we should make, and that, therefore, we were not in any condition to make an appropriation of this kind.

Mr. President, if we are to hold those islands for any length of time, I would vote for an appropriation for the harbor of Manila; but if I knew that no other place in those islands was to be fortified, I should not vote for it, because that would be a useless expenditure of money.

When we undertook to fortify our Atlantic coast we provided in that system for the places where it was thought we might be liable to attack. The same course, in my opinion, should also be adopted in this case. We have already expended some money, and we are about to expend more. We are about to expend \$700,000, and nobody can tell us exactly why or what is to be done with the money.

We are to take some of our great guns from home, and we are to put them up over there somewhere in the islands, nobody knows where, except, perhaps, the War Department.

It seems to me it is the duty of the legislative branch of the Government, which has the responsibility of raising revenues and their expenditure, to know a great deal more about the proposed expenditure than anybody in this Chamber or in the other can know from any published reports that the Government has issued. I am not in favor of any great expenditures on these islands, because I have hoped that ultimately we should surrender their control to the people who, in my judgment, have the right to control them. In the hands of natives, with the fact known that we do not intend to let any other power interfere with them, there would be no necessity for any expenditure for fortifications.

The islands are a part of our possessions. An attack upon those islands would be practically an attack upon the United States. That is the weak place where, if we have any foreign complication or a war with any foreign nation, they will do exactly what we did to Spain—take the islands away if they can.

One reason why I have felt that we ought not to expend money on them is that I believe it is an injustice to the people of those islands for us to dominate and domineer those communities without their consent.

Besides that, for myself, I believe that for every dollar I vote out of the Treasury I am accountable to my constituency, which is the whole, entire people of the United States. I can not make a proper answer to them by saying "We are going to get great glory by raising these people from a low state to a higher plane of civilization." That is not the duty of this or any other Government as a government, except with respect to people who belong to it. If I could show to my constituents, or to the people at large, whom I consider my constituents as much as I do the people of Colorado, that great profit could be made by our connection with them, that great commerce could be built up, and that great gain would be made by the people at large, it would be an answer why I did vote to appropriate the public money for fortifications or other purposes in those islands.

But, Mr. President, there is not a man living, after the experience we have had since we took possession of the Philippine Islands, who would dare stand in this Chamber and assert that there is a prospect of any commercial advantage that will compensate for the expenditure we have already made or for a tithe of what is proposed in this bill.

Mr. President, I notice in the morning papers, first yesterday, that we are about to take another possession; that the island of Santo Domingo is already in our hands, and that we are about or have already guaranteed the integrity of that island. I do not desire to complain unnecessarily, even about the expenditures in the Philippine Islands. We got into that difficulty, perhaps unadvisedly and somewhat accidentally, but I do mean to complain when the Administration undertakes to get us into fresh difficulties of this kind. I do not myself believe that the American Government should be used as a constabulary to collect the debts of European creditors that may be owing to them in this part of the world. I do not understand that there is anything in the Monroe doctrine which requires us to do that. If Santo Domingo owes Europeans money, the Europeans ought to be allowed to collect that money according to international law and subject to the rules which govern civilized people.

I know the Secretary said in the article which appeared in the morning paper that we do not guarantee. While of course we do not guarantee the payment, we guarantee the maintenance of peace and order—a thing that has not existed for any

considerable length of time in the Santo Domingo Republic for many years. Mr. President, it is a great job which we have taken upon our hands. It means an army in Santo Domingo.

There is one particular feature of this case to which I wish simply to call the attention of the Senate for a moment and then I propose to dismiss the matter. I deny the right of the executive department of the Government to make any contract, any treaty, any protocol, or anything of that character which will bind the United States. It is an assumption on the part of the Executive of power that is clearly and unequivocally given to the legislative department of this Government, if it rests anywhere in the United States. The President has no more right and no more authority to bind the people of the United States by such an agreement than I have as a member of this body. It is not intended that that treaty or protocol or whatever it is called shall be submitted to us for our consideration, because we are told by the Secretary, or some one speaking for him, that our officers are already in possession of one port at least in that island. And then, again, we are told that on the 1st day of February we are to take absolute control of the financial affairs of that island.

I want some man in this Chamber, I want somebody somewhere, I want some lawyer to tell me where the authority of the United States is to make that kind of a contract and bind us. This may be a small matter; it may not involve us in very great difficulties; but after all it is a step in a direction against which I want to enter my protest.

Under our Constitution we have a legislative department, we have an executive department, we have a judicial department; and perhaps in no country in the world has there ever been a more marked distinction made in the Constitution between the powers of these several departments. I regard the action of the Executive, through the Secretary of State, as a gross violation of the rights of the legislative department of this Government.

It is true, Mr. President, as I repeat, that no great complications may come out of it; it is true it may not cost us a great sum of money; but it is a departure from the fundamental principles upon which this Government was established. A departure in a small case may form a precedent for a departure in a great case.

So I do not hesitate to say that I think this is the time for the American Senate to say whether they approve of this method of procedure or not. For myself I have no hesitation in saying that I believe a departure of this kind will be followed by another and another until there shall be but little distinction between the departments, and, as the history of the world shows has been the case in almost every government of the world, eventually the executive power will become the sole power. Our safety in maintaining the wisest built Government that men ever erected is in maintaining the wide distinction they made between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial, and keeping each one a check upon the other.

Mr. President, I have not made these remarks because I thought they were likely to change the attitude of the Senate on this bill or on any other. I have made them because I believe it my duty to enter this protest.

I ask permission to insert the article to which I referred in my remarks.

The article referred to is as follows:

AVERTS GREAT PERIL—MR. LOOMIS EXPLAINS OUR DEAL WITH SANTO DOMINGO—SCOPE OF MONROE DOCTRINE—CAN NOT BE USED AS SHIELD BY AMERICAN REPUBLICS TO DENY JUSTICE TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS—AGREEMENT TO ASSIST IN ADMINISTRATION OF REVENUES ENTERED INTO ON INVITATION OF DOMINICANS.

After a consultation with Secretary Hay the following statement regarding the situation in Santo Domingo was issued by Assistant Secretary Loomis yesterday:

"The Dominican Republic, after mature consideration of existing conditions, has formally and freely invited the Government of the United States to assist it in the administration of its customs revenues and to aid it in establishing its fiscal system upon a firm and business-like basis. The Government of the United States having been explicitly, repeatedly, and emphatically informed by more than one of the great powers that it ought either to try to evolve some order out of the financial chaos in the Dominican Republic or assent to certain European creditors of that Republic doing this, and to the administration of the Dominican custom-houses by them, supported by their war ships, has deemed it advisable, in view of the unfortunate financial conditions in Santo Domingo, which for the last ten years have been rapidly growing worse, to accept the invitation of the Dominican Government, and therefore representatives of this Government and of Santo Domingo have signed a memorandum of a proposed agreement looking to the American control of the fiscal affairs, upon the request and with the consent of the Dominican Government.

"The United States proposes to guarantee the territorial integrity of the Dominican Republic. It is not the purpose of this Government to assume a protectorate over Santo Domingo or to interfere with or participate in its domestic affairs any further than the collection of its customs revenues, the necessary revision of its tariff laws, and the adjustment, through properly constituted tribunals or commissions, of its foreign claims, and its economic and fiscal organization on a sound basis may make it essential to do.

DECREE BY PRESIDENT MORALES.

"President Morales has signed a decree, which will be published today, in which the Government of the United States is officially asked to take full charge of all the Dominican custom-houses, to name all the employees, and to collect all the revenues, 45 per cent of which are to be returned to the Dominican Government for its current expenses. The balance is to be used to meet the interest charges on the acknowledged bonded indebtedness and other just obligations of the Republic. Any surplus will be turned over to the Dominican Government. The obligations representing the bonded indebtedness are largely owned by foreign creditors.

"The Government of the United States does not guarantee the debts of Santo Domingo or agree to provide for the payment of them, but only promises to try to so organize and adjust the fiscal administration of the country that in time their liquidation may be accomplished automatically and on a basis of equity toward all creditors. It is believed that if the Dominican revenues are wisely collected and disbursed all legitimate claims against the Republic will be ultimately satisfied.

"In this connection it may be added that under the award of the tribunal of arbitration of July 14, 1904, between the United States and Santo Domingo, in the sum of about \$4,500,000, the United States was given the right eventually to take possession of the four principal ports on the northern side of the island, and under the award the fiscal agent appointed by the United States is now in possession of the important custom-house at Puerto Plata.

QUESTIONS FRAUGHT WITH PERIL.

"The unfortunate financial condition of Santo Domingo more than once in the last decade has brought to the United States Government questions fraught with imminent peril. The Government of the United States could not, with due self-respect, allow the impression to deepen and gain currency that the Monroe doctrine can be used as a shield by an American republic to deny justice to other governments. Many foreign claims are just beyond peradventure, and, being held by citizens of various governments, the problem became increasingly more difficult as to how those claims could be satisfied under existing conditions with fair treatment toward all.

"In some respects a still more embarrassing feature of the situation has been that the Dominican Government has been compelled by force to pay grossly exorbitant claims, and the question has arisen whether the United States should interpose in such cases. Such interposition has never been resorted to perhaps but once in our history. Another deplorable feature of the financial situation in Santo Domingo is that her revenues have been crippled by granting, for a song, valuable concessions, which were exempted by stipulation from all taxation. Her interests have compelled the Dominican Government to disregard these promises of exemption from taxation, and this has resulted in numerous and increasing appeals to the Department of State to interfere.

"The Dominican Government itself reached the conclusion that its only hope of escape from bankruptcy was through the assistance of the United States Government in the organization of its finances. In view of these grave conditions the President has deemed it wise at this time to assent to the strongly expressed wish of the Dominican Government."

Rear-Admiral Charles D. Sigsbee, commander in chief of the Caribbean squadron, reported his arrival at Santo Domingo city yesterday in the flagship *Newark*. Both the *Newark* and the *Castine* are now representing the United States in Santo Domingan waters, although the latter has been scheduled to carry Capt. A. C. Dillingham to San Juan, P. R., where he is to take the mail steamer for the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. CARMACK. What is the amendment to the amendment?

Mr. HALE. Requiring estimates in detail instead of in gross. It is agreed to by everybody.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed, on page 7, after line 7, to strike out the remainder of the bill as amended down to and including line 23, as follows:

For construction of seacoast batteries in the insular possessions, \$700,000.

For the purchase, manufacture, test, and issue of seacoast cannon for coast defense for the insular possessions, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture at the arsenals, \$120,000.

Provided, That the Secretary of War is authorized to mount two 12-inch and three 10-inch breech-loading rifles on a corresponding number of carriages for which appropriation was made for the insular possessions in the fortification act approved April 21, 1904, and in addition thereto two 12-inch and two 10-inch rifles for the carriages for which estimates are now submitted, these guns being surplus on hand in excess of the number of carriages provided for emplacements in the United States.

Mr. PERKINS. In reply to the Senator from Colorado, I desire to say simply that the committee in considering the bill, when they reached the provision referring to the insular possessions, did not consider the policy of the Government in acquiring the Philippine Islands; whether they were acquired by treaty, or by conquest, or by purchase. It was sufficient for them to realize the fact that they constitute an American province today; that the Stars and Stripes are flying over the fortifications and forts and other public buildings in every port and city in the Philippine Islands, and that this Government is responsible for law and order. Peace to-day reigns tranquilly throughout the Philippine Islands.

The committee considered the question whether they would recommend an appropriation for the harbor of Manila as a

naval base, as a protection to the naval coaling station, as a protection to the city, to the people, to the buildings, to the public structures for which we paid \$20,000,000.

As my friend the Senator from Colorado is aware, the island of Corregidor is at the entrance of Manila Bay. It commands the full situation north and south and west.

If we are to maintain possession of Manila and Corregidor Island as a naval station even, it is absolutely necessary that we should be in a position to defend it, not only for our commercial interests, but for the Navy, for it must have a place to rendezvous, it must have a place for a coaling station, and as a basis for its operations.

It therefore seemed to your committee a wise policy to make the appropriation.

It has been the policy to consider in executive session a report in detail for the fortification of the thirty-one forts, under what is known as the "Endicott board," and for which we have appropriated about \$90,000,000 during the past fifteen years.

Our friend the Senator from Colorado says very truly that for the insular possessions there has been no regular plan similar to that of the Endicott board, but the Board of Engineers and the Ordnance Department took into their counsel a naval officer and they agreed that it is absolutely necessary that the islands should be fortified to the extent your committee have recommended. Indeed, they recommended twice the sum, but we thought, under the circumstances, this being an era of economy, and inasmuch as it requires about two years to build a 10 or 12 inch gun and another year to place it in position, we would proceed with this work gradually, and next year make a similar appropriation.

I therefore hope, in the interest of our Government, in the interest of the public service, in the interest of the Philippine Islands and the city of Manila, that the motion made by the Senator from Colorado will not prevail, and that the bill as submitted by your committee will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. CARMACK. I should like to ask the Senator from California whether there has ever been a report giving a general and systematic plan for the fortification of the Philippine Islands or any estimate for their fortification?

Mr. PERKINS. There has been a general plan adopted by the Engineer Department and the Ordnance Department, with the advice of the naval board, to the effect that there should be certain fortifications erected in the Philippine Islands—in Manila and Subig. The estimate of the Engineer Department for Manila amounted to \$1,095,000.

Mr. CARMACK. How much?

Mr. PERKINS. One million and ninety-five thousand dollars. That is for the engineering work, for the emplacements.

There has been no regular plan of fortification except for Corregidor Island and for Subig. Plans have been considered for other ports in Mindanao and other islands, but none have been agreed upon.

Mr. CARMACK. It seems to me it is time we did have some thoroughgoing estimate and plan of fortification for the Philippine Islands, if we are ever going to have any. I do not believe we ought to legislate piecemeal in this matter without knowing what is necessary in the way of fortifying the Philippine Islands.

The Senator says we must prepare ourselves to defend the Philippine Islands, and if so we must have a very elaborate and very costly system of fortifications. There is a coast line there twice as long, I believe, as the coast line of the United States. We must be prepared to defend every part of it, and I think we ought to have a detailed plan and estimate showing the cost of fortifying the Philippine Islands. It ought not to be kept from us any longer. We should know what it will cost and what it is necessary to do in order to make the Philippine Islands thoroughly defensible against any foreign enemy. I am going to vote against any such legislation as this until we do have something of that sort.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, if I understood the Senator from California correctly, he intimated that there was no well-defined plan of fortifications for our new possessions, but I wish to call his attention to the fact that the Secretary of War, in his last report, on page 17, says:

Projects for the defense of San Juan, P. R.; Pearl Harbor and Honolulu Harbor, Hawaii; San Luis d'Apra, Guam, and Manila Bay and Subig Bay, in the Philippines, have heretofore been made and approved, and estimates for the necessary construction transmitted to Congress. Congress, at its last session, by act of April 21, 1904, appropriated \$1,318,920 for beginning the work of fortifying our insular possessions.

Under this appropriation the work of actual construction of fortifications and their armament has begun in the Philippine Islands. The funds have been applied to heavy guns and batteries, which are costly and slow to build, leaving until later the lighter batteries, which in emergency could be rapidly completed and armed.

During the year the preparation of preliminary projects for emergency defenses of the more important harbors in the new insular possessions has been continued. Accurate surveys of a large number of battery sites have been completed, and actual construction of emplacements and installation of armament can follow at such rate of progress as may be determined upon by Congress.

I have been unable to find in any public document a detailed statement of what these numerous sites are which are to be fortified and what the cost will be.

I do find that under the act of last year appropriations amounting to \$1,318,920 were made for five or six forts which are specifically enumerated by the Secretary of War, and that the estimates for the same projects for this year are \$2,600,000. But you propose to appropriate \$936,000 under this bill.

I should like to ascertain from the Senator in charge of the bill if he has in his possession or if there has been submitted to the committee or to Congress any detailed statement of this whole project?

Mr. PERKINS. I call the Senator's attention to the report of the Chief of Engineers for last year, in which he estimates for Manila, Corregidor Island, for the engineering work, \$3,651,000. I suppose the guns, ordnance, etc., would be about four millions more. I have not the figures of the Ordnance Department. At Subig Bay \$997,000 is estimated for the engineering work, for emplacements, etc. The guns would probably amount to a million and a half more. It makes in all about \$10,000,000 that has been estimated for fortifications in the harbor of Manila and at Subig. Of course there are other places. At Iloilo it was \$574,000 and at Cebu \$708,900 for the engineering work, while the Ordnance Department will be approximately double that amount. Those are the only estimates of which I have any knowledge as having been furnished to Congress.

These fortifications were agreed upon by the Engineer Department and the Ordnance Department with the advice of a naval officer. Their report was submitted to the Secretary and met his approval, as appears in his report to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. GORMAN. That is twelve or fourteen million dollars for a few fortifications in the Philippine Islands. I ask the Senator now what the entire estimate for the remainder of the seven or eight points, such as Hawaii, would be?

Mr. PERKINS. San Juan, P. R., engineering, \$1,525,000; Honolulu and Pearl harbors, Hawaiian Islands, including \$526,100 for the acquisition of land, \$3,424,000; San Luis d'Apra, Guam, \$395,000. That completes all the estimates which have been submitted to your committee for the fortification of our insular possessions.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I desire to say simply a word about this matter. I think there are certain parts of the Philippine Islands to the fortification of which and the placing of armament there the Government can with propriety proceed, and I think our present action should be limited to such places, which I am now about to designate. Of course there is a general consensus upon the part of all men in public life, I think, with very few exceptions, that the time will come when it is the design of the United States Government practically to withdraw from the control of the government of the Philippine Islands; at the same time I think it is generally understood that whenever that day comes, whether it be near or remote, the United States Government will retain certain harbors for purposes of naval bases, coaling stations, etc. And it is not very greatly in doubt as to what localities would thus be selected. Subig Bay is one of them. I have no hesitation in the opinion—I may be mistaken about it—that ultimately the United States Government, even if it should surrender the sovereignty of those islands, would retain Subig Bay because of its advantages in all particulars as a naval base.

Mr. PERKINS. The Senator from Georgia has been in Manila. May I ask him if he does not also believe it to be the interests of the Government to retain and fortify Corregidor Island and Harbor?

Mr. BACON. I was coming to that. I was intending to say a word on that also. I was about to conclude what I had to say of Subig Bay with the statement that I thought, in the confidence we have that such would be the ultimate action of this Government, we might with propriety go to all the expenditure which might be reasonably deemed sufficient for the proper fortification and armament of Subig Bay. The probability as to Manila may not be so great from the fact that it is not so well adapted for the particular purposes of a coaling station. By reason of the size of Manila Bay and the turbulence of its waters it is not so well suited for the purposes of a harbor.

At the same time, I think the fortification, with reasonable limitations, of Corregidor Island is very proper if it could be

done for what I consider to be a comparatively slight expense, and it can be made a perfect defense to the entrance to Manila Bay. It is situated at the mouth of the entrance to the bay, with a deep sea channel on each side of it, being itself very little more than a couple of mountains.

But, Mr. President, when you come to speak of the fortification, at a large expense, of other localities than those two it seems to me to be not only unwise, but unnecessary. It is an impossibility, as has been suggested in this debate, that the Government of the United States can undertake the fortification of all the islands of the Philippine group except at the most enormous expense, by reason of the vast coast line, of which the Senator from Tennessee has spoken. Cebu and Iloilo are neither of them places where it is at all probable that the Government of the United States would ever desire to establish naval stations, and while I would be perfectly willing to vote for the proper fortification and armament of fortifications at Subig and also on Corregidor Island, I do think that it is an unnecessary expense and one from which we can hope in the long run to derive no benefit to seek out other places throughout that vast archipelago and expend money in their fortification and armament.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I will state to my friend from Georgia that this bill does not provide for any other appropriation in the Philippine Islands except for Subig Bay and Corregidor Island.

Mr. BACON. I misunderstood the Senator, then. I understood him to say that the estimates also contemplated the fortification of the island of Cebu, and Iloilo, and that while the bill does not specify the particular places upon which the expenditures are to be made, it does make appropriations with a view to meeting the estimates.

Mr. PERKINS. There is no estimate before your committee except the preliminary survey which has been made there. I am in full accord with the views expressed by the Senator from Georgia. Your committee do not understand that this money can be diverted for any other purpose except that which I have indicated, which is the emplacement of guns at Manila Bay, and we order the transfer of those guns which we have here now available for that purpose.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from California the amount it is proposed to be expended in fortifications at Subig Bay, or Manila, or elsewhere. What is the extent of the appropriation?

Mr. PERKINS. We make no appropriation for Subig Bay in this bill. There is \$700,000 appropriated for Corregidor Island, in Manila Bay.

Mr. MONEY. And no appropriation for any other point?

Mr. PERKINS. No appropriation for any other point except one at which it is proposed to place four 6-inch guns and four 3-inch guns.

Mr. MONEY. It seems a little like an anomaly that the United States should expend any sum of money to fortify possessions on the other side of the globe after the Senate by a solemn resolution decided by the casting vote of the President of the Senate that it should never be considered territory of the United States nor its citizens or subjects citizens of the United States. I do not like the idea. It seems to me to involve permanent possession. If we are going to undertake the trouble and expend the money to fortify those islands it appears to me that we are taking root there to stay. I know it is a very agreeable idea that we are there to stay. A very distinguished Republican gentleman outside of the Senate has seized upon an opportunity to declare to the world that we are there to stay. Now, I am not willing to entertain that idea, for I solemnly believe the American people will after a while reach a lucid interval and will themselves decline to have anything to do with that archipelago or anybody on it.

I believe the time will come, and very soon, too, when we will find it extremely to our interest to relinquish any control whatever of that archipelago. Events are transpiring to-day in the East which significantly point to the fact that Japan is about to increase her continental possessions, and having gratified the ambition for continental expansion it is perfectly natural that she should desire insular expansion. She has Formosa now by virtue of the indemnity exacted from China for the war ten years ago, and it is perfectly natural that she should reach farther south. Perhaps we would find that the people of Japan are the people most capable of instructing and governing the people of the Philippines, if they need any master or any controlling power or any instruction. I, for my part, believe they are able to take care of themselves, as every other people in the world are able to take care of themselves. I believe those people, although composed of a mixture of the col-

ored race with the white race, are able to manage their own affairs, and that they do not need a constable to collect their debts or a big stick to compel them to pay them.

These appropriations for permanent possessions all around the globe do not meet my idea of the powers of the Government of the United States of America. It is true the nation can do what it pleases, because it is here in power. It may provide a form of government by which and under which they may choose to govern themselves. No such policy was in contemplation in that instrument which the nation has provided for its government, and until there is some change in that organic instrument there should be no such expenditures as those now contemplated by the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. I should like to ask my friend from Mississippi if he does not think this a wise policy, even if for no other purpose than to protect our coaling station at Corregidor Island and as a basis for naval operations in the Indian Ocean? We own no naval station in the Indian Ocean or in the West. It seems to me that, leaving out all other questions, we ought to make this appropriation to fortify the island and to protect our coaling station, if for no other purpose.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I admit the pertinence of that question, and I will very cheerfully answer it. I do not believe we have any business over there which requires a coaling station. I do not believe that there is anything in the case which requires a coaling station or a fortification. We have voluntarily projected ourselves into what I may term the future storm center of the globe, for I conceive (I may be mistaken, however) that the wars of the future are to be in that sea, because there is constantly before the people of Europe, and I will say also of the United States, a partition and dismemberment of the great Empire of China. But I do not want to play the rôle of one of the robbers in that game. That is a rôle that a republic can not undertake. Therefore, I can see no necessity for a fort or for fortifications there except for that purpose.

I wish to say further, as I think the bar of secrecy has been removed from the debate, that a gentleman who represented the United States on the Commission of Paris stated here on this floor that one of the chief objects in taking possession of the Philippines was to secure a base of operations only 600 miles across the Chinese Sea, and when the time came to partition and dismember that great Empire we might have our part, as though we already had some sort of a claim upon that Government and that people. I am not living in the buccaneer age and I do not believe that the common sense of mankind will justify anything of that sort. We are to stay at home and attend to our business. It is none of our business to regulate the affairs of any other people whatever; and far above us, or below us, it ought to be to stoop to divide up and dismember a great empire, it makes no difference what our ideas may be of its capacity to govern itself and to manage its relations with the other nations of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER].

Mr. TELLER. On that let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, and several Senators answered to their names.

Mr. MONEY. I ask leave to interrupt the roll call so that the amendment may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest that that can not be done under the rule. The roll call will proceed.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MILLARD]. He is not in his seat, and therefore I withhold my vote. I should vote "yea," if he were present.

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

Mr. MONEY (when his name was called). I am paired generally with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I do not see him here, and I will therefore withhold my vote. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. As he is not present; I will transfer my pair to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN], and I will vote "nay."

Mr. PETTUS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE]. As he is not present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ELKINS. I will ask the Chair if the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. ELKINS. I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas, and therefore will not vote.

Mr. DEPEW (after having voted in the negative). Has the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. DEPEW. Then I withdraw my vote. I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY].

Mr. BEVERIDGE (after having voted in the negative). I inadvertently voted, as I usually do, not observing that my permanent pair, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. CLARK], is absent. I observe that fact now, and therefore transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], and let my vote stand.

Mr. DEPEW. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], and vote "nay."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understand that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] is already paired; that the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS] is paired with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE], and that he consents to transfer our pairs so that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE] will stand paired with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. CLARK], allowing both the Senator from Alabama and myself to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. PETTUS. I vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN. I will ask if the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that that Senator has not voted.

Mr. WARREN. Then I will not vote.

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—11.			
Bailey	Carmack	Latimer	Pettus
Bate	Clay	McCreary	Teller
Berry	Gorman	Patterson	
NAYS—29.			
Alger	Depew	Heyburn	Perkins
Allee	Dick	Hopkins	Platt, Conn.
Allison	Dolliver	Kean	Platt, N. Y.
Ankeny	Fairbanks	Kittredge	Spooner
Ball	Foraker	Lodge	Stewart
Beveridge	Frye	Long	
Burnham	Fulton	Millard	
Cullom	Gallinger	Nelson	
NOT VOTING—50.			
Aldrich	Daniel	Kearns	Penrose
Bacon	Dietrich	Knox	Proctor
Bard	Dillingham	McComas	Quarles
Blackburn	Dryden	McCumber	Scott
Burrows	Dubois	McEnery	Simmons
Burton	Elkins	McLaurin	Smoot
Clapp	Foster, La.	Mallory	Stone
Clarke, Ark.	Foster, Wash.	Martin	Taliaferro
Clark, Mont.	Gamble	Mitchell	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Gibson	Money	Warren
Cockrell	Hale	Morgan	Wetmore
Crane	Hansbrough	Newlands	
Culberson	Hawley	Overman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum not having appeared, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Alger	Cockrell	Heyburn	Patterson
Allee	Crane	Kean	Perkins
Ankeny	Cullom	Latimer	Pettus
Bailey	Depew	Lodge	Platt, N. Y.
Ball	Dick	Long	Proctor
Bate	Dillingham	McComas	Scott
Berry	Dolliver	McCreary	Stewart
Beveridge	Elkins	McCumber	Stone
Burnham	Foraker	Millard	Teller
Carmack	Fulton	Money	Warren
Clark, Mont.	Gallinger	Nelson	
Clarke, Ark.	Gorman	Newlands	
Clay	Hansbrough	Overman	

Mr. MONEY. It is due to my colleague [Mr. McLAURIN] to state that he is absent on important business concerning his family. I expect him here every day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The roll will be again called.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELKINS (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. I will transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN], and vote "nay."

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. That Senator being absent, I will withhold my vote. I should vote "nay," if he were present.

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

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. As he is not present, I will withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SCOTT (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO]; but I will transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I inquire if the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Then I withdraw my vote, as I have a general pair with that Senator.

Mr. PROCTOR. I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. DIETRICH], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McCOMAS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MONEY. I wish to again announce that my colleague [Mr. McLAURIN], who is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. FOSTER], is necessarily absent. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. LATIMER. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. TILLMAN] is absent on account of sickness.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—17.			
Bate	Daniel	Martin	Pettus
Berry	Dubois	Money	Teller
Carmack	Foster, La.	Morgan	
Clark, Mont.	Latimer	Overman	
Clay	McCreary	Patterson	
NAYS—38.			
Alger	Cullom	Hansbrough	Perkins
Allee	Depew	Heyburn	Platt, Conn.
Allison	Dick	Kean	Platt, N. Y.
Ankeny	Dolliver	Kittredge	Proctor
Ball	Elkins	Lodge	Scott
Bard	Fairbanks	Long	Spooner
Beveridge	Foraker	McCumber	Stewart
Burnham	Frye	McCumber	Warren
Burrows	Fulton	Millard	
Crane	Gallinger	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—35.			
Aldrich	Culberson	Hawley	Penrose
Bacon	Dietrich	Hopkins	Quarles
Bailey	Dillingham	Kearns	Simmons
Blackburn	Dryden	Knox	Smoot
Burton	Foster, Wash.	McEnery	Stone
Clapp	Gamble	McLaurin	Taliaferro
Clark, Wyo.	Gibson	Mallory	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Gorman	Mitchell	Wetmore
Cockrell	Hale	Newlands	

So Mr. TELLER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARMACK. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in after the amendment already adopted on page 8, line 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert after the amendment already adopted, on page 8, line 15, the following:

And the Secretary of War is hereby directed to report to Congress as soon as practicable a detailed plan of fortifications necessary to the proper defense of the insular possessions of the United States together with estimates of the cost of same.

Mr. CARMACK. I called the attention of the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] to the amendment the other morning, and I hope it will be acceptable to him.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I think the amendment reported by the committee as modified and reformed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] covers the whole proposition. Therefore, I think

it is unnecessary to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CARMACK. Having been called out of the Chamber, I was not aware of the amendments and modifications referred to by the Senator from California.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the amendment already adopted covers the object the Senator from Tennessee has in view.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PERKINS. In the amendment of the committee adopted on Saturday, in line 1, after the semicolon at the end of the word "finders," I move to insert the word "and."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the first amendment heretofore adopted, in line 1, after the semicolon following the word "finders," to insert the word "and."

Mr. PERKINS. It will then read: "For installation of range and position finders; and for the purchase, etc."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following joint resolution:

On January 23, 1905:

S. R. 77. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of James B. Angell on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

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 with an amendment the bill (S. 5763) granting certain property to the county of Gloucester, N. J.; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the acceptance from the State of Kansas of the statue of John J. Ingalls, to be placed in Statuary Hall.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 17474. An act 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, 1906, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer to the militia cavalry organization at Chattanooga, Tenn., a certain unused portion of the national cemetery reservation at Chattanooga, Tenn.

ARBITRATION OF VENEZUELAN CASES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

The Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State covering the report of the agent of the United States in the arbitration of the Venezuelan cases before The Hague tribunal, with accompanying appendixes.

The attention of Congress is invited to the request of the Secretary of State that 500 copies of the report and appendixes be printed for the use of the Department of State.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1905.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is rather of the opinion that the papers desired to be printed should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations and be printed, but there is a special request in the message that 500 copies may be printed for the use of the Department of State. The Chair supposes that could be accomplished by a resolution referred to the Committee on Printing. In the absence of objection, the message will be printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF GEORGE W. SOULE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business, being the "statehood bill," so called, is now before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BURNHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 559) for the relief of the legal representatives of George W. Soule.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, understanding from the Senator from New Hampshire that his measure will take no time at all, I am willing to agree that the unfinished business shall be temporarily laid aside, if that be agreeable to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] until the bill referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire shall have been considered. If it provokes any discussion, I shall not be willing to have the statehood bill delayed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the bill named by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BURNHAM]. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURNHAM. I now ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (S. 559) for the relief of the legal representatives of George W. Soule.

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

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Ephraim Hunt and Julia M. Hunt, executors of the last will and testament of George W. Soule, deceased, the sum of \$31,500, for loss and damage sustained by said George W. Soule by reason of the seizure and appropriation, against his protest, for public purposes, by the collector of customs of San Francisco, Cal., in the year 1852, in the erection of the custom-house of the United States, of six stores, the property of said Soule, situate upon a certain square of land in the city of San Francisco, by him then occupied under claim title, and being the same land whereon said custom-house was erected, said sum of \$31,500, being the cost to said Soule of the erection of said stores in the year 1851; and said sum of money shall be in full payment and discharge of all claims, of every description whatever, on behalf of the estate of said George W. Soule, his heirs, and legal representatives, against the United States.

SEC 2. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$31,500 for the purposes specified in this act.

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.

STATEHOOD BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14749) 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.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, I shall resume my remarks on the pending bill at the point where I left off at the adjournment on Friday last. I shall occupy but a short time with what I have to say this morning on the statehood bill, which, I think, is one of the most important we have ever had here or that we shall have for some time to come. Of course we all feel a deep interest in the subject, and I propose now giving my views on some phases of the measure which I have not heretofore discussed.

A recapitulation of the platform pledges of the great political parties as to the admission of these Territories as States in the Union carries the distinct understanding that each Territory was to be admitted to the Union as a State.

Joint statehood was never contemplated by either party, and this bill which keeps the word of promise to the ear breaks it to the hope of the people of each Territory by a forced cohabitation from which there is no divorce or separation, by even the omnipotent power of Congress, when once they have become States in the Union. Before such a condition of future peril the Senate may well hesitate to pronounce the bond of consolidation, which it can never dissolve.

There ought not to be any experimenting with the admission of States to the Union. Once in, they are there for weal or woe and forever, the indestructible members of our indestructible Union. "Distinct as billows, yet one as the sea."

These considerations seem to have impressed the Committee on Territories of the Fifty-seventh Congress, for the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] reporting for the new statehood bill, by Report No. 2206, says:

In conclusion the committee asks the Senate to consider the following: If it is a mistake not to admit these Territories at the present time, it is a mistake which can be remedied by any future Congress.

If it is a mistake to admit them and that mistake is consummated it never can be undone.

Is the mistake in either eventuality lessened in its consequences by combining the four Territories into two States?

That report in the Fifty-seventh Congress opposed the "omnibus bill" as singularly inharmonious, and accounted for its "lack of harmony" "only upon the principle that the admission of each Territory is a proposition standing by itself and that they are incapable of consideration 'bunched together.'" And yet in this Congress by making two bunches of the same materials, instead of one, they profess to find the most felicitous harmony in the consolidation of these Territories.

This new device for consolidating the people of Oklahoma with those of the Indian Territory into one State and for the consolidation of the two peoples of New Mexico and Arizona into another State presents anomalies which must create dissensions in the future among people so indissolubly united, as well as give trouble, annoyance, and vexation to the people of the United States, compelled to witness, without power to amend, the incongruities arising from conflicts in civilization which will restrict progress and retard prosperity in both States.

It must have been such consideration of public policy that moved the Republican convention of 1888 to declare in its platform that—

The government by Congress of the Territories is based upon necessity only, to the end that they may become States in the Union; therefore, whenever the conditions of population, material resources, public intelligence, and morality are such as to insure a stable local government therein the people of such Territories should be permitted, as a right inherent in them, the right to form for themselves constitutions and State governments and be admitted into the Union. Pending the preparation for statehood all officers thereof should be selected from the bona fide residents and citizens of the Territory wherein they are to serve.

And again in 1892 the Republican convention avowed the same purpose:

We favor the admission of the remaining Territories at the earliest practicable day, having due regard to the interests of the people of the Territories and of the United States.

The same declaration in the same language was repeated in the platform of 1896 by the Republican convention. And in 1890 the Republican convention declared:

We favor home rule for and the early admission to statehood of the Territories of New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma.

It was not only by such party platform pledges that the Republican party stands committed to separate statehood, for the Committee on Territories of the Senate, through Senator Harrison, afterwards the Republican President, reporting in the Dakota case, voiced the sentiment and purpose of the whole people of the country on the admission of Territories into the Union that—

The right of the people of a Territory of the United States to form a constitution and State government, republican in form, and be admitted into the Union of States is so self-evident that it will not be questioned by any enlightened citizen of any State, providing the requisite conditions for admission heretofore recognized have been complied with and exist.

The "requisite conditions for admission heretofore recognized" is admitted to exist at present, since the bill provides for the admission of each Territory, but in the condition of the Siamese twins—inseparably bound together by a ligament invented by the Republicans of the House of Representatives.

It is against that ligament that protest is made by the people of these Territories as contrary to precedent and in violation of the right of each Territory of the United States to form its constitution and to be admitted into the Union.

Never before has Congress required two Territories to form one constitution, but that the people of each Territory may make their own constitution, to suit their own conditions and perpetuate their institutions, with the sole condition that such constitution shall be republican in form.

It is useless to discuss at this day the requisite conditions of these Territories as to population, material resources, public intelligence, and morality, the existence of which the Republican platform of 1888 recognized as constituting the "right inherent" to each people to form for themselves, and not for another people, the constitution under which they were to come into the Union. The ligamentary form for binding two people into one State had not been invented previously to the present Congress. The device is unknown to our past history, and was never dreamed of by the statesmen—from Jefferson, in 1787, to 1900—who have blazed the way for new States into the Union.

The members of the Committee on Territories who protest against this ligamentary form of admission offer no objections to the admission of each Territory as a separate State. The size of the United States Senate as to its membership is regulated by the constitutional provision that "the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each

State," and to deny a Territory, rightfully qualified, admission to the Union because such admission would increase the number of Senators is none the less a violation of the Constitution when it is not avowed, but yet operates to restrict the membership of the Senate.

The unconstitutional character of such a policy is none the less when four States are consolidated into two and only four Senators instead of eight increase the membership.

It may be a difficult problem in casuistry to reconcile the "inherent right" of a people qualified for admission by all existing precedents with the power of Congress to deny such admission; but the excuse that eight Senators are too many to come into the Senate at one time will hardly satisfy the people of the United States. It has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States that the power of Congress to acquire territory extended only to Territories for the purpose of admission as States into the Union. While no fixed rule of admission of States into the Union exists either in the Constitution or in previous legislation, the Supreme Court, by Chief Justice Taney, pointed out that—

There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure, nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way except by the admission of new States.

It is upon that view of the Constitution that the "inherent right" to admission is recognized by the Republican platform of 1888. The admission as States is the ultimate purpose of all acquisition of territory, and such admission is not to be denied because it would increase the membership of the Senate.

I shall not occupy the time of the Senate in the discussion of the requisite condition of these Territories for admission, because the "hearing" by committees—not of the Senate, but House—the speeches of the Hon. J. F. WILSON, of Arizona, and the Hon. B. S. RODEY, of New Mexico, as parts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are within convenient reach of every Senator, and present in the fullest details the complete demonstration of the existence at present of every requisite which heretofore have constituted the precedents of admission. But I affirm, and I challenge contradiction, that there can not be found in all the legislation on the admission of States, from 1787 to the present time, either a precedent, an argument, or a reason for consolidation of two Territories into one State.

If any political reason for this condition exists, it has not been avowed and has not appeared in the report of any committee of either House of Congress, except in the report of the Committee on Territories of the Fifty-seventh Congress (Report No. 2206, pt. 1), where it was remarked that—

The admission of a new State involves:

First, the interests of the people of the new State; and

Second, the interests of the remainder of the Republic.

The second consideration is at least of equal weight with the first, since the new State has equal voting power in the upper branch of Congress with all the other States, and therefore the welfare of the nation is permanently affected.

Without controverting in any way the truth and accuracy of that "second consideration," the inquiry is pertinent whether the votes of Senators from Rhode Island, Delaware, and Nevada have affected the national welfare or can affect that welfare more than the votes of Senators from New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma.

That report is the first intimation of the existence of such a reason for refusing statehood to qualified Territories that I have found in all the documents upon the subject.

Mr. Quay, from the same committee, reporting his "views," takes no such contracted view of a great question which affects the very constitution of the Senate, but reported:

That the Republican party in 1900 promised statehood to the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, while no such pledge was made or promised in the national convention for the Indian Territory, which is not now fit for statehood.

The bill and report which now, only two years later, proposes to join that Territory, then unfit for statehood, to Oklahoma ought to have told the Congress when and to what extent changes and improvements have taken place which now fit the Indian Territory to form one-half of a State.

The Territory of New Mexico alone covers 122,580 square miles, almost as large as the whole of New England, with New York and New Jersey combined, which have 123,450 square miles.

To that vast empire of square miles this bill proposes to add the Territory of Arizona, which in "1863 was cut off from New Mexico because of its unwieldiness." The area of the proposed State would be greater than that of all New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Maryland (twenty Senators). And that is why the people of Arizona object to being joined with New Mexico and having one State made of

the two. (Hearing of N. O. Murphy, ex-governor of Arizona, January 7, 1904.)

In such a State "the distance from one side to the other would be as far as it is from New York to Chicago," and without railway connection.

Governor Murphy added that—

There is nothing in common between the people. It would be very unwieldy and an expensive State to govern, and to my mind the proposition should be absurd to any intelligent citizen of the country.

That is the opinion and judgment of an ex-governor of Arizona, of a public man who has "served as secretary of the Territory, governor twice, and Delegate in Congress once." (Hearing, p. 33, in House of Representatives.) He had "yet to hear even one citizen favor the joint statehood proposition."

The reasons why not one citizen of either Territory favors the joint statehood proposition are difficult to find. The policy heretofore pursued by Congress in the admission of Territories has been that of dividing large areas; thus the Dakotas were separated because the two united had 148,445 square miles. The policy now of the present bill is that of uniting large areas. New Mexico has 122,580 square miles and Arizona 113,020 square miles—together 235,600 square miles. (Hearing, House of Representatives, p. 51.) The case of Texas can have no application, either in precedent or principle. Texas was an independent republic, which by treaty came into the Union on her own terms—that of being divided at her election into five States. That Texas has not elected to divide her territory is no justification for adding to the Union another empire in area only 30,000 square miles less than Texas.

The area of New Mexico and Arizona is not only too large, but it is divided by a range of mountains, which, while not inaccessible, is yet a barrier which compels long circuits to trade and travel, impeding progress and prosperity, as well as the means of good government.

But the objection of the peoples of each Territory arising from the vast extent of territory is not the only nor the most serious reason why not one citizen of either Territory has been found to favor joint statehood.

The laws and the customs of the people are different in their origin and in their application. Mr. Richardson, pushing this objection to joint statehood, said that—

we have grown up under somewhat different conditions and under an entirely different system of laws.

He further explained that difference in civilization as the—

difference of laws on irrigation, or water right; on mining; and there are a great many things that are different—indeed you might say that there is an entirely different system upon all lines—the educational laws are somewhat different.

And he added:

The suggestion of uniting these two Territories is new. It has never been done in the admission of States into the Union.

On the contrary, the policy of Congress has been to divide territory until a homogeneity of population was secured under laws and institutions with which the people were familiar.

Mr. RODEY, the Delegate from New Mexico, was advised that the people of the Territory of Arizona would vote as a unit against the bill for joint statehood, and that "60 or more per cent of the people of New Mexico would vote this minute to defeat a constitution under it."

Can there be "home rule" where conditions of Territorial laws, customs, and civilization are so divergent that the people of the Territories would seek to defeat joint statehood?

An examination of the hearing before the House Committee on the Territories will surprise the Senate with the positive repugnance of the people of New Mexico as well as those of Arizona to the combination of the two peoples proposed by the pending bill. To the expressions of that repugnance by the Delegate from New Mexico, Mr. RODEY, I will add that of Mr. Ellingwood, who was for five years United States attorney for the Territory:

If you can not benefit the Territory of Arizona, do not do her an injury. New Mexico does not want us tied to her, and we do not want to be tied to New Mexico. We want statehood, gentlemen of the committee, but we are not insane on the subject of statehood. If you can not admit Arizona with its 113,000 square miles, with its resources, with its American population, leave us out.

Gentlemen of the committee, take up the New Mexico bill and pass it, take up the Oklahoma bill and pass it, and let Arizona remain as it is rather than join us together. We will be loyal. We would prefer to remain a Territory absolutely indefinitely, forever, until we work out our own salvation. We will do it. For heaven's sake do not strike us in the face if you can not help us. This is the preference of the people. I know the conditions in the Territory, and no one will appear before you who will not tell you the same thing. Arizona is unanimous on this subject. We will not have it if we can help it.

Mr. President, it is not surprising that such an energetic ex-

pression of opposition to consolidation should have prompted the question:

By what authority do you speak on behalf of your Territory saying that you are united in opposition to being joined with any other Territory to form a State? Is it simply your judgment about it or has there been a vote or a town meeting?

To which Mr. Ellingwood replied:

I will state to the gentleman that since this question has been up I have been in every county in the Territory and nearly every town in every county. I am with the people all the time, I am in the courts with the jurors and witnesses all the time, and I have never heard one man in the Territory of Arizona express himself favorably to any such joining of the two Territories.

He had "never heard one man in the Territory of Arizona express himself favorably to any such joining of the two Territories."

The district attorney, in constant touch with the people, is thus emphatic in his affirmation of practical unanimity of the population in opposition to the consolidation. Can evidence be stronger or more conclusive?

It was asked of Mr. WILSON, the Delegate from Arizona, who alike honors Arizona as he is honored by it:

Supposing that you were confronted with the question whether you could be admitted with New Mexico or not not at all, would you rather wait, or would you rather be joined?

The reply was swift and pointed:

We would rather wait until the crack of doom before we would ever consent to it, and if stronger language is necessary I will use it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is that the sentiment of your people?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir; absolutely.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will that sentiment change?

Mr. WILSON. It never will. It will only grow more violent.

The governor of Arizona, reporting to the Secretary of the Interior, is quoted by Senator BARD as saying:

While the people of Arizona are unanimous in their desire for the admission of the Territory as a State and feel that the longer this boon is denied them the longer is a great injustice being done to a hardy, honest, straightforward, and patriotic people, still they are as unanimous in their opposition to a union with any State or part of State or Territory, even though by such a union could the desired boon be attained.

They have withstood the dangers and vicissitudes of frontier life too many years; they have worked too hard to mold a State from the desert; they have expended too much time and energy in the upbuilding of their Territorial public institutions to at this late day desire to surrender control to others. * * * Arizonans desire admission to statehood, feeling sure that, under the stimulus given by the more stable form of government, Arizona will rapidly forge to the front and soon become one of the most prosperous of all the States of our Republic. They feel without exception that a union with the Territory of New Mexico as one State, by whatever name it may be known, would make a State too unwieldy for the proper administration of public affairs; that such a union would be disastrous to all concerned, and would be rather an obstacle than a help to progressive advancement for either.

And in his last report, for the year ended June 30, 1904, after the bill under discussion had been passed by the House, the governor of Arizona says (p. 14):

Finding themselves confronted with a plan to unite their Territory with New Mexico, the people of Arizona have protested vigorously, and they will continue to do so until they have defeated this repugnant scheme. The injustice of it should readily appeal to all. * * *

The two Territories, as they stand, are different in many ways. They have little in common; their lands are dissimilar. It is doubtful if they could ever become reconciled to exist under one form of State government.

* * * I can not add to the protest that has already been made by the people of the Territory of Arizona against this reprehensible measure, and I have only to say that they would desire that their Commonwealth remain a Territory indefinitely rather than be joined with New Mexico. They desire to come into the Union as the State of Arizona, with the present Territorial boundary, and until, in the wisdom of the nation's legislators, they are permitted to do this, they are content to remain as they are, trusting in the justice of the future years to bring the boon so earnestly sought.

I have repeated these quotations to emphasize the opposition and repugnance of these people of New Mexico to the combination. But Arizona is not more opposed to the consolidation than are the people of New Mexico.

From Governor Otero, a Republican in affiliation, the appointee of President McKinley, comes a not less emphatic protest:

There is no doubt that the great majority of the people of New Mexico are opposed to joining New Mexico and Arizona into one Commonwealth, as is proposed by pending legislation. Even the small percentage who would acquiesce in such a consolidation prefer single and separate statehood for each Territory. This is not due to any innate animosity between the two Territories, but to the inherent differences in population, in legislation, in industries, in contour, in ideals, and from an historic and ethnologic standpoint, not to mention that the consolidation of two Commonwealths like New Mexico and Arizona into one is unprecedented in American history.

And again, Mr. President—

The new State would be an unnatural and an unwilling alliance. It would be the coercion of two populations, which are unlike in character, in ambition, and largely in occupation. The union would be abhorrent to both. Simply because the two populations are in the Southwest the country should not suppose that they are alike or sympathetic.

The latest appeal to the Senate of the United States comes while we are debating the bill, and voices "the intensity of feeling" and the "loathing" of the people toward this union.

The president of the Bar Association of Arizona, in transmitting the resolutions of the Bar Association of Arizona, writes:

In this time of our peril we appeal to the Senate of the United States, and to each individual member thereof, not to put upon the people of Arizona the blight which this odious union will entail.

Adding that—

The people of this Territory are homogeneous, with similar tastes, ideals, and ambitions, and they have at great sacrifice established and maintained appropriate educational and charitable institutions conformable to those ideals and ambitions, and they desire the opportunity to work out their own destiny in accordance with those ideals.

There is nothing in common between the people of Arizona and those of New Mexico, and the topography of the country interdicts all intercourse and all interchange of commodities or ideas.

The combined area of the two Territories is too great for the convenient and economical administration of government.

The inhabitants of this Territory differ from those of New Mexico in race, government, ideas, political ambitions, and otherwise to such an extent as to make it impossible for the people of the two Territories to unite in harmonious conduct of a State government.

We therefore implore you not to lend your countenance or assistance to the passage of this measure, which, if it becomes a law, will practically disfranchise and enslave as progressive, loyal, and patriotic a body of American citizens as any whom the members of your honorable body represent.

Separate, independent statehood has ever been the hope of our people, yet we willingly, gladly consent to defer the fruition of that hope indefinitely rather than incur the irremediable disaster of the submergence of our identity which the proposed union with New Mexico would entail.

And the Bar Association, a body of able and enlightened lawyers intrusted, in part, with the administration of laws and the dispensing of justice and right, are not less pronounced and emphatic in their protest against the combination.

Resolution.

The Arizona Bar Association, of Arizona, at a meeting held at the capital of the Territory, on December 27, 1904, adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That this association protest against the admission of Arizona and New Mexico as one State into the Union, and offers this protest against the passage of the bill now pending on the following grounds:

First. It violates our sense of local pride; sentimental possibly, but a sentiment underlying and necessary to loyalty, patriotism, and the higher aspirations for good government and good citizenship.

Second. It subjects us to the domination of a majority heretofore strangers to us, living under different institutions, observing different customs, having different laws and different rules of property as to its acquisition, enjoyment, and disposition, subject to different environment, having different trade relations, and the larger proportion of whom can not and do not understand, speak, or write the English language.

Third. That such union involves either a concession by that majority of their laws, customs, and habits or an abandonment by us of ours, and the consequent unsettling of our laws and jurisprudence, which are the growth of nearly half a century of different, distinct, and separate government, and by experience shown to be adapted and adaptable to our institutions, customs, habits, and peculiar wishes.

Fourth. The union of these two Territories would create a State the area of which would be greater than Iowa, Michigan, New York, and all the New England States combined. This would entail extraordinary expenditure of money and time in the transaction of public business, working hardship and more or less operating to deprive us of participation in the transaction of our public affairs. It is, we submit, a cardinal principle of American institutions that the more nearly within the actual observation of the people the functions of a government are exercised, and the greater facility afforded them for actually participating therein, the safer those institutions are and the more economically, honestly, efficiently, and capably they are carried on.

These considerations principally, perhaps others, more than forty years ago induced a Congress of the United States to establish the government of the Territory of Arizona separate and apart from that of New Mexico. The lapse of time has not, we submit, rendered these reasons of less efficiency, but has, on the contrary, not only justified the act of that Congress, but emphasized and made more apparent and urgent the reasons that then prompted the separation. The proposed enabling act is violently opposed to our wishes and, as we deem it, will necessarily result in the subversion of our rights.

We therefore respectfully but most earnestly protest against the passage of the proposed law, implicitly believing that in so doing we express the sentiment of the vast and overwhelming majority of our people.

And as members of this honorable profession we appeal to the Congress of the United States that, as a matter of right and justice, this distasteful union be not imposed upon an unwilling people.

These are the views of recognized organs of public opinion in positions of trust and confidence, with opportunities of ascertaining the desires and aspirations of the people of each Territory; and they are positive and emphatic in protest and opposition to the blunder in legislation which this consolidation proposes that Congress shall make.

Those expressions of public opinion in the Territories in opposition to the consolidation are confronted only with the reports of majorities of two committees of Congress, composed of gentlemen with neither part nor lot in the future of these peoples, strangers to their laws and institutions, unfamiliar with the magnificent distances that separate their communities, but regarding an increase in the membership of the Senate as paramount to the prosperity and happiness of the millions of peo-

ple who, in the present as well as in the future, must bear the burden of the consolidation through all future times; for, once in the Union, neither the laws nor the Constitution provide a remedy, however great may be the evils resulting from consolidation.

The Democratic party has neither part nor lot in any political reason for consolidating two people with one State.

We stand with Jefferson in the ordinance of 1787, with Polk in 1849, with Buchanan in 1857, with Lincoln in 1863, and McKinley when he endorsed and ran on his platform for President, and upon that record of expansion which opens wide the door of the Union to every qualified Territory, regardless of the effect on the membership of the Senate; but we take no part in any ligamentary combination of peoples whose previous civilization and training unfit them for consolidation in vast empires of area.

The Democratic party has ever recognized that home rule was the inherent right of every organized people; and that as the people of the Territories grew in numbers, increased in wealth, and improved in educational facilities, and stood on a fair footing in these particulars with the States they were entitled by their inherent right of home rule to admission in the Union, regardless of any effect or influence on the membership of the Senate. It has been the policy of the Democratic party to shorten the period of probation and advance the time of admission because the idea of government by Congress of a distant people was repugnant to our conception of home rule.

President Polk in 1849, more than half a century ago, recognized that New Mexico was entitled to admission into the Union. What has been gained by the long delay which has held that people in a Territorial condition? It would tax the political ingenuity of a Senator to specify in what particular either the people of New Mexico or of the United States had been benefited by the denial of statehood to that Territory for fifty-six years. During all that period its people have paid the same Federal taxes that were collected of the people of the States. Its citizens responded with promptness to every call to the national defense. They were ever ready to perform every duty demanded of the people of the States. They have subdued the wilderness and made the desert places to blossom and fruit by the waters of irrigation. They have not failed in the performance of any duty, and yet they have been kept in a state of hope and expectancy while a less brave and stubborn people would have given up in despair. And now, in the ripeness of time, they see their hope of home rule dashed by a ligamentary connection with another people.

And how is it with Arizona? More than forty years ago the Republican party separated Arizona from New Mexico. The reasons for that separation are existent to-day—the same mountain range divides the Territories. But, for some unavowed reason, certain members of the present Republican party rebuke Mr. Lincoln and his advisers for dividing the Territories and by bill reunite what Mr. Lincoln divided, because that strange and inconsistent policy will keep down the membership of the Senate.

I can discover no other reason for combining people who were separated half a century ago, in which time the physical and natural conditions of their situation have developed institutions different from those of New Mexico, with which Arizona is again to be combined, with the result that only two Senators instead of four may be returned and become members of this body.

Oklahoma, a truly American community, has developed a remarkable prosperity, with institutions framed along American lines. She, too, is to be handicapped with carrying the Indian Territory into a new State.

The scheme for a combination of Territories seems to have gone through a process of development. In its infancy it took the shape of an "irrevocable ordinance," by which Oklahoma was to bind the people for all time to accept the Indian Territory at the pleasure of Congress.

What is an "irrevocable ordinance" in popular governments? Does the term mean that one legislature or one constitution can bind forever the coming generations from shaping their fundamental constitution to suit the exigencies that time may develop—that they are to be bound hand and foot in the shackles which the present generation may think proper to forge for them?

The so-called "irrevocable ordinance" has been abandoned and the plan of consolidation adopted, notwithstanding the declaration (in Report No. 2206, pt. 1) that the "admission of each Territory is a proposition standing by itself" and that "they are incapable of consideration bunched together."

The Democratic party has from the inception of the scheme of consolidation set its face in positive opposition, and that opposition was expressed most forcibly by the minority of the Com-

mittee on Territories which I had the honor to report in the second session of the Fifty-seventh Congress (Report 2335) in concise terms. The minority of the committee made no report at this session. A motion to recommit for that purpose was denied by the majority in the Senate, but on a former occasion they did make a report, from which I quote:

It has long been a settled doctrine of American polity, founded in wisdom and justice, that a Territory of the Union is, upon organization, clothed with the inchoate right of ultimate statehood—a right to be exercised in the discretion of Congress when the Territory is capable, by reason of its resources and population, to assume the duties and obligations of a free State.

The denial of this right, the reversal of this policy by an arbitrary exercise of power by Congress in forcing an unnatural union of Territories against the will of their people, the forcible union of peoples distinct in custom, habits, manner, and religion, is ultraradical and revolutionary.

Even more than that—it is the surrender of the power that four sovereign States would exercise in the Union if constitutional methods, as heretofore, were orderly followed in the admission of States. It is the last effort to minimize the influence of the West and Southwest in the citadel of Federal power, the United States Senate.

We are of the opinion that it will ultimately be better for the Union that the Territories opposed to consolidation shall be denied statehood under the theory of this bill indefinitely than the conditions that will be forced by an unnatural union should exist.

Mr. President, we find these Territories of Arizona and New Mexico lying side by side in the southwestern part of the country. They occupy in extent about 6 degrees of latitude, the northern line of which is on a line with the southern part of Kentucky and the southern part on a line with New Orleans, and is productive of cotton, sugar, cereals, vegetation, and fruits that are produced within that territorial range.

It is a vast extent of territory. It is about 800 miles, as the light gleams or the bird flies, from east to west, its longitude, as shown on the map, being 840 miles. There are 113,000 square miles in Arizona and a hundred and twenty two thousand square miles in New Mexico. Combined they make about 240,000 square miles.

It has been the policy of this Government to minimize the area of new States, instead of enlarging it. I believe that has been the case with many of our States. Take, for instance, Vermont. She came from eastern New York. And what was one of the principal reasons for making the State of Vermont?

If you will examine the records you will find that Vermont was taken from New York because it was said that the State of New York was too large and had too much power. There was much feeling about it, and the Government of the United States gave \$30,000 to New York as a bonus in the deal. Vermont, then, was taken off New York because New York was too large. That was the main reason urged, as will be found by an examination of the records.

Again, look at Massachusetts. Her territory extended far out northeast up the shore of the Atlantic Ocean, making an extended territory. The result was Maine was taken off of Massachusetts. Why? Because the area of Massachusetts was deemed unwieldy and inconvenient, and thus the area of Massachusetts was lessened.

Again, go south and you find there the Territory of Mississippi with its amazing production. Alabama was a part of Mississippi. Mississippi was considered too large and unwieldy for convenience and economy, and Alabama had to be stricken off and made a separate State. She is now one of the most flourishing, beautiful, and attractive States in this land of ours. Truly it fulfills the significance of the word "Alabama"—"Here we rest."

Again, Mr. President, see this very Territory over which we are contending—Arizona. The reasons of Mr. Lincoln and those given in the various speeches, especially by Senator Wade and others who discussed it at length, have been read by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], and I will not reiterate them. The main reason was that it was too large and that it should be minimized. The consensus of opinion by those Senatorial philosophers was that New Mexico should be divided so they could make a convenient and economical government of it by establishing the Territory of Arizona. Such was the case.

They have gone on in that Territorial government under the full belief that in due time it would become a State, and they have built up a large statehouse at an immense cost to those people. Now it is proposed to sweep that away and to put the capital at Santa Fe, a distance of more than 800 miles from the western part of that Territory to this capital, where a citizen would have to go to attend to any business connected with the State.

Such is the situation now, and such is the proposition in this bill. It is to reunite the two large Territories of Arizona and New Mexico, with their immense area combined of 235,000 square miles.

Not only are these vast areas unwieldy and inconvenient each in itself, but each of them has all the elements for a great State. Look for a moment at the vast and varied resources of these two Territories and see if each has not all the elements essential for a great State. I do not now care to particularize as to New Mexico, for that has already been done, ably and minutely, by Senators. It has been said in this debate that we should give statehood to New Mexico and let Arizona remain as she is. This would do injustice to Arizona, but this would be far better than to combine the two and thus swallow up the legal existence of Arizona and blot her out for all time. Some amendments to this bill are to that effect, to which I may refer hereafter. But as to Arizona, Mr. President, it is a fact that in Arizona the productions are absolutely amazing. She has her rivers, her mountains, her valleys; she has her desert, and she has the canyons in the sides of her mountains, where, in the natural progress of events, there will be reservoirs of waters established for the purpose of irrigation, and they will make that land bloom and blossom as a garden. There are greater possibilities for Arizona, in my opinion, than for any Territory in the United States, or even any State. The power irrigation will produce upon the soil is absolutely wonderful.

Look at her grasses and see the fat cattle that range her hills and browse on her mountain sides. See her railroads. She has two trunk lines, one the Southern Pacific and the other the Atlantic and Pacific, or the Santa Fe, as it is known. Those cross that mountain which is the natural barrier between Arizona and New Mexico, which nature's hand placed there, and which was recognized by President Buchanan, recognized by James K. Polk, and recognized and established and organized by Mr. Lincoln when the Arizona Territorial bill was passed by the Congress and signed by President Lincoln in 1863.

So you see, Mr. President, there are absolutely planted by the hand of nature distinct features, pointing as plain as fingerboards the way of single statehood to Arizona. What God has indicated should lead us. That mountain range—the Continental Divide—is the line now between the two and should so remain. There is the Perca River, running to the east from one side and to the west from the other side of this Continental Divide. The waters running east, strange as it may seem, after flowing for a distance of thousands of miles, find their way to the Gulf of Mexico, and at last make a part of that Gulf Stream which flows across the Atlantic Ocean. On the other side is the other Perca, just beyond the mountain where the Southern Pacific Railroad crosses, and you find that the waters run in the other direction and strike in the end the Colorado River, which is a large, splendid river coursing down through the southwestern part of this Territory, and finally finding its way into the Gulf of California and then into the Pacific Ocean.

So you see the barrier by which nature has divided these Territories, and you act in violation of nature when you put them together. They can not be united with safety in a political sense. They can not be united for the benefit of each other in a commercial sense. They can not be united with each other for the public good, and therefore should be kept apart.

See the fruit which is a profitable product in the western part of Arizona. It is wonderful. It has been said that no spot on earth produces as great a variety and to the same extent of development as the fruit Arizona produces upon her western slope, where the production of oranges, figs, limes, lemons, and all citrous fruits, pineapples, and all those southern fruits is remarkable.

There she is. Go to her mountains. Who has not seen upon the sides of the mountains of Arizona and New Mexico the splendid fruit in the way of apples that have been sent here, said to be the finest in the world? Orchards have been established there that are said to contain thousands of acres, and immense fortunes are being made. But it is not of the possibilities that I speak, but probabilities.

Now, take the water that will soon come through these canyons, which will become reservoirs and give nature's rain at will to these arid regions, and you will find them to bloom, beautify, and smile as genial as springtime. The Nile supported 60,000,000 people by her irrigation. India has become a garden in some spots by virtue of irrigation. Irrigation is almost as much of a wonder worker as electricity, and, Mr. President, when it is applied even moderately to Arizona, you will find that Arizona has no superior on this continent in her productions and her attractiveness.

Not only that, but her climate, especially on her elevated mesas and mountain sides, is delightful in many parts and is as a balm of Gilead to throat and lung trouble. It is the spot of the earth to which those unfortunates go and find relief.

Now, Mr. President, the distance is 800 miles from east to west as the bird flies or as the light gleams. Yes, it is 800 miles from Yuma, Ariz., to Santa Fe, the capital of the com-

bined States; and you propose to put them together by force, against the indication of nature, against the express will of the people, denying "home rule" to free and intelligent American citizens in violation of the policy of this Government, which has been from 1787 to lessen the territorial capacity and make solid small States that would be convenient and economical.

Such has been the policy of this Government for a hundred years. Now, will you violate it in this instance—the baldest instance, too, that ever occurred—because the territorial expanse is greater? Then why should it be done? What is the reason for it? Where is the political reason why you should propose to do it?

Mr. President, I do not believe it will be done. I believe that it will take the course of Dakota and other Territories. I saw sitting before me just now the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]. I remember well his speech on the division of the Dakotas, for I heard it and have read it since. The speech referred to he made here in the Senate in 1888 in regard to the division and admission of Dakota. I have it before me, and it is so much better than I can express it in giving his reasons therefor that I beg permission to read a part of it.

When the question of the admission of Dakota was up with its large territory, it became a question very much the same we have now before the Senate as to whether it was not unwieldy and as to whether it was proper for it to remain in that condition with its broad area or whether it should be divided into two separate States under separate governments. That was the question involved, and Congress decided that it would divide it; and the most potential effect was the influence of the Senator from Connecticut, who has honored himself and honored his State and honored the Senate by a long service here. He it was who brought about, perhaps more than any other, the division of Dakota, and I am anxious when we reach the point to hear his vote on this question. I think it and believe he will be in favor of dividing these two large Territories and be on a line of consistency—"consistency is a jewel"—not to consolidate and combine them into one State.

The Senator from Connecticut on that occasion said what I shall read.

By the way, the Territory of Dakota was not so large as this, but it made 149,000 square miles, 72,000 in North Dakota, or what was then called "Lincoln Territory," and 77,000 in the southern part, which is now South Dakota, and which is ably represented in this Senate.

The two combined made 149,000 square miles, while New Mexico has 122,000 square miles, and Arizona has 113,000 square miles, and the two combined, as this bill seeks to do, would make a State containing 235,000 square miles. I contend that there is greater reason for dissolving them or keeping them apart and allowing them to be admitted as two independent States than in the case of the Dakotas. So thought the Senator from Connecticut. This discussion touching the Dakotas will be found in the Congressional Globe, No. 90, volume 19, part 3, page 2802, and subsequent pages. The Senator from Connecticut in that discussion uses the following strong language:

This leaves, as it seems to me, two questions only for discussion. First, should the Territory be divided? Second, should South Dakota be admitted now? To each of these questions the majority of the committee—

He fortified himself by referring to the action of the committee having the matter in charge—

To each of these questions the majority of the committee render a most unhesitating answer, Yes; the Territory should be divided—

"The Territory should be divided," he says— and while I would respect the wishes of the inhabitants of the Territory to a great extent—

I hope he will hear this—

I am so strongly convinced that the Territory ought to be divided that, even against the wishes of a large portion of the population, I should feel that it ought to be divided for the benefit of the nation and for the future security of the rights of the other States in the Union.

Could language be stronger? Again, continuing straight along, he said:

It is too large for one State.

That was 149,000 square miles, while New Mexico and Arizona combined is 235,000 square miles. One hundred and forty-nine thousand is too large, he says. If so, the other is twice too large.

The Senator from Connecticut continues:

It is too large for one State. It is larger than anybody ever thought of making one State, with two exceptions. It is larger than anybody ever thought of making an agricultural State, with one exception, and that is the State of Texas, to which I shall allude further on.

I imagine that Senators do not realize the extent of that Territory or the size of the State which would be framed by admitting the whole

as a single State. When I say that it is 430 miles long from north to south and 400 miles from east to west, we do not even then get an idea of what a vast area that gives. We can get it only by comparison.

The whole Territory of Dakota is very much larger, and aside from the commercial advantages to be derived from a seacoast, which it lacks, it is as capable of sustaining a population as England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. Those four countries, comprising Great Britain, have 122,157 square miles.

Just the size exactly, do you not see, of New Mexico alone without uniting it with Arizona. The Senator from Connecticut continues:

The Territory of Dakota has by the Tenth Census 149,100 square miles, so that as one State it would embrace, in round numbers, 27,000 square miles more than the United Kingdom of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. It is practically as large as New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia. Just think—

Says the Senator from Connecticut—

Just think for a moment of putting those Territories into one State.

Here it is proposed to make one State out of these two Territories, which you see is more than half as large again.

The Senator from Connecticut further says:

Aside from the fact that it has no seacoast, it is as capable of supporting as large a population as those States.

It seems to me that when Senators seriously realize the area which this immense State (Dakota) would possess they can not but come to the conclusion that even if the sentiment of the people were adverse to it and the people had a dream of empire to grow out of the admission of such a great State, yet Congress, having reference to the physical equality of all the States, if I may use that term, ought not to think of admitting one State into the Union so capable of sustaining a dense population.

Now, Mr. President, this speech of Senator PLATT of Connecticut as to dividing the Dakotas into two States, because it was too large for one State, is stronger and more conclusive in favor of keeping apart New Mexico and Arizona than I could make, and I adopt it, although it comes from a Republican source. It is a stronger argument than I could make or anyone else, perhaps, in the Senate upon the very Territorial question which we are discussing. That was made upon Dakota, and Dakota, as I showed to you, contained more than half less the number of square miles than these two combined, and was but a little larger than New Mexico. New Mexico has 122,000 square miles and Arizona has 113,000 square miles. Both Lincoln Territory and South Dakota had only 149,000 square miles. What was then Lincoln Territory subsequently became North Dakota. So there was necessity there, and the Senator from Connecticut saw it and the whole country saw it, to divide its vast area into two States; to let them multiply the members of the Senate as often as they pleased. They were entitled to it and they got it; and I say these Territories are entitled to it and ought to have it.

Now, Mr. President, where did this territory come from to us? I do not care to go into the archaeological history of this remarkable country or allude to the prehistoric people who inhabited it. However seductive the sentimentality may be for some reference to the ancient cliff dwellers, I shall not indulge it now.

I do not know how old it is, but the first we knew of it in connection with our country was after the Mexican war. It was won by the blood and treasure and lives of many of the best citizens who lived under the flag of our country.

Mr. President, it affords me pleasure to state to the eloquent young Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] that his ancestors and their friends, no doubt, stood by our flag along with Tennesseans to win this very territory. Gen. Joe Lane, of Indiana, commanded a brigade in that war, with Col. Jim Lane, of Indiana. Colonel Wynkoop, of Pennsylvania, and Colonel Cheat-ham, of Tennessee, at one time composed General Lane's brigade. Hard by were Ohioans, Kentuckians, and Illinoisans. It would be no invidious distinction nor out of place for me to say in this connection, as it is history, that Illinois furnished in the war with Mexico more soldiers than any other State, not excepting my own State of Tennessee—the Volunteer State. Illinois had only between one and two hundred more than Tennessee, out of several thousand each. Missouri, perhaps, raised more than any, but did not get them all in the active field before Mexico was overrun. So you see, Mr. President, this land over which this contest is so unjustifiably raised was won by a combined effort. We won it in battle; we won it by the blood and treasure of our common countrymen. It was a patriotic movement, and we are jointly entitled to the territory.

Yes, Mr. President, it was won fairly, honestly, and patriotically and it will remain as a part of this Government, and we ought to take care of it, and give it every opportunity and advantage which any other Territory has had. We should treat it generously and justly, and rise above party and local prejudice and mete out justice as to other Territories, and make a State there, so as to let them increase in power and usefulness.

It is in part the fruit of the bold and vigorous charge made

on the black fort at Monterey. It is alike the fruit of the bloody fighting amid the hills of Buena Vista, when General Taylor drove Santa Anna and his forces from the Rio Grande line. Another step toward the possession of this vast territory, over which we now dispute, was seen at Vera Cruz, when the guns of General Scott silenced the Mexican batteries. And again, when General Scott, that grand and grim old warrior, with his compact little army, confronted Santa Anna and his double-shotted cannon on the old bald hills of Cerro Gordo and drove him helter-skelter from this stronghold and followed him to the blood-stained lava beds of Contreras and Churubusco. The sun-bright plains of Molino del Rey were darkly stained with American blood. From there through the park at the base of Chapultepec was a thorny path, and when the charge up the hill of Chapultepec accomplished its object and the flag floated out from the white castle that sat upon the crown of Chapultepec as a tiara upon the crown of a queen, the halls of the Montezumas, with their romance and reality, were surrendered to the American Army. All this blood and toil helped to give title to the territory which is the cause of this unjust and unwise contention.

This was territory which came from those struggles, and we should respect it for the memory of them. We should do justice to it. They have become our people by virtue of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and we should respect them. We should do justice to them and see that their Territory is made into a State.

Mr. President, Arizona will be an honor to this country whenever we give it an opportunity. Let the irrigation floods come and let those sandy plains be watered. Then you will see what it will produce. The result will astonish the country.

Furthermore, Mr. President, see the coal fields that are in Arizona. Look at the copper mines there—said to be superior to any in the world. It is said that there is more copper in Arizona than elsewhere in the world within the same extent of territory, and that it is of the finest quality. We have all that in this Territory. We have this great divide—in mountain form—and in them we have the canyons, in which we can make reservoirs from which to irrigate the plains and bring them out, making of it a wonderland. This is not only in the possibilities; it is in the probabilities; and I believe in a few years, if we deal justly with this Territory, this will be done.

But we can not do it if we hamper her and put her under the dominion of New Mexico, for this very bill gives power to New Mexico to hamper and neutralize the progress of Arizona. It gives her a majority in her constitutional convention, and that will give New Mexico a majority in her legislature. She may legislate selfishly or not; I do not know; but at least it gives a majority strength over Arizona.

So she has more coal, more copper ore, and then she has more qualities to produce grass and fat cattle that graze upon her hundred hills, and, besides all that, I wish to emphasize the fact that the hand of nature divides her. Nature planted those mountains there—the Continental Divide. The lowest point which divides this mountain range is 4,800 feet. The waters from one side run to the Atlantic and from the other to the Pacific. Nature did all that, and you are doing violence to nature whenever you seek to force these two Territories together to intermarry these parties and fasten them like the Siamese twins, so that the death of one will be the death of the other, for the legal ligament by which this bill seeks to join them could not be cut. It fastens them for life—no divorce can separate them. These mountains divide them. Nature planted them there, and do not let us refuse to obey the indication of nature or disdain her teaching in legislating for these Territories.

Mr. President, there are some amendments to this bill. I decline, however, to discuss those amendments now, and for the very sufficient reason that the Senators who introduced the amendments have not been heard from in regard to them, and I do not want to pass judgment upon an amendment offered by anyone to this bill until I shall hear the reasons for it. Therefore I can only allude to the fact that there are amendments to it—one by my friend over there from California [Mr. BARD], whose speech captured the Senate the other day as much as I have seen one do, with his modest merit and his plain statements of facts and arguments, which added to his justly earned reputation.

Another amendment has been offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], which nobody can possibly object to at the proper time when it comes in. It leaves the voice of the people to regulate this question. It is a home-rule amendment. I am not going to discuss it. Then there is the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], who has an amendment that is full of merit, in my opinion, but I decline to discuss it, because he desires to say something in regard to it himself before we have any action

touching it. Then, again, there is an amendment by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON], which is full of merit. You can see it. I want to hear him discuss it before we pass judgment upon it. Then there is the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], which admits Oklahoma, the State which has sprung up in so short a time, like magic.

Ah, Mr. President, Oklahoma is almost equal to California. There it is now with its half a million people, and probably the Indian Territory has half a million people. I do not know what course you may take about that; I for one do not believe in putting Indian Territory in with it, for reasons that I propose to give later on in this discussion.

I hope that which is thought best by a majority of the Senate will be done in this important matter. These States might jump into statehood as California did, if I may so speak; for California, as Senators will remember, jumped into statehood as a roe bounds before the hunter in the darksome glade or the shadowy forests. California came in with her Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys and her Forty-niners and claimed statehood without ceremony, and got it. And, Mr. President, when she did come with her broad coast-line territory and her Golden Gate, she brought with her apples of gold on platters of silver from Nevada; and on that silver platter of Nevada she emptied her golden apples into the Treasury of the United States without fee or asking for it. California, I repeat, sprang into statehood, as Minerva sprang from the brain of Jove, full panoplied, and found a warm welcome and a safe home in the Union; and so ought these other Territories without going through the usual slow process of years to which they have been subjected. But they have seen fit to take this course and have appealed in a legal and modest way to the country—to the House of Representatives first and then to the Senate; and I hope the Senate will give such a response as will be just to all parties and in the end give a warm welcome to each of these Territories as a sister State.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I think this an opportune time to direct the attention of Senators who are opposed to the bill to the fact that a time for voting might now be fixed upon, which would give an opportunity to the Senators whom the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] stated desire yet to be heard, and have a time fixed for voting after they are heard. I assume that will be—

Mr. BATE. I did not hear the latter part of the Senator's remark in regard to fixing a time for Senators to be heard.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I say that the Senator from Tennessee adverted to the fact, in closing his very able, eloquent, and interesting address, that there are other Senators who desire to be heard. I take it for granted, in view of what has passed both in open Senate and between Senators and myself privately, that now is an opportune time to fix a date at some future time when a vote may be had—a sufficient time ahead to give an opportunity to the Senators whom the Senator from Tennessee mentioned, and others who may desire to speak, to be heard upon the bill. I suggest to the Senator that perhaps next Friday would be a good day, and there would be sufficient time intervene—

Mr. TELLER. Oh, no.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I refer to this coming Friday.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, no.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am not particular about that date. I have suggested that date because the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] is going away on the following day, and he desires to be present when the vote is taken. I suggest either that day or a week later. I am not particular.

Mr. CARMACK. I suggest to the Senator that it is contrary to precedent to fix a day for a vote on the statehood bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, I want to know whether the Senator from Tennessee approves of the precedent to which he refers, and whether he expects to follow it?

Mr. CARMACK. I do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the very first assurance of that kind I have had, for I have been privately assured, and have been acting upon the understanding, I will say—and the Senator will bear me out—both in private conversation and in open Senate, that after a reasonable discussion there would be no objection to fixing a date on which the final vote might be taken. I, of course, am not particular about any special date.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Indiana has made reference to the fact that I am going away, and ask some favors in this matter, I rise to say that I do have to go out of the city the last of the week—perhaps Saturday—and shall be gone about a week.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] objected to fixing Friday.

Mr. FORAKER. I think I can be back for a vote on Friday of next week.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That will be satisfactory to me, if it be satisfactory to other Senators.

Mr. FORAKER. I think Saturday would suit me a little better.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Say a week from Saturday, then.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I do not believe that we can now fix a day for a final vote on this bill. I recognize the anxiety of the young Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] to get rid of what must be a burden to him. He has conducted this case very ably so far, and devoted a great deal of energy and assiduity to it, but we are about, as I understand, to resolve ourselves into an impeachment court. I have heard to-day that the House managers will appear to-morrow, and then I suppose the Senate will immediately take some order as to procedure. When that court is organized, I do not suppose the Senate will interrupt its judicial functions to hear any more legislative discussion until it has concluded that matter.

I recollect but one impeachment trial, and that was in the second term of President Grant. The President pro tempore of the Senate [Mr. FRYE] was then a Member of the House of Representatives, as was also the other Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], and some who are now here were members of the Senate at that time, and will remember, but I do not recall exactly what was then done. My impression, however, is that after the managers of the House of Representatives had moved the impeachment the Senate proceeded to the hearing, and that it was not interrupted by any other business. I presume the coming impeachment trial will have to be interrupted by the counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice-President of the United States. In view of the probable situation, I simply suggest to the Senator from Indiana that it would be risky to fix a date for voting on the pending bill; for we might have to fix another date, and then another. I think we might just as well await the progress of events.

I will say, besides, that there are some gentlemen who, being interested in this question, may desire to be heard, and I am one of them. I have become so much interested in it that I think it very likely that I myself shall make a few appropriate remarks. I do not know how many more are in that condition of mind. I can not say when I shall be able to speak. I do not know but that I am interfering in this matter, not being a member of the committee. I hope not, however. I do not know that the other side are particularly serious about the passage of this measure. I do not know whether they intend to do anything or not at this session or at any other regarding it; but I do not doubt the sincerity of the Senator in charge of the measure in pressing it.

In view of all these circumstances, I hope the Senator from Indiana will not insist on fixing the time now. Let us see what we are going to do with the impeachment case; and then it will be time enough, I think, to consider the fixing of a positive date to vote on this important matter.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, the Senate has not been favored with the presence of my distinguished friend from Mississippi very much since the holidays, or I am sure he would not have said that I had shown any particular earnestness or haste in pressing this measure. For that there was a reason. Senators have expressed to me privately their appreciation of the courtesy shown them by doing whatever was required from time to time, by adjourning, going into executive session, and even occupying time ourselves, which, I will say to the Senator from Mississippi, was done upon the personal assurance of Senators active in charge of the opposition to the bill that after a reasonable discussion, expecting to come to a vote this session, they would agree upon the fixing of a date. I accepted that assurance from several Senators, who gave it to me personally. The Senator will remember—the whole Senate will remember—that the same assurance was publicly given by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], who is universally recognized as the leader on that side upon the floor of the Senate. Accepting these assurances without a single question that they would be kept—and I have no doubt that they will be—I will say to the Senator that at no time has the bill been unduly pressed.

Mr. MONEY. The Senator will allow me to say right there that in the language I used I intended to be complimentary to him on account of his character and industry and energy, and that I did not intend to say, and did not say, that he had been in haste or anything of the sort.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am obliged to the Senator.

Mr. MONEY. I only mentioned the fact simply because I have been unfortunate in having been sick myself and in having sickness in my family. I came here without much infor-

mation about the matter. I freely acknowledge that. I have not intimated yet, nor do I intend to do so, that the Senator has failed in any courtesy to this side of the House, but I say that I am totally uninformed as to any private agreement that might have been entered into, and I will yield if the Senator says that is the case, to the leader of the Senate on this side, and leave to him entirely the fixing of a date. I only objected in my own behalf. So far as I am concerned personally, I am entirely willing to forego making any speech on the subject. I am not particular about that at all.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I shall be delighted to hear the Senator make a speech, as not only myself but all other Senators always are. I was merely taking this method of informing the Senator of occurrences of which I was sure he was in ignorance, they having transpired during his absence. I think the Senator will find that the disposition upon his side of the Chamber, as well as upon this side of the Chamber, is that there shall be no special delay about coming to a vote.

It was suggested when we last had this subject up—and since then I have not asked that a date be fixed—as I think the RECORD will show, that after a few days of discussion, when Senators shall have had an opportunity of presenting their arguments, and the arguments are before the Senate—I think now every argument has been presented that can be presented, unless perhaps the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] has some arguments with reference to his amendment—we could all get together and agree upon a day for a vote. I say that has been the universal understanding, expressed to me not only privately, but also publicly by the leader on the other side of the Chamber. I have acted in full faith upon that assurance, and therefore have not held the bill before the Senate unreasonably, as I think all Senators will agree, an appreciation of which fact they have personally expressed to me.

Now, I say to the Senator from Mississippi that I informed him of these facts, which he states he was ignorant of and which I was sure he was ignorant of, in order that the general understanding might be carried out. I am not now particularly importunate about any special date. I would not shut off any Senator from a reasonable discussion of this or any other measure. But the measure has now been discussed at considerable length upon one side; there has been only one speech made upon the other side, and perhaps will be but one more, and that a very brief one in closing the debate. Therefore it occurred to me, in view of what the Senator from Maryland had stated when we last had this subject up, that after a few days of discussion had been had we could agree upon a day for a vote. I suggested next Friday because the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] had said that upon the day following he must leave to make an argument before a Federal court and would not return for a week, and he suggested that the vote be taken on the following Saturday. That would leave two weeks during which speeches could be made by Senators who wanted to speak without interfering with the impeachment proceedings in case they should be perfected.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana states that he understood from me that an early day would be fixed to vote upon this bill. I think if he will refer to the RECORD he will find that what I said was this: That so far as I knew, there was no desire to unduly delay this bill, and that when the time arrived—as it always does arrive in the Senate—we would be prepared to vote, and so far as I knew we should be very glad to do so; but, Mr. President, I have stated to the Senator from Indiana in private, and I now say to the Senate, that, in my judgment, this is a case that does not come under the ordinary rule of fixing arbitrarily a day for the final vote on a measure until we shall have had opportunity to vote upon the amendments to it. When a day and hour is fixed for voting, it precludes the possibility of the discussion of important propositions that go to the very vitals of a question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. GORMAN. If the Senator will permit me to finish the sentence, I will then give way to him with great pleasure.

I think there is as great anxiety on this side of the Chamber as there can be on the other side of the Chamber for the admission into the Union of Oklahoma and Indian Territory, singly or combined, and for the admission of New Mexico; but, from the discussion and from statements made on both sides, there seems to be very great opposition to uniting New Mexico and Arizona. There is no possible political phase that affects the proposition to admit Indian Territory and Oklahoma and New Mexico, leaving Arizona out of the question.

Now, in that condition, Mr. President, with a view to reaching some proper conclusion in this matter, I suggest to the Senator from Indiana that we take up and vote upon the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. BARD], the amend-

ment offered by the distinguished Senator from Colorado to my right [Mr. PATTERSON], that of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] in my rear, and that of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER]. Each of those amendments will require discussion, but not unlimited discussion. My belief is that in this way we shall soon test the real sense of the Senate, so that we may know and will know after the votes on these amendments are had what the majority of the Senate desire. As soon as that is ascertained, the rule which has always applied, except upon some great political question—and this is not one—will bring us to a direct vote. Until we arrive at that conclusion, I think it is impossible to fix a time for the final vote on the bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. GORMAN. With great pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Can not the sense of the majority of the Senate be determined when we fix a day to vote, and vote on that day on the bill and amendments?

Mr. GORMAN. I think not, for the very reason I have already given.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What was the Senator's reason?

Mr. GORMAN. Because the amendments can not then be discussed freely.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the question I rose to ask the Senator in the first place. The Senator from Maryland suggested that the reason that could not be done fairly was because it would preclude the possibility of discussing proposed amendments. I will ask the Senator if we should fix the later date suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], whether in that interim every amendment offered to this bill could not be thoroughly discussed? There would be abundant time to discuss the amendments. We are told by the Senator himself that the bill itself has been discussed at considerable length. Is not that true? Is there any reason why these amendments should not be discussed if we fix the date at two weeks from now, as the Senator from Ohio has suggested?

Mr. GORMAN. The result of an agreement of that kind would probably be to preclude the real discussion of the amendments.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That would only be, I suggest to the Senator, in case the Senators who have proposed amendments do not desire to speak on them. That is within their own power, is it not?

Mr. GORMAN. I suggest to the Senator, if he wants to expedite this matter—and I am as anxious about it as he can possibly be—all the committee amendments, as I understand, having been concluded, that we shall at once proceed to take up and debate, for instance, the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to my right [Mr. PATTERSON], and I am quite certain that we can very soon reach the point where we can have a vote on that amendment and dispose of it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator would not make a request of that kind before the debate had been concluded by the chairman or some member of the committee in charge of the bill who resists the amendment, would he? I have been delaying until the debate is concluded, upon the assurance, which, I repeat, has been given me privately and publicly, that after a discussion of some days a time for a vote would be fixed. Therefore, not only have I not interfered, but I have consented to adjournments and executive sessions, and even occupied the time myself for two or three days upon committee amendments. Now the Senator suggests, with much of the debate on his side concluded and the debate not finished at all upon our side—for there has been but one speech made on behalf of the advocates of the bill—that we immediately proceed to vote upon the amendments. Certainly the Senator would not suggest that. That would be hardly fair to the committee, would it?

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I would, of course, be the last Senator in this body to suggest that we proceed to vote on the amendments before the Senator from Indiana and members of the committee on the other side, who favor the proposition for the admission of two States out of four Territories, should have opportunity to make speeches; but I suggest to him that the opportune time will come upon the amendment offered, for instance, by the Senator from Colorado, which goes to the very vitals of the bill of the committee. That amendment provides for the admission of two States, leaving Arizona out.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator suggest that we proceed right now to take up that amendment?

Mr. GORMAN. The Senator could make his argument on that amendment. The question revolves around that proposition, and, in a lesser degree, around the proposition of the Senator from Ohio, which might be accepted if the amendment of the Senator from Colorado were rejected. While some of us—and I for one—regard the amendments of the Senator from

Ohio as a very bad precedent, yet, to prevent what seems in our opinion a great misfortune—the adoption of the proposition to consolidate the two Territories—it would receive a very large vote. It would receive mine, although as an original proposition and standing alone I would not like it.

So I suggest again to the Senator, with these various opinions utterly impossible to be harmonized except by a vote in the determination of the Senate, that the only way, in my judgment, to reach a conclusion is for the Senator to proceed to sum up his case from his standpoint and let us have a vote on one of these amendments which is the very opposite of the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well. I will say again to the Senator that I have been proceeding in perfect good faith that certain speeches would be made, and when they had been made a day for a vote on the bill would be fixed; and that, as is usual, and, so far as I have observed in my brief term in the Senate, an unbroken precedent, the chairman of the committee, having heard all of the speeches or read them all, should proceed to close the debate. That is what I had expected to do. I have been informed that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] desires to speak, and the Senator will do me the justice of saying that I myself protected the Senator from Colorado when he was ill upon the ground that he was going to speak. I have been informed that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] desires to speak. I have not yet read, and was not fortunate in hearing, all of the very able speech of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE], the close of which so charmed us all. When all these speeches, which I had been personally informed were going to be made, had been made, I expected without much delay to prepare what brief remarks I might have in summing up this case. The delivery of those speeches I supposed would probably take this week.

I say that I have gone upon that assurance; otherwise I should be ready to proceed now. That, I see from the Senator's attitude as I make these remarks, is agreeable to his own understanding. That being the case, in view of the Senator's suggestion, why would this not be a reasonable solution: Let us agree on, say, next Saturday, to vote, for example, on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, to which the Senator from Maryland referred, and then the week following, when the Senator from Ohio shall have returned, vote on other amendments and on the bill. In the meantime any Senator can make a speech, and the chairman of the committee, or some Senator for the committee, can briefly sum up the case. Is there objection to that?

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, when I rose to make objection, which I did, to fixing a day certain and an hour certain for the final vote on this measure, I was not aware that any Senator on this side had been invested with power to speak for his colleagues, nor did I know until I was kindly informed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] that any such assurance had been given by anybody. I immediately retreated from my position, though, when I found the matter was in the hands of the leader of the Democratic side. Since then, however, I have found that there has been no conference in regard to the matter, and that nobody has been authorized to speak for this side of the House. I can find nobody who gave any assurance to the Senator from Indiana—of course I do not doubt his word that he had such an assurance—but I can not find the Senator who gave it, and the leader of the minority says the Senator from Indiana certainly misunderstood him. So I do not know how this assurance came to the Senator from Indiana; but I want to say in my own behalf, in vindication of my temerity in undertaking to file an objection—a thing which every Senator has a right to do on his own motion without consulting anybody—that I did so, not from any desire to delay the bill, for I have not kept up with it, but because I understand from good authority that we are about to enter upon the Swaine impeachment trial. I think the Senator from Indiana will agree that during the consideration of that case it may not occur to anybody to make a speech on this or any other question.

Mr. President, I do not yet understand how we can fix a day certain for a vote upon this bill, when everybody here is aware that we are about to enter upon an impeachment trial. Nobody here can say what length of time may be taken in that trial. It would hardly do for the Senate to adjourn before the trial had been concluded, because the new House of Representatives will not have managers authorized to conduct the case. The Senate can continue as a court, because it is a continuing body, but the House would have no managers in the next Congress and the case would fall to the ground. So we must continue the work if we undertake it. If it is the determination of the other side of the House to exculpate the impeached judge, we can have a very short procedure; but I do not believe that is exactly the inten-

tion. I think we want to get at the bottom of the facts in the case and then vote accordingly. So I must say, while my objection may seem rather slight to the Senator from Indiana, that there is a good deal in it, and we can not very well fix a day until some one can authoritatively, in some degree, state when that court is likely to terminate its functions and when we shall resolve ourselves back into a legislative body.

As I said, I should like to speak briefly on this bill, not because it is a matter that needs any elucidation or information from me, but simply because I have been largely in correspondence with and have visited both Arizona and New Mexico, and I have some things to say about them. I want to say that I disagree with some of my Democratic friends, as I understand them. I shall never vote to have any one of the Territories united with another.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is all right.

Mr. MONEY. I am perfectly willing to have any one of these Territories come in separately. I have respect for the moral obligation of a treaty, and our obligation with the Indians is that they shall never be joined with any other State. It is said that that expires this year; but a moral obligation never expires, and it is just as good fifty years from now as it is today. But so many white people have gone to the Indian Territory—about a half million—that they are perfectly competent now—the white men, excluding every Indian—to undertake the care and burden of self-government, and a Territory is such an anomaly in the whole theory of our Government that I am willing to hasten the day when we admit every one of them.

I recollect very well when, as a Member of the House, I insisted, when the Democrats had control there, that the new chairman should introduce a bill admitting every Territory, without regard to its politics or anything else, in order to rid the country of its wardship of a great section of the country fully able to take care of itself.

I share fully the opinions set forth by the eloquent Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] to-day, but I have something more to say upon the subject myself. I am not going to stand in the way of fixing a day, for I do not care anything about it; but I wanted at least to say that I have some rights in this matter, and that when I took the floor it was not with any assumed authority from this side, but in my own right, as a Senator, to make an objection if I saw fit.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything with reference to the proposition to fix a day for voting on this bill, but as some allusion has been made to the fact that the Senate will have to consume some considerable time in the impeachment trial which has been brought to our attention by the House, I desire to say that that to my mind furnishes an almost imperative reason why we should fix an early day for voting upon this bill, and I trust that Senators who are opposed to certain features of the bill will consider the necessity, growing out of the fact that the Senate must devote time to this impeachment trial, of getting this bill out of the way before that really commences.

I assume that Senators do not wish, by any delay or postponement of the time for fixing a vote on this bill, to prevent the bill from being acted upon at this session. I assume that all Senators desire to have this bill acted upon, it having been so long before the Senate and so thoroughly and ably discussed.

Now, as to the time when the Senate will have to commence actually the hearing of the trial upon the impeachment case, it is impossible to say. That is for the Senate to fix. The natural order of proceedings will be that probably on to-morrow the managers from the House will come and present the articles of impeachment. The rules provide that on the next day, or sooner if the Senate so desires, the Senators shall be sworn to try the case, and to all intents and purposes what may be called a court of impeachment be organized. I think, with a view of expediting the matter, that that ought to be done to-morrow, after the managers of the impeachment shall have presented the articles.

Then the next step is to issue a summons to the person impeached to appear. The Senate will have to decide what time shall be fixed for his appearance, and until that day occurs, of course, the legislative business of the Senate will not be interfered with. Then at that time he will appear, and, following the usual precedent, will ask for some time to be fixed within which he may file his answer, and that will be agreed upon, I take it. So that until that time arrives legislative business will not to any considerable extent be interfered with in the Senate. But after that the usual practice has been to designate certain hours during which the Senate should sit in the impeachment proceedings, and during the other hours of the day legislative or executive business would proceed as usual. It is manifest that we shall have to hasten with all possible and practical speed, without doing any injustice to anyone, the proceedings in

the impeachment trial. Having said this much, it does seem to me that Senators on both sides of the Chamber ought to look to the result of getting this bill entirely out of the way before the judge impeached shall come here and file his answer and the actual trial begin. I make these suggestions merely because the matter had been alluded to by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY].

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, it is manifest to my mind from what has been said here that there can not be any agreement on a day to take a vote on this bill and all amendments until some of the amendments which have been offered have been disposed of. I am somewhat taken by surprise by this situation, but that is what has developed.

I think everyone recognizes that the difficulty as to this measure is chiefly with respect to the provisions of the bill in relation to New Mexico and Arizona, providing joint statehood instead of separate statehood. There are some amendments here to strike out all about New Mexico and Arizona, and two or three amendments, I believe, providing for separate statehood for New Mexico; and there is the amendment which I offered a few days ago providing that if this bill pass and become a law there shall be a majority vote in each of the Territories upon the question of adopting the constitution that is to be framed; failing in a majority vote in each Territory the whole proceedings fall to the ground.

In view of what has developed here, I have concluded to offer an amendment, and I shall take advantage of an early opportunity to speak briefly in support of it, and then I will ask, as soon as we can agree upon it, for a vote on that amendment. The amendment I shall now offer and do offer—I send it to the desk for that purpose—is to strike out all in the present bill referring to New Mexico and Arizona, and providing for separate statehood for both New Mexico and Arizona.

Mr. CLAY. I will ask the Senator from Ohio whether it is not true that an amendment of that kind is pending?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. FORAKER. There is not an amendment, as I understand it—

Mr. CLAY. There is.

Mr. FORAKER. Providing separate statehood as to both Territories and substituting—

Mr. CLAY. I will say to the Senator that there is an amendment pending and printed that strikes out all the provisions of this bill relating to Arizona and New Mexico and inserts separate statehood for Arizona and New Mexico, and substituting the bill—

Mr. FORAKER. I was not aware of that.

Mr. CLAY. And substituting the bill which passed the House and was pending in the Senate during the last session.

Mr. FORAKER. I was not aware that anyone had offered that particular amendment. I offer it and ask—

Mr. CLAY. I will say to the Senator that I prepared it at his instance.

Mr. FORAKER. Very well. I will ask that this amendment be printed and laid on the table, in order that it may be compared with the other, to determine whether there are any differences between them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The amendment will be received and printed.

Mr. FORAKER. I have no extended speech to make. I wish to say something in behalf of the amendment. I think we ought to try to reach a point where we can give statehood to Oklahoma and the Indian Territory. I do not think there ought to be any objection to that. I think it would be very unfortunate if there should be; and I do not think we will ever get a vote on that proposition until we take a vote on the other.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood as to what I said in my colloquy with my friend the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] a few moments ago. I did not mean to say that I was unalterably opposed to fixing a day for a vote. I only meant to say that I am opposed to fixing a day until after we have had a reasonable time for debate. As to what constitutes a reasonable time for debate on the statehood bill of course will have to be governed by precedents.

Mr. BEVERIDGE obtained the floor.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Was the Senator from Colorado going to address the Senate on the matter under discussion?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will withhold, then, until the Senator from Colorado gets through.

Mr. PATTERSON. It pertains to the general matter that was under discussion.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If that is true, I yield. Otherwise I was going to make a request.

Mr. PATTERSON. It is not a foreign matter.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator, I take it, is not going to make a speech to-night?

Mr. PATTERSON. Oh, no; I am about through.

Mr. President, it has been stated that there is no amendment to the statehood bill now pending. I offer an amendment which I had printed a few days ago, and I ask that a vote be taken on that amendment. I will state briefly what the amendment is.

It eliminates from the bill as reported by the Committee on Territories all that pertains to New Mexico and Arizona as a State, leaving, as the bill was reported from the committee, all that relates to the joining of Oklahoma and Indian Territory as a State. In lieu of the part that is proposed to be stricken out, the part that relates to the joinder of New Mexico and Arizona, I have, following the phraseology of the bill and carefully retaining all the provisions that were applicable, made the amendment provide for the admission of New Mexico alone, applying to New Mexico all the provisions that were applicable to the joint bill, but so changing them as to make them applicable to New Mexico alone. So the amendment, if adopted, would make the bill stand as it was reported from the Committee on Territories, except to provide for the admission of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory as one State and the admission of New Mexico as another, leaving Arizona out of the bill at this time altogether.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I take it the Senator from Colorado did not hear the colloquy between the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] and myself. I stated to the Senator from Maryland that in view of the fact that I had been expecting, relying upon assurances that there were certain speeches to be made, to close the debate, or that some person, on behalf of the committee would, before any vote was taken, he would hardly expect to offer that or any other amendment before the chairman or some person in behalf of the committee had closed the debate, to which of course the Senator from Maryland by a nod of the head instantly assented. I take it the Senator from Colorado did not hear the colloquy between us.

Mr. PATTERSON. Let me say—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Colorado to the fact that it is not in order to offer his amendment for action at this time.

Mr. PATTERSON. I do not understand the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Colorado intends to offer the amendment for action at this time, it is not in order.

Mr. BERRY. Why?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Because there are pending an amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] and a reserved amendment by the committee.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In any event, point of order or no point of order, but going to the root of the matter, I say I take it the Senator from Colorado could not have heard the colloquy between the Senator from Maryland and myself about this very matter.

Mr. PATTERSON. Let me—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Of course the Senator would not expect any vote to be had until we had closed the debate or had an opportunity to do so. I repeat that I had expected to close the debate at the end of the week, upon the assurance that this week would be taken up by speeches which I expected would be made by various Senators.

The Senator from Colorado has been away most of the session, I will say to the Senate. In the conduct of this bill from day to day, I have acceded to every request that was made of me by Senators on either side opposed to the bill, upon the understanding repeatedly made that when the bill had been reasonably and in good faith debated a day for voting would be fixed.

Now, it has been stated, even to-day, that there are several speeches to be made. After these are made I expect to close the debate, and the Senator would hardly offer his amendments in view of that.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am sure the Senator did not hear the colloquy.

Mr. PATTERSON. As a matter of course, I had not the slightest idea that the Senator from Indiana would be prevented from making the speech which we are all anxious to hear.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am sure you must be.

Mr. PATTERSON. It undoubtedly will be filled with everything that is interesting and essential to a proper understanding of the entire question. By the way, I want to suggest to the honorable Presiding Officer that I was not aware that when a bill is up, even for discussion, the offering of an amendment is not in order at any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not so state.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I assume—

Mr. PATTERSON. Just one moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not so state.

Mr. PATTERSON. It was my misfortune to understand the Chair in that way.

I want to ask the Senator from Indiana whether he is willing to fix a time for taking a vote upon this amendment of mine?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that he has not been paying attention to the proceedings. I suggested that very thing, and not only that, but when the Senator rose I had risen and was about to make a request for unanimous consent that on next Friday or on next Monday we vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, and that on the following Saturday, to wit, one week from next Saturday, we vote upon the bill and all other amendments.

Mr. PATTERSON. It must be obvious to the Senator from Indiana that there are very serious objections, which have been urged by Senators upon this side of the House, against now fixing a time for voting upon the bill and amendments.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Why?

Mr. PATTERSON. The Senator was mistaken when he suggested that I had not been paying attention, for I have been.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not mean it in any unkind way.

Mr. PATTERSON. Oh, no. It is all right.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator did hear me suggest that we vote on his amendment next Friday?

Mr. PATTERSON. If the Senator from Indiana will agree that my amendment shall be voted upon next Friday, which is a simple proposition entirely disconnected from other matters—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is a simple proposition.

Mr. PATTERSON. I have not any question that it will be accepted.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not only that, but I now make the request for unanimous consent that on next Friday at 4 o'clock in the afternoon we shall vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, and that upon the following Saturday week we shall vote upon the bill and other amendments.

Mr. PATTERSON. The motion of the Senator from Indiana is divisible.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; I do not make a motion. I make a request.

Mr. PATTERSON. Well, the request of the Senator from Indiana is divisible. I am interested in having him agree to a vote upon my amendment disconnected from all other propositions—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am, too; but—

Mr. PATTERSON. On next Friday.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. We are, of course, trying to arrive at a common conclusion. We are not parrying. This debate thus far has not been carried on in that spirit. We are getting to a common conclusion, a conclusion we have all agreed should be reached. I am willing to oblige the Senator from Colorado. The suggestion he makes originated with me. Let us vote upon the Senator's amendment, and then a week afterwards, when the Senator from Ohio shall have returned—and that is the reason why I fixed a week afterwards, because he will be away during that week—let us vote upon the bill and his amendments.

Now, why should the Senator—I put it to him in entire good faith; this is no sparring—insist upon a time being fixed for a vote upon his amendment and not be willing to fix a time for voting on the bill to which the amendment is offered, in view of the fact that the bill itself has been thoroughly discussed, and that, in the meantime, between now and Friday, the Senator himself can amply discuss his amendment.

Mr. PATTERSON. The Senator from Indiana very clearly has not been paying attention to what I have been saying.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That may be clear to the Senator.

Mr. PATTERSON. Or, very clearly, he did not apprehend what I was saying.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That may possibly be.

Mr. PATTERSON. I suppose, if the latter is the case, it is owing to my lack of ability to express myself.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not at all.

Mr. PATTERSON. My proposition clearly and unqualifiedly was that, independent of every other proposition, a day should be fixed for voting upon my amendment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I heard the Senator. I comprehended even that from the Senator.

Mr. PATTERSON. And immediately the Senator from Indiana—

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

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No. Let the Senator go ahead. I do not ask him to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PATTERSON. And immediately the Senator from Indiana says, "Yes; of course we will agree to the proposition of the Senator from Colorado," and then he proceeds to restate it, but tacks on an amendment of his own which has no relation or connection with the proposition I made.

Let us have an understanding with the Senator from Indiana, clear and distinct, upon my proposition. Will he now agree to fix a day for voting upon my amendment, disconnected from any other agreement or proposition?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Most certainly the Senator does not expect me to agree to any such thing. I have the right to ask the Senator why he makes such a proposition. I want to say to the Senator that he has been absent or he would not make such a proposition. I state again and with earnestness that the whole conduct of this bill has been upon the definite assurance of Senators upon the other side that they wanted to make some speeches, and after those speeches were made they would be willing to fix a day for voting on the bill at this session. The speeches thus far made have consumed three weeks upon the bill itself.

Now the Senator from Colorado proposes an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that his amendment shall be voted on next Friday, during which time he can enlighten the Senate upon his amendment, and that in the week following, when the Senator from Ohio shall have returned, we shall vote upon the bill itself, which I have been assured by Senators in active management of the opposition to the bill would be done before this session closes. Why does the Senator from Colorado ask the Senate to vote upon the amendment alone and not on the bill, which has been under discussion and which I have been assured, and we have all been assured, would be voted upon at this session? I will say to the Senator that if he had been here during the afternoon, since I made the request, he would have heard it repeatedly stated and agreed to by Senators on the other side that the conduct of this debate upon the part of those of us who favor the bill has been with that understanding. From day to day we have adjourned. Any request that has been made by any person in opposition to the bill has been immediately acceded to upon the understanding and upon the assurance directly given that a vote would be had. Otherwise the Senator knows perfectly well I would have held the bill before the Senate from 2 o'clock until 5 o'clock every day. The Senator has been away and does not know that, of course, or I am sure he would not have made the request. In order to solve this whole problem I ask unanimous consent that on next Friday at 4 o'clock we vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, and that on the following Saturday week, when the Senator from Ohio shall have returned, we vote upon the bill and all other amendments, beginning at 2 o'clock.

Mr. BARD. Mr. President, I desire to ask whether it is in order now to offer an amendment to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments can be offered at any time.

Mr. BARD. I supposed so. I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. BARD. Mr. President, in this connection I desire to say in reference to fixing a time for voting upon any other amendment that I believe the most logical way of ascertaining the will of the Senate will be to take up first this amendment. It is practically for a division of the bill. It disposes of the latter part of the bill, and there remains but one proposition—the admission of the new State of Oklahoma. The bill would then be open for any further amendment. I would therefore prefer very much to have this amendment discussed and disposed of first.

Mr. McCUMBER obtained the floor.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will say to the Senator from California—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not observe that the Senator had addressed the Chair. The Senator from North Dakota may proceed. I was merely going to explain a matter to the Senator from California.

Mr. McCUMBER. I only want to say very briefly that there are several amendments to this bill. Some amendments provide for statehood for New Mexico separately and for Arizona separately; some for the Indian Territory and Oklahoma separately. In order to vote intelligently upon any one of these amendments, each and every one ought to be discussed.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is true.

Mr. McCUMBER. I for one shall object to any single

amendment being taken up and voted on at any given time without the consideration of all the other amendments, and then another day being fixed for voting on the bill. I feel that all of these amendments are introduced in good faith—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. And they ought to have consideration and they ought all to be debated.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think the remarks of both the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from California are very much to the point, and I wish to say to both Senators that I made my request with reference to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland. The Senator from Maryland suggested that, and being willing to adopt any reasonable method that would solve this question and meet as nearly as might be the desires and views of all the Senators, I merely adopted the suggestion that on next Friday we should vote upon it. But possibly that might be modified. I do not know but that logically the amendment of the Senator from California might come first. That is immaterial. It might be modified in this way. That beginning on next Friday at 4 o'clock we vote on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado or the amendment of the Senator from California—I do not care which—and then, to meet the further suggestion just made by the Senator from North Dakota, that we continue to vote from day to day, as the amendments may be discussed, upon other amendments to the bill until the following Saturday week, at which time we shall vote upon the bill and all amendments that have not in the meantime been discussed and disposed of.

The effect of that would be that on next Friday at 4 o'clock we would vote upon whatever we might agree to be the first amendment, and then immediately, from day to day, vote upon succeeding amendments as they come up until the following Saturday week—that would be eight days—at which time the bill itself and all remaining amendments would be voted upon. I modify my request in that way. I think that meets the view of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I see nothing in the condition of this bill that would justify the assumption that it is necessary to fix two separate days for voting.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No, the Senator—

Mr. McCUMBER. I can not see—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator excuse me?

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment. I can not see why, if we agree upon a day to vote upon the bill, we can not also agree on a day to vote on all amendments, and following those amendments with the vote on the bill. So far as I am concerned personally, I should like to see that done.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. All right.

Mr. McCUMBER. I admit that I favor four separate States out of those Territories. I should like to see that question voted upon. I should like to have time for its consideration.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. All right.

Mr. McCUMBER. If we take up any of these amendments it seems to me that by next Friday we will not have time to consider the several amendments and give opportunity for every Senator to express himself not only upon the amendment in which he may be interested, but upon every other amendment. It seems to me that in two weeks, say, a week from next Friday, we could probably practically exhaust the subject so far as its discussion will be necessary in the Senate, and I for one should like to see the vote taken at that time or shortly after that time, but I must object to any one amendment being taken up and fixed to be voted upon prior to the time of the vote upon the bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I am perfectly agreeable to the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota. I merely made the other to meet the views of other Senators. I understand that the Senator from North Dakota will object to any time being fixed for a separate vote on amendments, and that matter must go on in the meantime to be discussed by those who have speeches to make upon the subject. I will not further urge my request for a day to be fixed either as to amendments or the bill.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. At the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and following the thought of the Senator from North Dakota, I ask unanimous consent that on one week from next Saturday, at 2 o'clock, the bill and all amendments shall be voted upon.

Mr. GALLINGER. Amendments pending and to be offered.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Amendments pending now and to be offered.

Mr. GALLINGER. Amendments then pending.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That will give two weeks.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the

Senator from Indiana upon having brought up this matter with a view to reaching a conclusion at the earliest possible moment. I think the propriety of this discussion about voting upon the several amendments and on the bill itself at the earliest possible moment is admitted by all. Certainly I am anxious for it. But it is evident that it is impossible to come to any definite conclusion about all the amendments and the bill itself this afternoon.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. All right.

Mr. GORMAN. I think, however, what has been said has put the Senate in such a frame of mind that the Senator himself will be able to go on probably without any agreement and will begin voting on the amendments at an early day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the request of the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not urge it, but I will say to Senators that I shall renew it at times when Senators' minds may have become settled on the subject. Do I understand that the Senator from Maryland will this evening object to my last request?

Mr. GORMAN. I think it is utterly impossible to agree to it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. At the present time. Very well; I will not urge it further this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana withdraws the request.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; I do not withdraw the request. I do not urge it further this evening.

IMPEACHMENT OF JUDGE CHARLES SWAYNE.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Without displacing the unfinished business, I ask unanimous consent for the reference of the resolution which I send to the Chair.

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

Resolved, That the expenses incident to the impeachment trial of Charles Swayne, judge for the northern district of Florida, be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Sergeant-at-Arms.

SARAH A. ROWE.

Mr. McCUMBER. I submit a concurrent resolution asking for the return of a bill, as the beneficiary has died.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 5501) entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Rowe."

LANDS IN GLOUCESTER, COUNTY, N. J.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5763) granting certain property to the county of Gloucester, N. J., which was, on page 1, line 8, after the word "acres," to insert "including the monument site 20 feet square."

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 17474. An act 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, 1906, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs; and

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer to the militia cavalry organization at Chattanooga, Tenn., a certain unused portion of the national cemetery reservation at Chattanooga, Tenn., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. LODGE. I submit a conference report on House bill 14623, to amend the act providing civil government in the Philippine Islands. The report has already been read to the Senate. The conferees have made a slight change in the original report, and I suggest that it be printed and go over without being read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be printed and go over. Does the Senator ask to have it again printed in the RECORD?

Mr. LODGE. I think it had better be printed again in the RECORD in order to show the portion which was omitted from the former conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14623) to amend an act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," and to amend an act approved March 8, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," and to amend an act approved March 2, 1903, entitled "An act to establish a standard of value and to provide for a coinage system in the Philippine Islands," and to provide for the more efficient administration of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 3, and agree to the same with amendments.

Amendment numbered 2, section 3, page 4, line 4, after the word "legislation," insert the words "to be approved by the President of the United States."

Page 4, line 14, change colon to a period and strike out the words "Provided further, That no such municipality shall exercise the power to issue such bonds without the prior approval of the President."

Amendment numbered 3, section 4, page 6, line 15, strike out the words "chief executive" and insert in lieu thereof the word "governor-general."

Page 7, after line 10, insert the following: "Fourth. That after the construction and equipment of said railroad in accordance with the foregoing provisions and all others of the contract of guaranty the railroad shall apply its gross earnings as follows: First, to the necessary operating expenses, including reasonable expenses of the corporation; second, to the necessary and ordinary repairs of said railroad and its equipment; third, to such betterments and extraordinary repairs of said railroad or equipment as may be first by the governor-general of the islands, in writing, expressly consented to; fourth, to the payment of the interest on the bonds, the interest on which to any extent shall have been guaranteed by the Philippine government under this section."

Page 7, line 13, strike out the word "same" and insert in lieu thereof the words "said contract of guaranty."

In the same line strike out the words "signed and delivered" and insert in lieu thereof the word "executed."

Page 8, strike out line 11 and insert in lieu thereof the words "said government."

Page 8, line 20, after the word "the," insert the word "Philippine" and strike out the words "have the power to."

Page 9, after line 2, insert the following: "The supreme court of the Philippine Islands shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction in all actions, proceedings, or suits at law or in equity brought by the Philippine government against any person or corporation involving the construction of this section or any right existing under, duty enjoined, or act prohibited by said section or any contract made in pursuance thereof; and jurisdiction is hereby vested in the supreme court to make such order, to enter such judgment or decree, and to take such proceedings in enforcement thereof as may be proper. During the vacations of said court the chief justice or any judge thereof shall have all the power to grant restraining orders, orders of injunction, to appoint receivers, or to do any other act under authority herein granted that a judge of a court of general jurisdiction may do in the vacation of court."

Page 9, line 6, after the word "purposes," insert the words "approved July 1, 1902, so far as the same is not in conflict with the provisions of this section."

Same line, after the word "corporations," insert the words "the interest upon."

Page 9, line 7, after the word "bonds," insert the words "or any part thereof."

HENRY CABOT LODGE,
EUGENE HALE,
FRED T. DUBOIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

HENRY ALLEN COOPER,
J. A. TAWNEY,
E. D. CRUMPACKER,
W. C. JONES,
JOHN W. MADDOX,

Managers on the part of the House.

AFFAIRS IN SANTO DOMINGO.

Mr. BACON. I beg leave, out of order, to offer a Senate resolution. I ask that it may be read, and then, if agreeable to the Senate, that it may have present consideration.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia was recognized.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask the Senator from Georgia to yield, and I will state the request of the Senator from Georgia. I am asking unanimous consent, if the Senator from Georgia will be so gracious as to yield.

Mr. BACON. I do so, with the greatest pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside for the purpose of the consideration of the Senator's matter, and, further, for the rest of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the remainder of the day. Without objection, it is so ordered. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Georgia will be read:

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas in the public press of January 22, 1905, there appeared the following dispatch purporting to be a press dispatch from Santo Domingo, in the Republic of Santo Domingo, to wit:

"SANTO DOMINGO, REPUBLIC OF SANTO DOMINGO, January 21.

"A protocol between the Dominican Government and the American minister, Mr. Dawson, and Commander A. C. Dillingham, United States Navy, in behalf of the American Government, was signed yesterday.

"The principal conditions are that the American Government guarantees the complete integrity of Dominican territory, agrees to undertake the adjustment of all obligations of the Dominican Government, foreign and domestic, and the conditions of payments, to adjust unreasonable claims, and to determine the validity and amount of pending claims. In the case of the appointment of one or more commissions to reach such an adjustment the Dominican Government shall be represented in order to protect its responsibility.

"The American Government will take charge of the existing custom-houses and those hereafter to be created, and will name the employees necessary to their management, the duties they will exercise, and their rights. These will be considered Dominicans and subject to the laws of the Republic. The Dominican Government will have at each custom-house inspectors in behalf of its interests from after the date the contract takes effect. The present employees are to be considered as acting under its provisions.

"DIVERSION OF REVENUES.

"Out of the revenues collected at the custom-houses of the Republic the American Government will deliver to the Dominican Government 45 per cent of the total of the gross amount for the purpose of attending to the necessities of the budget. It is estimated that the first year \$900,000 will be receivable monthly. The advance payments are divided into four installments in the following manner: Eighteen thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars on the 1st, 8th, 15th, and 22d of each month. In case the total revenues of the first or subsequent year are less than \$2,000,000, the payments may be proportionately decreased.

"Out of the 53 per cent the American Government will pay the employees of the custom-houses and the interest on the amortization of the foreign and domestic debts. The whole surplus may remain, and each fiscal year will be delivered to the Dominican Government and devoted to the payments of its debts.

"No changes in the present import dues or port charges will be made without the consent of the American Government until the debt is completely paid.

"GENERAL GUARDIANSHIP.

"The American Government, at the request of the Dominican Government, shall grant such other assistance in its power to restore the credit, preserve order, increase the efficiency of the civil administration, and advance the material progress and welfare of the Republic.

"The agreement will take effect February 1 next.

"The Americans here say Minister Dawson and Commander Dillingham deserve credit for the extremely quick settlement of the Dominican problem, and it is claimed that the execution of the agreement undoubtedly will be beneficial to the Republic.

"President Morales has presented Commander Dillingham with the gold pen used in signing the protocol.

"Quiet prevails here and is expected to continue;" and

Whereas on this the 23d day of January, 1905, there appeared in the public press the following, purporting to be an authorized statement from the Secretary of State of the United States, to wit:

"After a consultation with Secretary Hay the following statement regarding the situation in Santo Domingo was issued by Assistant Secretary Loomis yesterday:

"The Dominican Republic, after mature consideration of existing conditions, has formally and freely invited the Government of the United States to assist it in the administration of its customs revenues and to aid it in establishing its fiscal system upon a firm and businesslike basis. The Government of the United States having been explicitly, repeatedly, and emphatically informed by more than one of the great powers that it ought either to try to evolve some order out of the financial chaos in the Dominican Republic or assent to certain European creditors of that Republic doing this, and to the administration of the Dominican custom-houses by them, supported by their war ships, has deemed it advisable, in view of the unfortunate financial conditions in Santo Domingo, which for the last ten years have been rapidly growing worse, to accept the invitation of the Dominican Government, and, therefore, representatives of this Government and of Santo Domingo have signed a memorandum of a proposed agreement looking to the American control of the fiscal affairs, upon the request and with the consent of the Dominican Government.

"The United States proposes to guarantee the territorial integrity of the Dominican Republic. It is not the purpose of this Government to assume a protectorate over Santo Domingo or to interfere with or participate in its domestic affairs any further than the collection of its customs revenues, the necessary revision of its tariff laws, and the adjustment, through properly constituted tribunals or commissions, of its foreign claims and its economic and fiscal organization on a sound basis may make it essential to do.

"DECREE BY PRESIDENT MORALES.

"President Morales has signed a decree, which will be published to-day, in which the Government of the United States is officially asked to take full charge of all the Dominican custom-houses; to name all the employees, and to collect all the revenues, 45 per cent of which are to be returned to the Dominican Government for its current expenses; the balance is to be used to meet the interest charges on the acknowledged bonded indebtedness and other just obligations of the Republic. Any surplus will be turned over to the Dominican Government. The obligations representing the bonded indebtedness are largely owned by foreign creditors.

"The Government of the United States does not guarantee the debts of Santo Domingo or agree to provide for the payment of them, but only promises to try to so organize and adjust the fiscal administration of the country that in time their liquidation may be accomplished automatically and on a basis of equity toward all creditors. It is believed that if the Dominican revenues are wisely collected and disbursed all legitimate claims against the Republic will be ultimately satisfied.

"In this connection it may be added that under the award of the tribunal of arbitration of July 14, 1904, between the United States and Santo Domingo, in the sum of about \$4,500,000, the United States was given the right eventually to take possession of the four principal ports on the northern side of the island, and under the award the fiscal agent appointed by the United States is now in possession of the important custom-house at Puerto Plata.

"QUESTIONS FRAUGHT WITH PERIL.

"The unfortunate financial condition of Santo Domingo more than once in the last decade has brought to the United States Government questions fraught with imminent peril. The Government of the United States could not, with due self-respect, allow the impression to deepen and gain currency that the Monroe doctrine can be used as a shield by an American republic to deny justice to other governments. Many foreign claims are just beyond peradventure, and, being held by citizens of various governments, the problem became increasingly more difficult as to how those claims could be satisfied under existing conditions with fair treatment toward all.

In some respects a still more embarrassing feature of the situation has been that the Dominican Government has been compelled by force to pay grossly exorbitant claims, and the question has arisen whether the United States should interpose in such cases. Such interposition has never been resorted to perhaps but once in our history. Another deplorable feature of the financial situation in Santo Domingo is that her revenues have been crippled by granting, for a long, valuable concessions which were exempted by stipulation from all taxation. Her interests have compelled the Dominican Government to disregard these promises of exemption from taxation, and this has resulted in numerous and increasing appeals to the Department of State to interfere.

"The Dominican Government itself reached the conclusion that its only hope of escape from bankruptcy was through the assistance of the United States Government in the organization of its finances. In view of these grave conditions the President has deemed it wise at this time to assent to the strongly expressed wish of the Dominican Government.

Rear-Admiral Charles D. Sigsbee, commander in chief of the Caribbean squadron, reported his arrival at Santo Domingo city yesterday in the flagship Newark. Both the Newark and the Castine are now representing the United States in Santo Domingan waters, although the latter has been scheduled to carry Capt. A. C. Dillingham to San Juan, P. R., where he is to take the mail steamer for the United States; and

Whereas it is stated in the said publications that the agreement therein set forth will take effect February 1 next, and that the war ships of the United States have already been sent to the harbor of Santo Domingo, and are present therein: Therefore

Resolved, That the President is respectfully requested, so far as the same may be compatible with the public interest, to inform the Senate whether any agreement has been made between the United States and the Republic of Santo Domingo, and if so, the nature and terms of said agreement; and particularly whether any agreement has been made by which this Government undertakes to guarantee the integrity of the territory or Government of the Republic of Santo Domingo, and whether under said agreement this Government assumes any responsibility or obligation, pecuniary or otherwise, to the said Republic of Santo Domingo or to any other government in behalf or account of said Republic of Santo Domingo.

Mr. BACON. I desire to correct the phraseology, and instead of the words "so far as the same may be compatible with the public interest," make it read "if not incompatible with the public interest."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia makes the following modification.

Mr. BACON. It is simply a change of phraseology.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, That the President is respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interest—

Mr. SPOONER. Let it read "if not in his judgment incompatible with the public interest."

Mr. BACON. I have no objection to that modification.

Mr. LODGE. I think that the resolution should go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. It will be printed, I suppose.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that it may go over and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be printed, under the rule.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GALLINGER. 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 eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 24, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23, 1905.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

Charles Richardson, of Massachusetts, now secretary of the legation at that place, to be secretary of the embassy of the United States at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, to fill an original vacancy.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Erwin S. Cooley, of New Jersey, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, with the rank of third lieutenant, to succeed Michael N. Usina, promoted.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Joseph M. F. McGinty, a citizen of New York, to be a chaplain in the Navy from the 16th day of January, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Assistant Naval Constructor Guy A. Bisset, to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 31st day of August, 1904.

Assistant Naval Constructors John E. Bailey, and Henry M. Gleason to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 30th day of September, 1904.

Lieut. Commander James H. Sears to be a commander in the Navy from the 12th day of January, 1905, vice Commander William P. Day, promoted.

Lieuts. (Junior Grade) Frederick J. Horne, jr., James R. Combs, and Charles H. Fischer to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1905, to fill vacancies created by the act of March 3, 1903.

Gunner Patrick Hill to be a chief gunner in the Navy, from the 29th day of October, 1904, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904, to correct the date of his promotion as confirmed on December 16, 1904.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

George F. Schad to be postmaster at Brewton, in the county of Escambia and State of Alabama, in place of Charles F. Rankin, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

Jesse H. Dungan to be postmaster at Woodland, in the county of Yolo and State of California, in place of Jesse H. Dungan. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1905.

Frank H. Owen to be postmaster at Winters, in the county of Yolo and State of California, in place of Frank H. Owen. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1904.

COLORADO.

Thomas H. Davy to be postmaster at Fort Collins, in the county of Larimer and State of Colorado, in place of William V. Roberts, removed.

ILLINOIS.

Daniel A. Williams to be postmaster at Antioch, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential July 1, 1904.

Etta M. Perdue to be postmaster at Marshall, in the county of Clark and State of Illinois, in place of John C. Perdue, deceased.

INDIANA.

Henry W. Bennett to be postmaster at Indianapolis, in the county of Marion and State of Indiana, in place of George F. McGinnis. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1904.

KENTUCKY.

J. L. Grissom to be postmaster at Burnside, in the county of Pulaski and State of Kentucky. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

MICHIGAN.

Justin A. Harsh to be postmaster at Tekonsha, in the county of Calhoun and State of Michigan, in place of Justin A. Harsh. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1905.

Guy C. Mars to be postmaster at Berrien Springs, in the county of Berrien and State of Michigan, in place of Andrew W. Mars. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1905.

Hugh W. Parker to be postmaster at Bancroft, in the county of Shiawassee and State of Michigan, in place of Hugh W. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1905.

MINNESOTA.

Adolphus L. Elliott to be postmaster at Paynesville (late New Paynesville), in the county of Stearns and State of Minnesota, in place of Adolphus L. Elliott, to change name of office.

Truman B. Horton to be postmaster at Stewartville, in the county of Olmsted and State of Minnesota, in place of Truman B. Horton. Incumbent's commission expires January 31, 1905.

Mark M. Woolley to be postmaster at Howard Lake, in the county of Wright and State of Minnesota. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

MISSISSIPPI.

Jennie D. Ligon to be postmaster at Gloster, in the county of Amite and State of Mississippi, in place of Jennie D. Ligon. Incumbent's commission expires January 31, 1905.

Allison S. Pitts to be postmaster at Hattiesburg, in the county of Perry and State of Mississippi, in place of Allison S. Pitts. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1904.

Mary G. Stone to be postmaster at Iuka, in the county of Tishomingo and State of Mississippi, in place of Rufus C. Skinner. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1905.

Houston M. Tubb to be postmaster at Amory, in the county of Monroe and State of Mississippi. Office became Presidential October 1, 1904.

NEW JERSEY.

Obadiah E. Davis to be postmaster at Redbank, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey, in place of William T. Corlies. Incumbent's commission expires January 31, 1905.

NEW YORK.

John N. Van Antwerp to be postmaster at Fultonville, in the county of Montgomery and State of New York, in place of John N. Van Antwerp. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

OHIO.

William O. Custis to be postmaster at Jamestown, in the county of Greene and State of Ohio, in place of John R. Crain. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

Adolphus D. Haney to be postmaster at Morrow, in the county of Warren and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

Joseph F. Meyers to be postmaster at Minster, in the county of Auglaize and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

David E. Owen to be postmaster at Burton, in the county of Geauga and State of Ohio, in place of Lester Crittenden. Incumbent's commission expires January 31, 1905.

D. C. Pemberton to be postmaster at New Vienna, in the county of Clinton and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential October 1, 1903.

Seymour S. Tibbals to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Warren and State of Ohio, in place of Joseph B. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1904.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Henry Feindt to be postmaster at Lykens, in the county of Dauphin and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Henry Feindt. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1905.

Elizabeth H. Ketcham to be postmaster at Narberth, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Eliza Ketcham, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA.

William W. Hamilton to be postmaster at Bramwell, in the county of Mercer and State of West Virginia, in place of William W. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1904.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn January 23, 1905.

Thomas B. Van Horne to be postmaster at Franklin, in the State of Ohio.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23, 1905.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William G. Wheeler, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Ensign James Reed, jr., to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1905.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Albert Wheelon, of South Dakota, to be register of the land office at Pierre, S. Dak.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Henry E. Cutting, of South Dakota, to be receiver of public moneys at Pierre, S. Dak.

POSTMASTERS.

MAINE.

Jacob F. Hersey to be postmaster at Patten, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine.
Charles H. Eastman to be postmaster at Millinocket, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George A. Birnie to be postmaster at Ludlow, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN.

Berton M. Wooley to be postmaster at Elsie, in the county of Clinton and State of Michigan.
Simon H. Heath to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Macomb and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

William J. Annon to be postmaster at Anoka, in the county of Anoka and State of Minnesota.
Aaron R. Butler to be postmaster at Bagley, in the county of Clearwater and State of Minnesota.
William H. Smith to be postmaster at Cambridge, in the county of Isanti and State of Minnesota.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Arthur W. Charles to be postmaster at North Conway, in the county of Carroll and State of New Hampshire.

OHIO.

Peter Housel to be postmaster at Shreve, in the county of Wayne and State of Ohio.
Henry H. Dibble to be postmaster at Canal Winchester, in the county of Franklin and State of Ohio.
George R. Garver to be postmaster at Strasburg, in the county of Tuscarawas and State of Ohio.

OREGON.

John Hahn to be postmaster at Astoria, in the county of Clatsop and State of Oregon.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Christmas E. Fitch to be postmaster at Wampum, in the county of Lawrence and State of Pennsylvania.

WISCONSIN.

Robert J. Audiss to be postmaster at Westfield, in the county of Marquette and State of Wisconsin.
Oliver W. Babcock to be postmaster at Omro, in the county of Winnebago and State of Wisconsin.
Charles S. Button to be postmaster at Milton Junction, in the county of Rock and State of Wisconsin.
Martin A. Lien to be postmaster at Black River Falls, in the county of Jackson and State of Wisconsin.
Irwin R. Nye to be postmaster at Wittenberg, in the county of Shawano and State of Wisconsin.
Charles Settergren to be postmaster at Baldwin, in the county of St. Croix and State of Wisconsin.
John C. Southworth to be postmaster at Whitehall, in the county of Trempealeau and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 23, 1905.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6450. An act to amend an act authorizing the Winnipeg, Yankton and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak.; and

S. 6422. An act to amend an act approved February 12, 1901, entitled "An act to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company, in the city of Washington, D. C., and requiring said com-

pany to depress and elevate its tracks, and to enable it to relocate parts of its railroad therein, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following order:

Ordered, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that the Senate is ready to receive the managers appointed by the House for the purpose of exhibiting articles of impeachment against Charles Swayne, judge of the district court of the United States for the northern district of Florida, agreeably to the notice communicated to the Senate.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 6422. An act to amend an act approved February 12, 1901, entitled "An act to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company, in the city of Washington, D. C., and requiring said company to depress and elevate its tracks, and to enable it to relocate parts of its railroad therein, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives, by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On January 19, 1905:

H. R. 15320. An act to amend an act to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in the District of Columbia, approved June 3, 1896.

On January 20, 1905:

H. R. 15225. An act to amend an act relating to the printing and distribution of public documents, and for other purposes.

On January 21, 1905:

H. R. 7279. An act for an additional circuit judge in the first judicial circuit;

H. R. 11178. An act for the relief of Miss Lelia G. Cayce;

H. R. 16284. An act to transfer Fayette County from western to southern district of Texas; and

H. R. 16582. An act to authorize the Union Trust and Storage Company to change its corporate name.

On January 23, 1905:

H. R. 1979. An act providing for the extension of the national cemetery, on Williamsburg turnpike, near the city of Richmond, Va.; and
H. R. 16160. An act granting to Farwell, Ozmun, Kirk & Co. license to make excavations and place footings in the soil of certain land belonging to the United States at St. Paul, Minn.

IMPEACHMENT OF JUDGE CHARLES SWAYNE.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER and Mr. PALMER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania rises to offer a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the managers on the part of the House in the matter of the impeachment of Charles Swayne, district judge of the United States in and for the northern district of Florida, be, and they are hereby, authorized to employ a clerk, stenographer, and messenger, and to incur such expense as may be necessary in the preparation and conduct of the case, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers approved by the managers, and the managers have power to send for persons and papers.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

GRANT OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO GLOUCESTER COUNTY, N. J.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?
Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I rise to call up the unfinished business of Saturday, being the bill S. 5763.

The SPEAKER. That was a pending bill?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5763) granting certain property to the county of Gloucester, N. J.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey moves an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, in line 8, after the word "acres," insert "including the monument site, 21 feet square."

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I move the adoption of the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CODE OF LAWS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up for present consideration the bill H. R. 18035.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] calls up for present consideration bill H. R. 18035, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18035) to amend section 552 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, relating to incorporations.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 552 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia is hereby amended by adding thereto the following: In addition to the fees herein required, all corporations hereafter incorporated in the District of Columbia shall pay to the recorder of deeds at the time of the filing of the certificate of incorporation 40 cents on each thousand dollars of the amount of the capital stock of the corporation as set forth in its said certificate: *Provided, however,* That the fee so paid shall not be less than \$25: *And provided further,* That the recorder of deeds shall not file or record any certificate of organization of any incorporation until it has been proved to his satisfaction that all the capital stock of said company has been subscribed for in good faith, and not less than 10 per cent of the par value of the stock has been actually paid in cash, and the money derived therefrom is then in the possession of the persons named as the first board of trustees.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say in reference to this bill that it is an amendment to the present code of the laws relating to the organization of corporations. The construction that has been given to the present law was unexpected both by the bar association, the judiciary, and Congress. During the past year there have been organized in the District 1,491 corporations, with a capital of \$2,041,960,000. The fees received by the District of Columbia for recording their incorporation papers amounted to about \$1,491.

Now, your committee, Mr. Speaker, together with the Department of Commerce and Labor, proposes to bring before this House later a bill providing for a general law for the organization of corporations in the District of Columbia that will be in harmony with the sentiment and conditions that exist to-day. It is important, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be acted upon promptly to prevent abuses and the organizing of bogus companies.

I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, in order that we may express our indescribable horror at the wanton massacre of the people that has taken place in St. Petersburg, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. A simple motion to adjourn without the preamble is in order.

The question was taken; and the motion was rejected.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, that shows the interest we have in humanity.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill (H. R. 18035) offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK].

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and was read a third time, and passed.

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

METROPOLITAN POLICE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of bill (H. R. 7022) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1901.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] asks for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7022) which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the substitute be read instead of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] asks that the substitute for bill H. R. 7022 be read

instead of the bill itself. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of "An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1901, be, and the same is hereby, amended so that it shall read as follows:

"Sec. 4. That hereafter the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to deposit with the Treasurer of the United States, out of receipts from fines in the police court and receipts from dog licenses, a sufficient amount to meet any deficiency in the policemen's fund or firemen's fund: *Provided,* That the chief engineer of the fire department and all other officers of said department of and above the rank of captain, the superintendent, assistant superintendent, any captain or lieutenant of police, in case of retirement as now provided by law, shall receive relief not exceeding \$100 per month; and in case of the death from injury or disease of any of the officers named in this section, if he leave a widow or, if unmarried, a dependent mother, or children under 16 years of age, the same shall be for their relief during the period of widowhood, or until such children reach the age of 16 years: *Provided,* That in no case shall the amount paid to a widow exceed \$50 per month, nor shall the amount paid for a child exceed \$25 per month."

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] for the purpose of offering an amendment and further explaining the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 4, on page 2, by striking out all after the word "section," in line 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"If he be unmarried and leave a dependent mother, who is a widow, the same shall be for her relief during the period of widowhood, or if he leave a widow, or children under 16 years of age, the same shall be for their relief during the period of widowhood, or until such children reach the age of 16 years: *Provided,* That in no case shall the amount paid to such dependent mother or widow exceed \$50 per month, nor shall the amount paid for a child exceed \$25 per month."

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to the substitute, which I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] will accept. However, if the gentleman will permit me to offer my amendment to the original bill, then he can offer his as a substitute.

The SPEAKER. There is an amendment by the way of substitute to the original bill. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] offers an amendment to the substitute. It is not further amendable until that amendment is disposed of.

Mr. COWHERD. Very well; I will wait until that is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call upon some gentleman of the committee to explain what we are called upon to vote upon here.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I will endeavor to explain the bill as far as lies within my power. Under existing law, passed by Congress in February, 1885, certain provisions thereof provided for the placing upon the pension roll certain policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia. That law, as I am informed, has worked very beneficially ever since. It was amended in 1901. The amendment was as follows:

That hereafter the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to deposit with the Treasurer of the United States, out of receipts from fines in the police court and receipts from dog licenses, a sufficient amount to meet any deficiency in the policemen's fund or firemen's fund:

Provided, That the chief engineer of the fire department and the superintendent, assistant superintendent, any captain or lieutenant of police, in case of retirement as now provided by law, shall receive relief not exceeding \$100 per month; and in case of the death from injury or disease of any of the officers named in this section, if he leave a widow or children under 16 years of age, the same shall be for their relief during the period of widowhood, or until such children reach the age of 16 years: *Provided,* That in no case shall the amount paid to a widow exceed \$50 per month, nor shall the amount paid for a child exceed \$25 per month.

The present bill seeks to amend this law of 1901. The only change contemplated by this bill is to provide that officers of the fire department of and above the rank of captain shall receive the same consideration in case of retirement by reason of age or by reason of injury received in the line of duty as now provided for the chief engineer of the fire department or any or all officers of the corresponding rank of the Metropolitan police.

The officers affected thereby are the fire marshal, deputy chief, battalion chiefs, and captains. The other change contemplated by this bill is in regard to placing the dependent mother of a policeman or fireman who is unmarried on the same footing as a widow. Your committee thinks that it is a very important

change. They think that a dependent mother, if she be a widow, of a fireman or a policeman who is unmarried is just as much entitled to this relief fund as a widow or children would be. The amendment that I have offered is merely to correct the language and phraseology that appeared in the substitute bill. This is the only change from the original report; being in form, not substance, and for the purpose of making these corrections, the committee thought proper to rewrite a considerable portion of the section.

This bill in no manner calls for a contribution from or takes one dollar from the Treasury of the United States. This pension fund is partially provided for by reserving from the pay of the policemen and firemen \$1 per month, which, together with the fines from the police court and the dog licenses, complete it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would like to ask the gentleman whether a provision of this bill or his amendment incorporates into this class receiving the benefit of these funds the crossing policemen, who are not, as I understand, under the civil service, and are not a part of the Metropolitan police force.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can not answer the gentleman as to that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Perhaps the gentleman from Wisconsin can explain that?

Mr. BABCOCK. I will say—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The point of my inquiry is whether this bill incorporates as beneficiaries the class known as "crossing police officers," who are appointed practically under the "spoils system." I want to know whether this amendment provides for the incorporation of that class of crossing policemen into those who are beneficiaries under this fund?

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that this organization of policemen and firemen is voluntary; that it is a fund that is maintained by contributions of \$1 a month from their salaries.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I understand that.

Mr. BABCOCK. The crossing policemen are not a part of the Metropolitan police force, and I do not think they are included in this class at all.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman knows what I refer to.

Mr. BABCOCK. Oh, I understand it perfectly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Two or three years ago there was an effort made to incorporate these crossing policemen into the Metropolitan police system.

Mr. BABCOCK. I remember. This bill proposes simply to amend the act of 1885.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman's best judgment is that it has nothing to do with the crossing policemen at all?

Mr. BABCOCK. I think not.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COWHERD. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That no pension shall be paid to any person not of good moral character, and any pension heretofore or hereafter allowed may be discontinued whenever it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioners of the District, upon due notice to the pensioner, and after hearing thereon, that the pensioner is not then a person of good moral character.

The SPEAKER. This is offered as an amendment to the substitute?

Mr. COWHERD. Yes; it follows at the close of the bill. And I just want to say that it is needed to supply a defect in the system under which, after the pension is granted, the Commissioners have held, I am informed, that they have no right to discontinue it no matter what the pensioner may do.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, does this amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] apply to the law of 1885 or to this amendment?

Mr. COWHERD. I want it to apply to the general law, to all pensions either heretofore or hereafter granted, and I think it will, because this bill is an amendment to the general law.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. This bill is an amendment of the general law?

Mr. COWHERD. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. This bill is an amendment to an amendment of the general law?

Mr. COWHERD. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. A part of section 4.

Mr. COWHERD. I understand. That makes it, then, a part of the general law.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And it more particularly refers to the officers of a certain grade. I do not know that it applies particularly to the ordinary policemen or to the ordinary firemen.

Mr. COWHERD. However, the amendment reads that "no pension shall be granted to any person," etc., and being a part of the general law under this amendment, I think it would apply.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That would include widows and children?

Mr. COWHERD. Yes; I want to say, as I understand it now, no matter what crime a man commits, or a woman, for that matter, having once gone upon this pension roll, the Commissioners of the District hold that they have no right to withhold the pension. That is what I am informed, and I think that ought to be changed, and that restriction ought to be removed. There have been one or two very glaring instances in the District.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. The gentleman's amendment places the discretionary power entirely in the hands of the District Commissioners?

Mr. COWHERD. The Commissioners of the District are the parties to grant the pension.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, suppose a man has served on the force for twenty years and has been retired on account of age. During the twenty years he has paid in his premiums of a dollar a month. Those are practically payments on his insurance policy. He retires and is placed on the pension roll.

I ask the gentleman from Missouri, who is one of the best lawyers of the District Committee, if he believes this amendment would be a proper one, taking away from the man what he has paid for during the twenty years of his life service, notwithstanding what his character may be?

Mr. COWHERD. Yes; I do. We pay him a good deal more than the premiums he pays would provide insurance.

Mr. BABCOCK. That is not usual with insurance companies?

Mr. COWHERD. I do not know that it is unusual in fraternity organizations. It is not at all unusual to limit a man's insurance to proper conduct. Even though a man may have paid in a part of the fund from which this pension is paid and he commits a serious crime it seems to me that the man ought not to be placed on the pension roll.

Mr. BABCOCK. The question is as to the legal status.

Mr. COWHERD. It strikes me that there would be no trouble about it.

Mr. BABCOCK. There is no contract here like a fraternal organization providing for certain things. This man does not hold a policy, but under an act of Congress he is entitled to a pension for which he has paid premium.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman from Missouri stated that in fraternal organizations the system he seeks to inaugurate prevails. I would like to ask, for information, if the gentleman can state any fraternal organization where that is the law?

Mr. COWHERD. I do not belong to any, and I may be misinformed. I have been told that a man's connection with fraternal organizations can be stopped at any time for bad conduct. I may be mistaken. This, however, is not an insurance; this is a pension. If a man dies then he will not be removed for bad character; that is insurance. But if a man lives and is on a pension roll and proceeds to put himself beyond the pale and consideration of respectable people, it seems to me he ought to be taken off the pension roll for bad conduct.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. COWHERD. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Does the law now provide that there shall be no pension paid policemen who are discharged for immoral conduct?

Mr. COWHERD. I will explain. They would have no pension; the Commissioners then would not retire them on pension.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. My understanding is that the law provides that when a policeman is retired he shall have a certain amount of pension.

Mr. COWHERD. After so many years' service.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. After so many years' service. Now, the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri provides that if he is guilty of immoral conduct or if his character becomes bad his pension shall cease.

Mr. COWHERD. After notice and hearing, if the immoral character is established.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. What is the object of the amendment?

I do not know of any pension system that permits the question of morals to enter into it. If it is viewed from an economic standpoint, it would seem to me that bad conduct would probably tend to hasten the death of the pensioner, and certainly from that consideration it would be no ground for discontinuing the pension.

Mr. COWHERD. The gentleman says he knows of no such system. Let me ask him if it is not true that under the pension laws of the United States when a woman, for instance, who has a pension as a widow, becomes of bad character, the pension is taken away?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The widow, but not the soldier. The soldier who has served his country as a basis for the pension, after he gets a pensionable status his pension is never affected by his subsequent misconduct, and it seems to me that this amendment is upon a wrong principle. It does not occur to me that in any pension system the conduct of the pensioner who has rendered services to the public as the basis for the pension ought to affect his right to draw a pension. I do not see the reason for it.

Mr. COWHERD. I will say to the gentleman that one case has been brought to my attention. I have not had time to examine into it and have not satisfied myself fully in regard to it, and I only give it as hearsay. There was a very malodorous case heralded through the newspapers of a retired policeman's conduct. He had a place near a school and was charged with a serious offense toward some small children. That man was then on the pension roll, and I am told that he is still on the pension roll of the District of Columbia. Now, there ought to be, it seems to me, some way of dropping him from the pension roll.

This is not an insurance, but is a sort of retirement fund. A man pays a very small percentage, a dollar or so a month, out of his salary, and so much is paid from certain funds, police court fines, and the dog tax; in fact, the two latter are, I believe, the principal sources of revenue for this fund. Now, it seems to me that a man whose character has become such that it is a stench in the nostrils of the people of the community ought not to be entitled to share in that fund.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, allow me to suggest in that respect that the retired policeman referred to by my friend is amenable to the criminal laws just the same as any other citizen, and the whole system of pensioning is based on the idea that the service rendered to the public is accompanied with some peculiar hazards to life and safety, perhaps, and that the pensioner has earned this annuity by his services and by payments from his monthly salary.

It belongs to him, and it would seem to me now that under the law, being amenable to the criminal laws of the District in the same manner as other citizens, by adopting this amendment we add an additional penalty upon him for his misconduct. I think it has no place at all in a civil or military pension system. The pensioner has already bought and paid for his pension and he will answer to the law for any misconduct that he may be guilty of. Therefore, why impose upon him this additional penalty over and above that which would be imposed on the ordinary citizen who is guilty of the same class of offense? I do not think it is just and right. This bill is not one to promote morals, but to pay pensions to retired policemen who have rendered twenty years' service.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cowherd], further, that this is not a fixed pension. The law simply states in each instance that it shall not exceed a certain amount, as, for instance, when it says here that no more than \$25 shall be paid for any one child. I am informed by the police department this morning that in case they had six or seven children it is apportioned. Neither are they obliged in any case to go to the full limit.

The whole matter is apparently discretionary with the District Commissioners. Now, while I do not favor a pension to criminals, yet it does seem to me they have earned this pension by previous good conduct, or they would not be placed on the pension roll. To adopt this amendment might subject them possibly to the caprice of some superior officer simply because of some subsequent misconduct on the part of the pensioner, either through weakness or by getting intoxicated.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Does not this amendment take from such person his pension?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. So I understand.

Mr. COWHERD. What is that?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does not this amendment make it absolutely compulsory to withhold a pension from such a man as is described?

Mr. COWHERD. The amendment says that no pension shall be paid to a man of bad character, and that if it is paid to him

and it is established after hearings to the satisfaction of the Commissioners that he is a man of bad character, it shall be discontinued.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that a man should for a slight dereliction in his old age be deprived of that which he has justly earned in previous years, for many years, perhaps, of good conduct, and the adoption of this amendment, would place him at the mercy or caprice of subsequent officials. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he does not think that in case a man should become intoxicated and slightly disorderly on the streets, landing in the lockup, the Commissioners would regard that as such an offense as to oblige them to remove or withhold his pension? That would certainly make him a bad character within the scope of this amendment.

Mr. COWHERD. Oh, no.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Then where will the gentleman draw the line of demarcation?

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Speaker, I leave it to the Commissioners to draw the line. The discretion as to amount is left with them now. I desire to call the attention of the House in the first place to the fact that where you pay a soldier a pension of \$6, \$8, or \$10 you pay a retired policeman a pension of \$50 a month. Now, that shows that this is not simply a pension placed upon the same lines as the pension for service in the Army is. I desire to call attention again to the fact that pensions, even in the Army, the pensions of the United States, are not granted where a man's disability results in any way from vicious habits.

Now, then, I want to limit, in the first place, the giving of this kind of a pension to men of good moral character. Notwithstanding the twenty-years' service, they have served all the time at a fairly good salary. It is true, and I agree that there has been possibly some risk in the service and there ought to be some pension for the service, but I do contend that a pension, especially the size of this, far in excess of anything paid a soldier who has gone out and risked death on the battlefield, ought to be limited to a man who at least can maintain a fair standing in the community; and when it can be shown to the satisfaction of the men granting the pension that he is a man of bad moral character he ought not to be a pensioner upon the community under any such terms as provided in this bill; and when it can be shown that the widow whom he leaves is a woman of bad moral character she is not entitled to draw the sum provided in this bill, and if she goes upon the pension roll or if he goes upon it and then either become a person of bad moral character the community ought to be relieved from their support; and therefore I ask for a vote upon the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 115, noes 42.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute as amended.

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

On motion of Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

DEFINING LIMITS OF SQUARE 1131, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 17109.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 17109) to define the limits of square 1131 in the city of Washington, D. C.

Be it enacted, etc., That the surveyor of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized and directed to mark out an area as hereinafter more fully described, and the said surveyor of the District of Columbia is further directed to record a plat of said area surveyed and to designate it as square No. 1131 of the city of Washington, viz: Bounded on the north side by the south line of H street south, 206 feet; on the east by the west line of Twenty-first street east, prolonged south from the south line of H street south, as said Twenty-first street is now located, 285.33 feet; on the south by the north line of I street south, produced from its present location, lying between Virginia avenue and Thirteenth street east, 206 feet; on the west by the east line of Twentieth street east, prolonged south from the south line of H street south, as said Twentieth street east is now located, 285.33 feet, containing 58,777.98 square feet.

Mr. BABCOCK. I ask for a vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18123) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PIERCE] whether he has any suggestion to make in regard to limiting general debate.

Mr. PIERCE. This side of the House would like to go ahead for the present without limit as to debate. There are two or three on this side who desire to speak, and then I do not think there will be any trouble in reaching an agreement.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The suggestion is agreeable to me, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. What was the suggestion?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The suggestion is to fix no time at present, but let general debate run for a time.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 18123, the District of Columbia appropriation bill (Mr. MANN in the chair).

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18123) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the estimates for this bill will be found in the Book of Estimates, pages 353 to 470, inclusive. They amount to \$12,418,456.25. This bill carries, aside from the appropriation for the water department, \$9,394,938, or \$3,023,518.65 less than the estimates. The current law for this appropriation amounts to \$10,888,034, so that the bill now before the House carries less than the current law by \$1,493,096. In round numbers this bill, then, carries a million and a half dollars less than the current law. This reduction is largely due to the fact that in last year's appropriation there was an item of a million six hundred and ten thousand dollars for the completion of the filtration plant for the water supply of the city. That appropriation not being in this bill accounts for the large reduction, so that, in fact, the bill of this year is the bill of last plus about \$100,000.

The total revenues of the District for the ensuing fiscal year are estimated to be \$5,462,325.

The portion of the bill now under consideration to be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia amounts to \$4,697,469. The appropriations made and to be paid out of District revenues in the legislative bill and expected to be made in the sundry civil bill amount to \$100,000. There have been advances which will amount by the beginning of the next fiscal year, from the United States Treasury to the District of Columbia, amounting to \$3,400,000. The interest on that at 2 per cent will amount to \$68,000. It is required by the law providing for the Union Station that there shall be five annual payments of \$150,000 each out of the District revenues. So that, in all, the expenditures from the District revenues for the ensuing year will be \$5,015,469.

We are rather proud to point to the fact that there will be an excess of revenue amounting to \$446,856.

There were a great many applications for increases of salaries. After giving the matter careful consideration we concluded that, while recognizing the weight of the argument in many cases, we would not make any increases this year. We held to that resolution with one exception. That exception is the case of the kindergartners receiving the lowest salaries. Those we increased somewhat, to put them on a par with teachers of the primary grades.

There are a few things in this bill to which I deem it proper to direct the special attention of the House. They are all indicated in the report, which is quite full, and which will elucidate the bill to those who have time to read it.

The first item to which I desire the attention of the committee is that relating to the harbor patrol. It is a rather singular fact that in the grant to Lord Baltimore the boundaries of Maryland were extended to the Virginia shore. Usually the boundaries of a State, when marked by rivers, are found in the main channel of the bounding river; but in this case the boundaries

of the State of Maryland, and hence the boundaries of the District of Columbia, from which this District was taken, go to the farthest shore of the Potomac River.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] permit an interruption?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I believe that in all cases of cessions of States or Territories by Virginia the line was carried to low-water mark on the shore of the ceded territory. All along the Ohio River the cession of Virginia or the northwestern territory carries the line of Virginia to the low-water mark on the Ohio and other sides.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. So that the northern boundary of Kentucky extends across the Ohio River. That is so unusual that I am obliged to the gentleman from Ohio for mentioning it.

The practical application of the fact in this instance is this, that the harbor patrol extends over the entire river within the boundaries of the District of Columbia.

Heretofore that control has been exercised, and is now, by an officer called the harbor-master. He has the command of a boat and several assistants, including four police officers. For the last two or three years the District Commissioners have brought to our attention the desirability of placing the river under the general police control of the city and the District—that is, under the superintendent of police. With the multitude of things to be thought of in connection with this bill, we did not take it up seriously until this year. Having taken it up, we concluded that the contention of the Commissioners was well founded, and therefore we have made what is practically a new police precinct. Provision has been made for a lieutenant to take charge of that precinct, who is to have the assistance of a sergeant and a proper number of other officers.

Another matter to which the attention of the committee should be directed is this: In carrying on the work of construction of bridges, the laying of streets and sewers, and such things, there have been a large number of what are called "per diem" employees, who have been paid out of the several general appropriations. For a year or two we have had under consideration the propriety of placing on the annual roll the employees who are regularly employed throughout the year, to the end that the House might know just what employees they are and just what the salaries are.

On the other hand, it is desirable to maintain a proper elasticity, to the end that persons employed only temporarily and at intervals may be employed on the per diem basis.

Those who have the report before them and care to read it will find that we have placed in this bill 291 of these salaries. The persons receiving the salaries now receive as per diem payments \$283,555.23.

The salaries which we propose as a substitute for the sums now paid these per diem men aggregate \$271,028, or \$12,000 less than the per diem now paid them.

Reductions have been made in the appropriations for this general work amounting to \$227,025. So that, while we apparently increase the payment of salaries, that is only an apparent increase. As a matter of fact, there is a decrease both in the salaries and in the total amount expended.

Another matter to which the attention of the House should be directed is one relating to the Reform School for Boys. This reform school is located in the eastern part of the District, out on the Bladensburg road. It has some 300 inmates, of whom about 200 are boys committed by the courts of the District of Columbia and about 100 are boys committed by the United States courts, sent from the different States in this vicinity for offenses against United States laws.

This ground belongs to the United States Government. Nearly all the improvements were made at the expense of the United States Government. The management of the institution is under the Attorney-General, but the payment of the expenses has heretofore been provided for in this bill on the half-and-half basis.

We had three courses before us from which we might make choice. The present status might be maintained—that of proprietorship and management by the United States, and payments on the half-and-half basis by the United States and the District of Columbia—or we might turn this institution over wholly to the District of Columbia, the management and all, on the general theory that, having twice as many inmates as the United States, that would be the proper course.

Or we might turn it over entirely to the United States and let the appropriations be made for it in the sundry civil bill, the

District of Columbia paying only for the inmates which it sends there, as in the case of St. Elizabeth's Asylum. With the three courses open to us we have chosen the third.

The general course of reasoning that brought us to that conclusion is this: Until recently the United States has used the penal institutions of the several States for both its adult and juvenile offenders. For reasons which need not be stated here, the United States concluded some years ago to get away from that arrangement and provide for its prisoners in its own penal institutions. It has therefore provided for the erection of a penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga., and another one at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. These are now in course of construction. A third is contemplated when the necessity for it shall appear, to be located on the Pacific coast. These penitentiaries are for adult prisoners.

The same general principle or policy is suggested by the Department of Justice for its juvenile offenders, namely, that it would be well for the United States to discontinue the practice of sending its juvenile offenders to State institutions and take care of them in an institution of its own. This institution is already, in fact, provided in this Boys' Reform School. There is a tract of land of some 250 acres, with suitable buildings, the title already in the United States, most of the expenditures for improvements having been made by the United States.

With this in mind, we concluded to recommend to the House that this institution, the Boys' Reform School, be turned over wholly to the United States, and that such use as the District of Columbia should make of the institution on account of its incorrigibles, its juvenile offenders, should be paid for at a rate to be fixed by the District authorities and the United States authorities.

There is also a Reform School for Girls. This reform school is also under the management of the Department of Justice, but it is paid for under this bill on the half-and-half principle. Should we maintain the status quo or should we turn the reform school over entirely to the District of Columbia? Or should we turn it entirely over to the United States Government? In this case we recommend that the status quo be maintained.

In reaching this conclusion we were governed by the fact that, while it is a United States institution, every inmate is from the District of Columbia. There seems to be no girl offenders against United States laws in this part of the country.

Another subject to which the attention of the House should be directed is that of the Freedmen's Hospital. This institution is in a very anomalous condition. The hospital was established, as you all know, shortly after the civil war in the interests of the freedmen. The management of it is in the hands of the United States. The medical service is provided by Howard University. The money appropriated for it is appropriated in this bill on the half-and-half basis. There is a mixture of supervision, and hence unsatisfactory administration, and it does not seem quite fair that it should be upon this bill.

Therefore we have recommended that it be placed wholly under the charge of the United States Government and that provision for its maintenance be made in the sundry civil bill. So in this bill we simply appropriate a lump sum of money to care for such indigent patients as the District of Columbia may care to send there.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. FINLEY. Who owns the land and building?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The present building was constructed by the United States Government upon land owned by Howard University.

It is a very complex situation. I will say to the gentleman that it is proposed to erect a new hospital upon ground owned by the United States. Fifty thousand dollars toward the construction of that hospital was voted last year on the half-and-half principle. The entire expense of the hospital is to be \$300,000.

Mr. FINLEY. Then, as I understand the gentleman, the building at present used, being on land owned by Howard University, what would become of that building?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. That is an old building, unsuited to hospital purposes, and the trustees of Howard University can do with it, I suppose, as to them seems best.

Mr. FINLEY. It would revert to the use of Howard University?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I so understand.

Mr. FINLEY. About what proportion of patients in this hospital come from the country outside of the District of Columbia?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. About seven hundred odd from outside of the District of Columbia, and something like

three times as many from the District. About a quarter of all the patients who go there come from the outside.

Mr. FINLEY. Is it proposed to put an end to the admission of these patients coming from outside of the District of Columbia?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. No; the purpose is to place the management of this institution wholly under the Department of the Interior, to the end that it may make such rules as to it seem wise relative to the admission of patients from the outside.

Mr. FINLEY. About what would be the increased cost under the plan proposed by the committee?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. It is not expected that there will be any increase of cost. We simply appropriate \$20,000 for the purpose of defraying the expense of maintaining those patients that are sent there from the District of Columbia.

Mr. FINLEY. Perhaps I have not made myself clear. Under the plan as proposed in the bill under consideration will there be any greater cost to the United States Government than there has been heretofore?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Not unless it makes provision for a larger number of patients, as I understand the matter. That will come under the sundry civil bill, and I have no way of knowing what would be the judgment of the committee reporting that bill, or what they will recommend to the House; but our thought was that there would be practically no change except to unify administration, instead of having it scattered among a number of different authorities.

Mr. FINLEY. Then, going back to this building that was erected, as I understand, at the expense of the United States Government on land belonging to Howard University, it is now comparatively—

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. It is an old building.

Mr. FINLEY. It is now comparatively worthless.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Yes; for such purposes.

Mr. FINLEY. About what is it worth for any purpose?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. If I should make any statement on the subject it would be a mere guess on my part. I would not know what to say. It is quite a large building. The brick might be worth something; but the building is insanitary. It is utterly unfit to use for hospital purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I recognize that the committee had a difficult problem to deal with in securing some substantial relief from a division of control and management of these institutions; but the solution adopted by the committee seems to be to charge the revenues of the United States in two manners, and relieves the District, to some extent, in each instance. One would be that the United States build the asylum and furnish the ground. The District of Columbia patients pay a per capita per year. In other words, the United States is charged with that additional expense by the new system.

There are floating people in these eleemosynary institutions now in very large numbers and in the reformatory institutions, and under the plan adopted by the gentleman's committee those will hereafter be charged inevitably to the United States revenues instead of to the District revenues, as heretofore. The result is that the District secures a substantial benefit under this change.

It may be best to do that. The problem is difficult, but that is the result of it. Citing the instance of St. Elizabeth's, more than one-half of the patients in that asylum now are from the District of Columbia, who pay only a per capita, the Government furnishing the land and furnishing the building. That is the effect of it, in my judgment.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the spirit in which the gentleman comments on the recommendation of the committee, but one of the results to be accomplished is that of having something—a little more strictness—in admissions; at least one of the purposes that we had in view in making this recommendation was that there might be a little more supervision of admissions.

As it is to-day, practically any person can go up there and simply hang up his hat, declare himself sick and in need of attention, and he can stay there some little time. The District officials have little or no control over admissions charged to the District. But if we have the arrangement we propose, those who go from the District will have to be reported on the following day to the District authorities by name and color and age, etc. Then all these things will be entered on cards, so that it will be known whether this is a new person. If he has gone

there as an emergency case, unable to get in advance a card of admission, the case will be inquired into at once and the propriety of his having treatment at District expense will be determined. If those in charge of the institution on the part of the United States will be equally careful, there will be no abuse of the benevolent feeling of the United States and the District.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Unless the strictest regard for the interests of the United States is had, the entire floating inmates of that institution will be charged to the United States, because you can rest assured that the District of Columbia will take care of itself. The effect of that provision will be to charge the entire floating inmates to the United States, thereby going against the law of 1878, which provides that the District shall pay one-half.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. In answer to the gentleman, I will say that those difficulties are considered in the proposal we make in the bill. Then we make provision that whatever service is desired by the District of Columbia is to be paid for in proper proportion in harmony with its cost.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That will only be for the maintenance per capita per annum, and that will not take into view the fact that the United States owns the institution and provided the site.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Minnesota how much this bill carries in the aggregate?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Nine million three hundred and ninety-four thousand nine hundred and thirty-eight dollars.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Bearing upon that amount, I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman representing the Committee on Appropriations so as to ascertain what the policy is to be with reference to the condition which, it seems to me, now confronts us. Will it delay the gentleman if I propound the inquiry now?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I think not.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I find that the total permanent annual appropriation for the fiscal year 1905—the total regular and permanent annual appropriations were \$783,974,206.79. The estimate for regular and permanent annual appropriations for the fiscal year 1906 is \$790,260,367.71. I have a memorandum, furnished by the clerks of the Committees on Appropriation for the Senate and the House, and that memorandum shows that the estimated revenues for 1906 are only \$725,590,515. This would show a deficit as compared with the estimated regular and permanent annual appropriations of something like \$64,669,852.31. The memorandum referred to is as follows, viz:

1905-6.

Table comparing, by bills, estimates of regular annual appropriations for the fiscal year 1905 with those for 1906, and also comparing the appropriations made by the general appropriation acts for 1905 (exclusive of deficiency and miscellaneous appropriations) with the estimates for 1906, and showing the aggregate of estimated regular annual and permanent appropriations and amount of estimated revenues for 1906.

[Prepared by the clerks to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House, December 5, 1904.]

Title of bill.	Regular annual estimates, 1905.	Regular annual estimates, 1906.	Increase, 1906 over 1905.	Decrease, 1906 under 1905.	Regular annual appropriations, 1905.	Appropriations for 1905 exceed estimates for 1906.	Appropriations for 1905 less than estimates for 1906.
Agriculture	\$6,729,880.00	\$6,419,810.00		\$310,070.00	\$5,902,040.00		\$517,770.00
Army	77,161,446.13	72,076,237.99		5,085,208.14	77,070,800.88	\$4,994,062.89	
Diplomatic and consular	2,236,300.69	2,423,222.72	\$186,922.03		2,020,100.69		403,122.03
District of Columbia ^a	13,017,581.00	11,032,370.00		1,985,211.00	11,018,540.00		43,830.00
Fortification	12,002,237.00	10,458,570.40		1,543,726.60	7,518,192.00		2,940,378.40
Indian	7,502,232.54	7,144,213.02		358,039.52	8,447,961.40	2,905,748.38	
Legislative, etc.	29,711,700.48	29,685,307.84		26,492.64	28,558,253.22		1,153,447.26
Military Academy	1,045,387.01	722,791.38		322,595.63	973,047.26	251,155.88	
Navy	102,806,449.34	114,530,638.34	11,624,189.00		97,505,140.94		17,025,497.40
Pension	138,152,600.00	138,250,100.00	97,500.00		138,380,700.00	110,600.00	
Post-Office ^b	168,086,770.00	183,748,495.00	15,662,725.00		172,545,988.75		11,202,496.25
River and harbor	c 16,383,360.00	d		16,393,900.00	e 3,000,000.00	3,000,000.00	
Sundry civil	f 67,499,732.60	g 66,902,390.52		597,342.08	h 57,840,211.34		9,659,521.26
Total regular annual appropriations	642,502,386.79	643,424,047.21	27,611,660.42	26,689,675.61	611,761,391.48	10,659,567.15	42,322,222.88
Total permanent annual appropriations	141,471,820.00	146,836,320.00	5,364,500.00		i 141,471,820.00		5,364,500.00
Total regular and permanent annual appropriations	783,974,206.79	790,260,367.21	32,975,836.03	26,689,675.61	753,233,211.48	10,659,567.15	47,686,722.88
Deficiency appropriations, second session Fifty-eighth Congress					26,771,800.18		
Miscellaneous appropriations, second session Fifty-eighth Congress					1,167,273.52		
					j 781,172,875.18		
Increase, estimates of regular annual appropriations for 1906 over same for 1905							\$921,690.42
Increase, estimates of permanent annual appropriations for 1906 over same for 1905							5,364,500.00
Total increase, estimates for 1906 over same for 1905							6,286,190.42
Increase, estimates of regular annual appropriations for 1906 over regular annual appropriations for 1905							31,632,655.73
Increase, estimates of permanent annual appropriations for 1906 over permanent annual appropriations for 1905							5,364,500.00
Total increase, estimates for 1906 over appropriations for 1905 (exclusive of deficiencies and miscellaneous)							37,027,155.73
Amount of estimates of regular annual appropriations for 1906							643,424,047.21
Amount of estimates of permanent annual appropriations for 1906							146,836,320.00
Total estimates of regular and permanent annual appropriations for 1906							790,260,367.21
Amount of estimated revenues for 1906							555,000,000.00
Amount of estimated postal revenues for 1906							170,590,515.00
Total estimated revenues for 1906							725,590,515.00
Excess of estimated appropriations (exclusive of deficiencies and miscellaneous) over estimated revenues for 1906							64,669,852.21
Excess of estimated appropriations (exclusive of \$57,000,000 for sinking fund and exclusive of deficiencies and miscellaneous) over estimated revenues for 1906							7,669,852.21

^a One-half of the amounts for the District of Columbia payable by the United States, except amounts for the water department (estimated for 1906 at \$137,720), which are payable from the revenues of the water department.

^b Includes all expenses of the postal service payable from postal revenues and out of the Treasury.

^c This amount is exclusive of \$3,697,067 to meet contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements included in the sundry civil estimates for 1905.

^d No amount is estimated for rivers and harbors for 1906 except the sum of \$3,442,396 to meet contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements included in the sundry civil estimates for 1906.

^e In addition to this amount the sum of \$7,872,300 is appropriated in the sundry civil act to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements for 1905.

^f This amount includes \$3,697,067 to meet contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements for 1905.

^g This amount includes \$3,442,396 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements for 1906.

^h This amount includes \$7,872,300 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements for 1905.

ⁱ This is the amount submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury in the annual estimates for the fiscal year 1905, including \$56,500,000 to meet the requirements of the sinking fund, the exact amount appropriated not being ascertainable until two years after the close of the fiscal year.

^j In addition to this amount, contracts are authorized to be entered into, subject to future appropriations by Congress, as follows: By the District of Columbia act, \$650,000; by the naval act, \$21,300,000; by the sundry civil act, \$1,041,300; in all, \$22,991,300.

Now, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that one of two things must be done: Either we must reduce appropriations or increase the revenues, or else we face a deficit. I now give a list of the appropriations for 1904-5 and 1903-4:

Title.	Law of 1904-5.	Law of 1903-4.
Agriculture.....	\$5,902,040.00	\$5,978,160.00
Army.....	77,070,300.88	77,888,752.83
Diplomatic and consular.....	2,020,100.69	1,968,250.69
District of Columbia.....	11,018,540.00	8,638,097.00
Fortification.....	7,518,192.00	7,188,416.22
Indian.....	9,447,961.40	8,540,406.77
Legislative, etc.....	28,558,258.22	27,598,653.66
Military Academy.....	973,947.26	652,748.67
Navy.....	97,505,140.94	81,876,791.43
Pension.....	138,300,700.00	139,847,600.00
Post-office.....	172,545,998.75	153,511,549.75
River and harbor.....	3,000,000.00	
Sundry civil.....	57,840,211.34	82,372,900.10
Total	611,761,391.48	596,061,787.12
Urgent deficiency, 1904, and prior years.....	16,102,157.64	21,465,660.25
Deficiency, 1904, and prior years.....	10,609,732.54	
Total	638,533,281.66	617,527,447.37
Miscellaneous.....	1,167,273.52	2,941,238.65
Total, regular annual appropriations	639,700,555.18	620,468,686.02
Permanent annual appropriations.....	141,471,820.00	132,589,820.00
Grand total, regular and permanent annual appropriations	781,172,375.18	753,058,506.02

Now, I have a memorandum showing the amounts of the appropriation bills thus far reported at this session. I will compare them with the appropriations of last year. The army bill shows \$69,310,821.64, a decrease of something like \$7,759,479.34. The District of Columbia bill, the bill now under consideration, carries \$9,528,604, and shows a decrease of \$1,489,944. The fortification bill carries \$6,747,893, and shows a decrease of \$770,299. The Indian appropriation bill carries \$7,335,446.02, and shows a decrease of \$2,112,521.38. The legislative appropriation bill carries \$28,838,709.84, and shows an increase of \$280,451.62. The Military Academy bill carries \$669,413.38, and shows a decrease of \$304,533.43. The pension appropriation bill carries \$138,250,100, and shows a decrease of \$110,600. The post-office appropriation bill as reported carries \$180,781,993.75, an increase of \$8,235,995. This shows an aggregate decrease of \$12,547,377.05 and an increase of \$8,516,446.42, a net decrease of only \$4,030,930.63.

Now, personally, I am willing to follow the committee on any reasonable line they suggest, but it seems to me the appropriation bills must show a more decided decrease, or the committee or the leaders of the House must have in its mind some method of increasing the revenue. I am very much opposed, as a matter of policy and right, to having the appropriations exceed our income. I think we ought to keep ourselves entirely within our income. I make these inquiries only that the House may be advised and the country may be advised, of the policy, if the gentleman from Minnesota is advised of the policy, that it is proposed to adopt in this respect—that is, whether the leadership will decrease the size of the appropriation bills and ask us to follow them in that decrease, or whether they contemplate a continuation of the appropriations at about the existing rate, and contemplate later on some method that will increase the amount of our revenue.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that we must do one of two things. We must reduce appropriations or we must increase our revenue. I will be glad, so far as I am concerned, to follow anything reasonable, any suggestion that the committee may make, but I wish now to emphasize this fact, that the decrease in the appropriations must be very much larger than at present indicated by the bills already reported—and I do not wish to be understood as criticizing any of the bills—in order to accomplish the result by a decrease: An estimate of something like \$790,000,000 and the decrease thus far of something like \$4,000,000. Of course, that comes very far from being the amount of decrease necessary.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is the business of the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate money to meet the expenses of the country, and we have done that to the lowest possible point. It is the business of the Committee on Ways and Means to raise the revenue.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will excuse me, I do not wish to make a reflection upon the Committee on Appropriations. The only reason why I make this inquiry now is because of this comparison of the appropriations

for the year ending 1904 and 1905 and the bills reported so far as they have been reported for the year ending 1906. But I think the House ought to be advised, and I think the country ought to be advised, by those of the membership of the House who expect to formulate its policy whether we are to cut down these appropriations, and, if we are to cut them down, what appropriations we ought to cut down. I am willing to follow along any line that is reasonable, but I insist, from my point of view as one Member, that the appropriations should be less or the revenues more.

I do not believe that it is either right or proper or just or wise for us to continue to appropriate in excess of the revenue expected. I do not understand that legislation is now contemplated in the line of increasing revenue. I would like to be advised by some one who can speak with some degree of authority just where on these various appropriation bills we ought to begin the cutting down. If we can not cut down I would like to be advised of that, and if we can I would like to follow in the place where it is suggested that a reduction is proper. But if we can not make that reduction, then the House is confronted with the proposition and the country is confronted with the proposition that we must increase the revenue. I should dislike to increase the revenue, as such increase involves an increase of taxation, and I should prefer to decrease the appropriations. I would like to be advised by some one familiar with this subject—and I am only asking for information, as the gentleman from Minnesota appreciates, and for no purpose whatever of disturbing him in the progress of his bill—just what we are to do. We have only a few weeks left before the end of the session and we must pass these bills during that time, but somebody ought to tell us what we must do and where we must apply the pruning knife and what appropriations we must cut down. It seems to me we ought to be informed in respect to one or the other of the propositions. Of course, I do not assume that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] himself can give the information, but I thought perhaps he might be able to.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am not the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and therefore can not speak for the committee as a whole, except to indorse in a general way the answer made by the leader of the minority, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON], that this is an appropriation committee. I can only speak for the subcommittee of which I am the chairman, the one having charge of the bill now before the House. I direct the attention of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] to the fact that the appropriation now under consideration has been reduced below the current law by about 14 per cent. We have done our share in the reducing.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Well, I am very glad to know that.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. And I want to say further, Mr. Chairman, while I am on that thought, that our friends in the District to the contrary notwithstanding, we have not sacrificed any material thing in doing it. We have taken care of the important elements to the District's interests, and yet have been able to make, by prudent care, a reduction of about 14 per cent of the current law.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. This makes a reduction of about a million and a half, approximately?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. In round numbers.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Is the gentleman sufficiently well advised in relation to the general financial situation and the various appropriations necessary to carry on the Government to inform the House where we can make the other necessary reductions in order to bring our appropriations within the limit, or whether it is proposed to do so? I don't know whether the gentleman can or not.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I do not believe that anyone can make answer to that just now, Mr. Chairman. I am very much obliged to the gentleman from Maine. I think he has rendered a service to the country in bringing to the attention of this House a large view of one great problem that is before it. The statement will be helpful to all of us.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I suppose the gentleman concedes as a matter of business we either ought to reduce the appropriations or to increase the revenues?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Yes; and being like the gentleman unwilling to increase the revenues just now, I have done my part toward the other alternative.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I think the gentleman is entitled to the gratitude of the House.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. BAKER. I understood the gentleman from Minnesota to say that he is not in favor of increasing the revenues to raise more money?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Of the two alternatives I prefer to reduce the expenditures if it can be done without neglecting any proper interest.

Mr. BAKER. As bearing directly upon this bill, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether he has in his mind roughly the aggregate of assessments of the District of Columbia. There is nothing in the bill to show it so far as I have been able to discover.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. In round numbers, something like \$200,000,000.

Mr. BAKER. I assume the chairman has no objection to an increase of revenues if it can be had legitimately, without being a burden upon the people—I will put it that way. Well, if the gentleman does not care to answer that question—

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. That is a very broad proposition.

Mr. BAKER. All right, if the gentleman does not care to answer it.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I see no reason—

Mr. BAKER. Let me call the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to the fact that there is a fund that this committee can avail itself of that will pay all the expenses of the District of Columbia. He says the aggregate assessment is about \$200,000,000. Why, the Tom L. Johnson committee showed in 1892, twelve years ago, that the land values at that time of the city of Washington, when the population was not much more than half what it is to-day, certainly not two-thirds, that the land values then were over \$400,000,000. The land values, not the buildings, nor personal property. And they were increasing, according to that exhaustive investigation, at the rate of \$42,000,000 a year. Now, if anything like a proportionate rate has been maintained and with the increase of population it has probably increased at a much greater ratio, it has probably increased at the rate of fifty or sixty million dollars a year as the population has increased.

Why, you have got a fund of nine hundred millions to a thousand million dollars that you call upon to pay the expenses of the District of Columbia, yet here are the assessors, the sworn officers of this District, who have taken an oath to obey the law and put all property upon the tax list at its true value, violating their oath of office, according to these statements, to the extent of four-fifths of the land values alone that exists in the District of Columbia. Does the gentleman propose to rectify that? Has he anything to say in criticism of the failure of these men to find that fund which is patent to everybody?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the assessed valuations in the District of Columbia have very largely increased within the last three years, and while that is always a subject about which people have honest differences of opinion, the man who is assessed thinking he is assessed too high—we have had numerous complaints of that kind—and a publicist like my friend here—

Mr. BAKER. I beg pardon, the gentleman from New York is not a publicist.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Why, I thought he was.

Mr. BAKER. Not at all. He is a mere student; that is all.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Some men with large views of public policy think that the man who pays taxes is assessed too low, but we do feel that these men are making an honest effort to make an accurate assessment, and we are giving them every facility that we possibly can.

Mr. BAKER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question on that point. He says he believes these assessors are attempting to make an honest assessment. Now, I presented to this House a year ago a statement of the relative cost of some of the best-known property in the city of Washington and the assessment upon such property—and I will get the RECORD, if the gentleman cares to have it, and call his attention to it again—showing that some of the best-known properties in the city of Washington are assessed at not to exceed 10 to 12 per cent of their value. Now, is a man competent to act as assessor, or is he honest, if he can not see more than 12 per cent of the value of the real estate before him?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I direct the attention of my friend from New York [Mr. BAKER] to the fact that this is a Committee on Appropriations. Under the rules of this House it is especially forbidden to legislate. We take the conditions as we find them and do the best we can with them.

Mr. BAKER. The committee has supervision, as I understand it, over the government of the District of Columbia, and the appropriations for the same.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] feels that there is further legislation needed, he has the privilege of introducing that legislation and having it referred to the legislative committee. And if he feels that anyone has failed in the discharge of his duty, he has the same privilege that I have in bringing him up to the chalk mark.

Mr. BAKER. Will the gentleman explain how I can bring the assessors up to the chalk mark?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Will the gentleman explain how I can do it?

Mr. BAKER. Pardon me. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] is the chairman of the subcommittee before whom these several departments come and before whom the Commissioners come and ask for these appropriations. And when they ask for these appropriations it seems to me it is the duty of the subcommittee to say, "Are you doing your duty? There is a complaint made, which seems upon its face to be an outrageous violation of duty, that you are assessing property at 12 per cent when you ought to be assessing it at 100 per cent, and you ask that you shall have three or five thousand dollars to continue that office when you are violating this law." That is the duty which is up to you. I have no such power. I am not upon the District Committee. The Speaker was kind and gracious enough to put me on a committee that never meets.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Will the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] permit a question?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Yes, sir.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. As I understand it, the United States pays one half of the expenses for the running of this District government and the District pays the other half?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. That is correct.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Of what consequence is it, then, to the United States Government what the valuations may be that are placed upon the real estate or property in this District? How does it affect the United States revenues in the least? If the valuations are low, then the percentage in making up the one-half that the District is to pay would be a higher percentage, and if they are high, it would be lower. Is not that all?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. There is a certain amount to be raised, and the lower the assessment the higher the rate.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Then, as a matter of course, the question of the valuation of property in the District of Columbia is one which does not in the least concern the revenue of the United States, or us here, as I understand it. Is that so?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. It does not affect the taxation.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. It does not affect it at all.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. They raise their half.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The United States simply pays its half, and the method of raising the other half here in the District of Columbia is of no special consequence to the United States.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. That is my understanding. If other property is assessed too high or too low, whether the values are reasonable or not, is a matter that does not concern us in the least.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, another subject that engaged the attention of the subcommittee is that relating to the emergency hospital service of the District. As gentlemen perhaps know, there are in the District two emergency hospitals, so called. One, called the Central, is down on Fifteenth street, about two or three blocks below the Treasury. The other is out east of the Capitol. Heretofore we appropriated as a lump sum directly to the officers of these corporations, which are private corporations, \$15,000 to the Central Emergency Hospital and \$2,000 to the Eastern Emergency Hospital. It was deemed by the committee wise to change the method of making the appropriation, and instead of making the appropriation as a lump sum, to be turned over to a private corporation, we have appropriated instead of the \$17,000, \$15,000 for emergency service, and have placed it at the disposal of the Board of Charities for indigent people, and these are the ones contemplated by the appropriation, and only these, wherever the Board of Charities may deem it wise in the public interest to have this service rendered.

The Emergency Hospital, known as the "Central," is well located, and no doubt will be given the bulk of the cases, as heretofore. But if a man should be stricken out on Fourteenth street, not far from the Garfield Hospital, it might be better to take him in there than send for an ambulance to take him down somewhere else. In such a case minutes may be important.

In the arrangement which we propose and recommend to the House the appropriation is reduced from \$17,000 to \$15,000, and

is placed under the control of the Board of Charities, to be disposed of as in their judgment will best serve the public interest. We believe that \$15,000 under this policy will serve as well as \$17,000 do now.

The Eastern Dispensary is not well located. It is located in the midst of hospitals that are not only willing to do this work, but would be glad to have it.

In the bill there are a number of limitations upon appropriations. On page 22, gentlemen will find by the report, is the following limitation:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to invite bids and to make contracts for operating the District quarry for such periods, not exceeding five years each, as may be determined by them to be most advantageous to the District.

Up until something less than five years ago, in constructing the county roads, etc., the District of Columbia bought stone from men who had stone to sell. They bought it under contract.

The stone was quarried in this vicinity. It was not the best of stone. Something less than five years ago the District purchased, out of the fund for county roads, a quarry of trap rock some 20 miles distant from the city. This rock is very much superior to the rock formerly secured. The District Commissioners have been working this quarry under a contract, the stone to be delivered on board the cars. That contract is about to expire. The District Commissioners recommended that they be granted authority to make another contract covering a period not to exceed five years.

The five-year period was selected because it seemed to the Commissioners that no one would care to have it for a less period, or if he should that he would have to make a larger profit for the period of the contract where it is less than five years. Hence the period recommended.

On page 24 there is a provision regarding the Anacostia bridge. That is the bridge down near the navy-yard, over which people travel in coming from Anacostia, east of the river. The existing bridge is in a very dangerous condition. It has to be constantly watched, and repairs are always being made upon it. A year ago the Commissioners came before us with a proposition for the erection of a new bridge. The new bridge was authorized at an expenditure not to exceed \$250,000.

They now ask that we increase the limit of cost to \$375,000. They explained that at the time they made the estimate a year ago the amount estimated for would have done the work; but since then three changes have been made, which have made necessary a change in the limitation: First, the War Department—this being nominally a navigable river and therefore under the control of the War Department—has required the widening of the river by bringing in the bulkhead. That lengthened the bridge by something like a hundred feet. The War Department has also deepened the river at that point, which makes it necessary to increase the height of the piers. The War Department has also required that in this bridge there shall be a draw—something that was not in the existing bridge and was not contemplated by the Commissioners when they made their estimate.

I presume this draw is required by the War Department on the theory that in the event that the Anacostia Flats are reclaimed there may be a space provided for boats to pass up and possibly a landing place will be found above the bridge; and out of abundance of caution they deem it proper to demand that a draw be inserted in this bridge.

For these three reasons the Commissioners ask that the estimated limit of cost be increased from \$250,000 to \$375,000, and it was the judgment of the committee that that increased limit of cost should be approved.

We make no appropriation for the bridge this year, because last year we made an appropriation of \$100,000 and authorized a contract for the full amount of \$250,000. Owing to the changed conditions that I have indicated, it was not deemed wise to begin the construction of the bridge, so that the \$100,000 which we appropriated last year will be available for use in the coming year. Hence there is no necessity for any further appropriation at this time.

I believe that covers the general features of the bill to which special attention of the House should be directed.

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

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. BAKER. I have now the RECORD of April 18, 1904, containing a few remarks that I made upon this very subject, in which I then called attention to the actual assessments of some typical properties in the city of Washington, and the prices at which those properties were sold very shortly thereafter. In

the case of highly improved properties in the very heart of Washington those properties were not sold, and therefore I am not able to cite a sale price as proof of their value. Here is the northeast corner of Fifteenth and New York avenue, assessed for \$12 per square foot in 1901 and for \$16 per square foot in 1904. The true value is not less than \$60 per square foot. Here is the southwest corner of Ninth and F, one of the best pieces of property in the city, assessed in 1904 at \$15 a square foot, while the value is about \$60 a foot.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will my friend pardon a question?

Mr. BAKER. Certainly. I assume that you and I both want to have justice done in this matter.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Yes; I would like to ask my friend whether he thinks that the rate of taxation in this city is now too low?

Mr. BAKER. I will answer that question by saying that of course if the assessors fail to do their duty and only put property upon the assessment roll (as I will cite and, I think, prove conclusively) at a very small fraction of its value, then the property that is put upon the assessment roll at something approximating its true value must bear a disproportionate amount of taxation, and therefore it works an injustice to those people who own the small homes in this community. I care nothing about the rate as a mere matter of principle. I care a great deal about the rate as a matter of inequity between the owners of property.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Yes, and I presume my friend believes that those who are thus burdened or hurt would be the first to complain.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, my experience is that those who are thus burdened and hurt are not the first to complain. That is my answer to that proposition. Why? Because the people who are most hurt and most burdened are the people who own the small properties. They are men who have their noses on the grindstones. They have to work all the time in order to make a bare living and possibly to pay off each year a small proportion of a building and loan association loan, or mortgage upon their property. Most of them have no knowledge of what other assessments are, and have no time to find out. They are the victims of a system which is encouraged and perpetuated by the large speculators in land, and also by the men who are held up in this and other communities as leading citizens, who own large buildings. These two classes of men own the properties that are assessed at a very low value, and those are the men who employ lawyers to go before boards of assessors in the city of Washington to plead for reductions, while the great mass of the people who are assessed at one thousand, two thousand, or three thousand dollars, have no means of knowing that A and B, in the heart of the city, have immense buildings that are only assessed at 30 or 40 per cent of their value, nor that other men have large tracts of vacant land which are assessed as low as from 10 per cent to 20 per cent. No, Mr. Chairman, those are not the people who make protests, because few of them have knowledge of the conditions. But even if they knew what to do and where to go to have their assessment corrected they would have to lose their time when they went to make complaint, and even run the risk of loss of employment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the privilege of inserting in my remarks the data I have in my hand, so that the House can see for itself this fearful discrepancy.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman printing the matter he refers to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting certain tables. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ASSESSMENT ON VACANT LAND OUTSIDE OF THE CITY LIMITS.

Square between Eighth and Ninth and Flint and Genesee streets, Brightwood Park, D. C. (120,000 square feet), 1901, 2 cents to 4 cents a foot; 1904, 5 cents to 8 cents a foot. True value about 40 cents a foot.

But, while it is bad enough in the city of Washington, the moment you go to the outskirts of the city there you find an even worse condition of affairs. There you find land assessed at even a lower rate than in the cases I have cited. I have here a list of a few properties—I could just as easily produce a hundred such cases if time allowed—assessed as low as from one-fifth to one-eleventh of their value—vacant lands in this community. I have the figures showing that in one case 1,200 acres were assessed at \$120,000, when the property was actually sold at \$1,041,687. In another case the property was assessed at \$500 an acre, when it was worth \$4,000 an acre. In another case the assessed value was \$1,000 an acre and the actual value \$8,000 an acre.

Statement showing date of sale of certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia, its selling price, and the assessment on said property at time of sale.

Location.	Sold for—	Assessed at—
Rock Creek Park, about 1,200 acres (1898).....	\$1,041,687	\$120,000
North of Cleveland Park, 60 acres (1898).....per acre..	4,000	500
Tennallytown and Woodley Lane roads, 31 acres (1898).....per acre..	8,000	1,000
Grant road, near Chevy Chase, 12 acres (1899).....do....	1,000	200
Grant road, near Chevy Chase, 3 acres (1901).....do....	2,200	225
Woodley road, 18 acres (1901).....do....	4,500	400
Wisconsin avenue, 148 acres (1901).....do....	4,500	400

The Washington Evening Star is the authority for the selling price of the above tracts of land. The assessments were furnished to a prominent business man and large property owner of Washington by the District assessor. Hundreds of similar cases could be given to show that land in the District of Columbia has been assessed at a very small fraction (from one-fifth to one-twentieth) of its true value for many years, but I will only cite a few:

Location of land.	Sold for—	Assessment.
Square No. 55 (1903).....	\$38,000	\$3,452
Square No. 125 (1903).....	23,000	2,564
Square No. 711 (1903).....	15,436	1,382
Square No. 712 (1903).....	4,708	672

That these are not extreme nor isolated cases is shown in the matter of the City Hospital sites in 1900. I have here a list of some twenty different sites which were suggested for the location of the hospital, the prices at which they were offered, the assessment thereon, and in the third column is placed the proportion the assessment bore to the real value of the land:

Sites offered for City Hospital in 1900.

Party.	Location.	Price.	Assessment.	Proportion of assessment to real land value.
B. H. Warner & Co.....	Long Meadows	\$77,843	\$7,604	10
W. H. Saunders	Mount Pleasant	90,000	10,390	11½
J. V. N. Huyck	Conduit road	44,505	2,250	5
Do	do	28,150	1,239	4½
Catharine Shugrue.....	do	50,000	3,734	7½
Wm. Miller	Petworth	65,325	5,296	8½
Clark Brothers	Anacostia road	20,000	875	4½
L. P. Shoemaker	Grant road	30,000	3,477	11½
Do	Square No. 110, Georgetown.....	88,500	9,440	11
Do	Southwest of Anacostia.....	24,500	1,502	6½
A. Greenless and J. Ridout.....	South Takoma	50,000	6,900	14
H. R. Dulaney	Pierce Mill road.....	100,000	7,000	7
Do	do	73,500	4,200	6
Do	Ingleside	50,000	3,468	7
R. W. Walker & Son.....	Unversity Heights	31,356	2,613	8½
D. O'C. Callaghan	Bladensburg road	50,000	4,000	8
G. J. Sufferle	Foxhall road	39,600	2,774	7
Alex. Mosher	Brentwood road	80,000	4,476	5½
Walter D. Davidge.....	Cathedral avenue	40,000	4,500	11½
		1,033,279	85,736	8½

That these are honest assessments, that they in any way represent the honest judgment of the assessor, no one, I assume, will contend, and yet with what apparent determination to be accurate these parcels are assessed. If it were not that the prices asked for these several parcels of land are set in an adjacent parallel column one would assume that an assessor who could figure the value of a piece of land so accurately as is represented in an assessment of \$7,604, or, as in another case, \$1,239, or \$3,734, or \$5,496, or \$2,613, must be an extremely conscientious official. And yet it is obvious that the real purpose of these assessments is to lead the casual observer to believe that extraordinary pains and great care had been taken to arrive at an absolutely accurate valuation.

An official who guesses that a piece of land worth \$28,150 is only worth \$1,239 or a \$50,000 tract is only worth \$3,466 is a dangerous man for a community to employ, it being so palpably evident that he is not assessing these properties in the interest of the community—his employers—but in the interest of the owners of the land.

These assessments are either incompetent or dishonest. If the former, then the official who can only see 4½ or 4¾ per cent of the value of a tract of land should be immediately removed and some other official with an eye less blind to the public interests and not so single to the interests of the person who is cheating the community should be appointed in his place.

I am told that the city finally paid for a site for this hospital the sum of \$25,000, the site, however, being then assessed at only \$1,400, or less than 6 per cent of the price the city was then compelled to pay. No landowner could justly complain if his land was assessed at the price which he offers same for sale. Looking at the matter from this standpoint, it will be seen that the owners of these tracts of land have been cheating their fellow-citizens out of anywhere from three-fourths to seven-eighths of the taxes which they properly should have paid upon those several tracts.

BUILDING AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS SHOULD NOT BE TAXED.

At the proper time I propose to offer an amendment to this bill to exempt from taxation the earnings and the capital stock of building and loan associations.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour, or so much thereof as the gentleman may desire, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS].

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I shall take advantage of the latitude in debate under appropriation bills to make some remarks regarding a section of the President's last annual message to Congress, which I shall read:

While I am of the opinion that at present it would be undesirable, if it were not impracticable, finally to clothe the Commission with general authority to fix railroad rates, I do believe as a fair security to shippers, the Commission should be vested with the power, where a given rate has been challenged and after full hearing found to be unreasonable, to decide, subject to judicial review, what shall be a reasonable rate to take its place; the ruling of the Commission to take effect immediately, and to obtain unless and until it is reversed by the court of review.

The Government must, in increasing degree, supervise and regulate the workings of the railways engaged in interstate commerce; and such increased supervision is the only alternative to an increase of the present evils on the one hand or a still more radical policy on the other. In my judgment the most important legislative act now needed as regards the regulation of corporations is this act to confer on the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to revise rates, the revised rate to at once go into effect, and stay in effect unless and until the court of review reverses it.

President Roosevelt, in a previous message to the Fifty-seventh Congress, called attention to the fact—

That the cardinal provisions of the interstate-commerce act were that railway rates should be just and reasonable, and that all shippers, localities, and commodities should be accorded equal treatment.

And after discussing possible errors in the act, he says:

The act should be amended. The railway is a public servant. Its rates should be just to and open to all shippers alike. The Government should see to it that within its jurisdiction this is so, and should provide a speedy, inexpensive, and effective remedy to that end.

Nothing could be more foolish than the enactment of legislation which would unnecessarily interfere with the development and operation of these commercial agencies. The subject is one of great importance and calls for the earnest attention of Congress.

It will be observed that he suggests here no remedy as being either "speedy," "inexpensive," or "effective," although he does state specifically that the means devised for the enforcement of its provisions are defective. This was before the Presidential election, however, and the statement of his position now admits of no sort of question. He not only at length discusses with ability and marked clearness the duty of the Government, but in language which can not be misunderstood states the legislative remedy which should be applied, and, having stated it, gives great emphasis to it by saying:

In my judgment the most important legislative act now needed as regards the regulation of corporations is this act to confer on the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to revise rates and regulations, the revised rate to at once go into effect and to stay in effect unless and until the court of review reverses it.

I shall not consume any time discussing the constitutionality or the legality of such a law as the President here recommends. I shall take it for granted that there will be no controversy on this subject; that good lawyers are agreed that this can be constitutionally and legally done, and that practically no one, save those who oppose the legislation on other grounds, even at any objection of this character. It may be safely assumed that before the President made this recommendation he had this matter thoroughly investigated, took legal advice of his competent Cabinet officer and others whose judicial opinion he valued, and gentlemen on that side will not likely attack this recommendation of their great party leader upon the ground that the law would be illegal.

Mr. Chairman, down in my State the foremost citizen of the great Commonwealth has recently written a letter on this subject, and before I briefly quote from that, as I shall do, I desire, in obedience to a habit that I have always endeavored to cultivate of not waiting until a man is dead to say a good thing about him, to speak briefly of the man's character and services to the State to which he is an honor and to the nation of which he is a citizen.

John H. Reagan is the last survivor of the Confederate Cabinet. His services to the country at large since the war have been as pure and as earnest as was his devotion to the lost cause. [Applause on the Democratic side.] At an advanced age now he is spending the sunset of a glorious life in the quiet retirement of an humble private home. Around him hovers the halo of a devotion on the part of the people of that State that in its intensity and extent has never been equaled in the case of any other citizen of my State, living or dead. [Applause.]

This man's exalted character, his great talents, his length of service in all forms of legislative business, and his near ap-

proach to the dark river lend to his words a purity and a power not to be questioned.

In a letter published widely in the Texas papers of the 10th of this month he uses this language:

Now the enlargement of its powers by Congress has become a necessity, if Congress is to respect the rights of the general public, and not, as in the past, to assume that its special mission is to take care of the interests of the railroad corporations whenever they are found to conflict with the public interest.

But much as this is needed I think there can be but little hope of any relief to the public in this respect while the Senate of the United States is subject to the influences which have of late controlled that body.

The ownership of the railroads by the Federal Government is, it seems clear to me, both impracticable and dangerously unwise. I have not before me the real or capitalized value of the railroads of the United States, but a reference to those values will show the enormous amount of debt such purchase, if it could be made, would entail on the people.

The railroads could only be purchased on terms consented to by their owners. But the feature of greatest danger would be the effect of such a policy on the General Government. There are probably in the employment of the United States 150,000 or 200,000 persons in one or another branch of business. There are over 1,000,000 employees in the service of the railroad companies, as shown by the last report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, most of them active men in the meridian of life. If we should add this number to those already liable to executive influence, would it not so greatly increase the power and influence of the Federal Government, and so diminish the power and influence of the States, as to change the character of the Government? And with this addition to executive patronage, could not an ambitious President continue himself in office as long as he might choose? Another view should not be lost sight of.

All well-informed persons know that it requires more men, more time, and more money in the continuation or operation of any public enterprise by the Government than is required under the control and interest of private capital. And whether railroads should be owned by the General Government or by the States, this would greatly increase the cost of the maintenance and operation of the road, and the cost of transportation of property and persons, and would, therefore, operate against the interests of the public.

I mention these facts to contrast the success of regulation as in Texas with the idea of the public ownership of the railroads.

I had thought in preparing these remarks, Mr. Chairman, that I would make no question of the patriotic purpose of the President of our country in making this recommendation, nor shall I seriously question that purpose now. I had hoped to frankly concede that he was actuated by the same lofty motives that impelled the great old man whose words I have just read. The fact that the President says in this message that it is to the interest of the shippers of the country and for "the security of the shipper" that this ought to be done, the fact that he warns his countrymen that the increasing evils of existing conditions demand that either the Government shall exercise increasing supervision of these corporations or shall be driven to a "still more radical policy," puts him in line with the two positions which I just read from this letter of John H. Reagan.

But I can not forbear quoting and commenting slightly upon what one who is considered a great statesman and a close political adviser and friend of the President has recently said, if correctly reported by the papers, to be true of the President's purpose in this matter. Last Friday night there was a banquet at the Brunswick Hotel, in the city of Boston. The senior Senator from the State of Massachusetts was the principal speaker at that banquet, and in Saturday morning's press a part of the speech then and there made by that Senator was reported. He said:

The President laid down in his message to Congress a policy in regard to interstate commerce, into the details of which it is not necessary to enter. I wish, however, to say a few words in regard to the principle of the policy. It is a serious and important measure, a great and perplexing question. Those who regard the policy of the President as radical and likely to make great changes make a mistake. I think that the policy suggested by the President is conservative.

Mr. Chairman, this word "conservative" is a great word, but it depends a great deal upon what is to be conserved. Continuing, he says:

The policy of the President is not to attack the railroads, for the railroads do not earn very splendid dividends, and no one wants to see the railroads other than prosperous. What the President's policy stands for is an equalization of rates, not only to give the small shipper fair returns, but also to make up to the railroads that which the great corporations force them to give up in the matter of rebates, and to abolish rebates and the differentials between various points.

I knew, Mr. Chairman, that the people demanded a protection against some of the great corporations of the country, but this is the first intimation I ever have had of the necessity to protect the poor railroads of the country against the rapacity and greed of other corporations! He says further:

To-day, New York and Boston are suffering from railroad differentials, made to benefit points farther south. The question is difficult, but if not dealt with now it will assume alarming proportions.

Mr. Chairman, if this be a true version of the purpose of the President in this recommendation, an alarming proposition confronts Congress. The effort is to be made to aid the railroads in checking a growing and healthy competition between Atlantic seaboard lines and lines which run south to New Orleans

and Galveston, for I shall not insult the intelligence and character of the Senator who uttered these words by assuming either that it is a mere piece of banquet, after-dinner wit, or that it is a mere scheme to influence the people of that section to follow him in the advocacy of Mr. Roosevelt's recommendation, without revealing the true purpose for which it is to be enacted into law. If this version be correct, then the purpose does not refer to restraining the maximum rates in the interests of a wider and better commercial competition, but to the use of the minimum rate to check and throttle an increasing competition which is to the interest of the whole country.

If this position is true, we have arrived at the point where the principle of protection so long invoked in the interest of the eastern manufacturer and eastern capital is to be extended to eastern railroad capital and eastern railroad lines to protect them against the growing western and southern transportation conditions. I frankly concede that the phenomenal growth of imports and exports at New Orleans and at Galveston in the last two or three years, the rapid trend of business South and West, is such that it may well attract the attention of the thoughtful business men of New England. I concede that much, but it is the healthy, normal, natural trend, which ought not to be interrupted by the hand of the law. We do not need on this subject minimum-rate legislation so much. That is not the chief matter of which the people complain.

We need legislation fixing maximum rates to restrain the milking of the great agricultural sections of the capital which they produce annually and its pouring into the coffers of roads owned in the East that reach out into that territory to amass their profits. But, however that may be, Mr. Chairman, assuming, as I do, that the President had no such narrow sectional purpose in view in this recommendation, it only makes this utterance from the President's last annual message, in the light of seven years' history of the subject to which he refers, one of the most remarkable emanating from the Chief Executive in our country's history.

The act of 1887, creating the Interstate Commerce Commission was generally supposed to confer the power upon that Commission to substitute a reasonable rate for a rate which they found upon investigation unreasonable. The Commission acted upon this idea for ten years in hundreds of cases that were before it for that period, and in not one of them was this power questioned. In sixty-eight different cases the Commission, by formal order, prescribed a change of rate for the future. There was no serious contention during this period, even on the part of the railroads themselves, of any oppression in the execution of the law. And on the part of shippers and receivers of freight all over the country there was so widespread and general satisfaction with the law and its execution by the Commission that President Cleveland, in a message to Congress in 1896, nine years after the passage of the act, referring to it said:

The justice and equity of the principles embodied in the existing law, passed for the purpose of regulating transportation charges, are everywhere conceded, and there appears to be no question that the policy thus entered upon has a permanent place in our legislation.

The following year all this was suddenly and vitally changed by the decision of the Supreme Court, denying to the Commission the power to fix rates.

In May, 1897, in the case of the Interstate Commerce Commission v. The Cincinnati, New Orleans and Texas Pacific Railway, the Supreme Court decided by a divided court that Congress had not conferred upon the Commission the legislative power of fixing rates, either maximum, minimum, or arbitrary.

As the Hon. John D. Kernan, in his address before the Interstate Commerce Law Convention at St. Louis, in October last, aptly says:

This meant that the Commission could investigate, have long and intricate hearings, report for or against the rates and practices complained of, and then that railroads could do as they pleased.

Almost immediately upon the rendition of this decision shippers everywhere recognized its fatal defect and began to use every possible avenue to urge an amendment to the law which would give the power to the Commission that it was popularly supposed it had originally.

The State legislatures of eight different States of the Union, including the great agricultural State from which hails the distinguished chairman of the Foreign and Interstate Commerce Committee, in varying phraseology urged practically this contention. Resolutions were adopted by over 400 of the leading commercial and industrial associations of the Union, comprising, it is estimated, not less than a million shippers and receivers of freight, such as the National Grange, numerous State granges, the Grain Dealers' National Association and its numerous bodies, the National Board of Trade, the National Live Stock Association, the National Hay Association, the National

League of Commission Merchants, the Millers' Association, and the national organizations representing the lumber, cotton, drug, hardware, grocery, and other interests, and State and local organizations in forty-three States and Territories.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the first and second sessions of the present Congress shows the number of petitions and memorials praying for the enactment of such legislation on 96 different dates, submitted by 31 different Senators and 73 different Representatives from 116 different associations and shippers and receivers of freight.

The National Association of State Railroad Commissioners, in convention at San Francisco June 5, 1901, passed a resolution that—

Congress is earnestly urged to the prompt enactment of legislation to clothe the Interstate Commerce Commission with power and authority to fix charges when, in its judgment, needed.

And this demand was repeated in its convention at Charleston, S. C., February 15, 1902. The National Grange in annual convention declared:

We furnish nearly 60 per cent of all freight carried by the railroads of this country. We approve the recommendations as to enlarging the powers and duties of the Commission, giving it and charging it with the duty of fixing maximum rates.

Similar declarations have been made by State granges in Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, and other States.

The National Live Stock Association, which represents \$4,000,000 worth of invested capital and comprises in its membership as high character, pure patriotism, and large contributions to the increasing wealth of our country as any class of our citizenship, at its fifth annual convention adopted a memorial to Congress which so clearly and comprehensively states this whole matter that I shall ask the Clerk to read the portion marked, which I send to the desk.

This association, in behalf of its constituency, earnestly urges upon Congress the great importance and increasing need of Federal legislation which will give the Interstate Commerce Commission adequate power to correct discriminations, remove preferences, abate unreasonable rates, and, where necessary, to prescribe the maximum and minimum rates, making its decision effective pending any appeal to the courts.

When the present interstate-commerce law was enacted in 1887 it was at least popularly supposed, and we believe clearly intended, that it gave the Interstate Commerce Commission, after due hearing and investigation, the power to say what was a reasonable or unreasonable rate and to enforce its decisions. Court decisions have since declared that the Interstate Commerce Commission does not have the power to fix rates for the future, either directly or by indirection.

As substantially every complaint that has been or would be brought before the Commission involves the question of the reasonableness of rates, it can be readily seen that these court decisions practically wipe out the only real power the Commission was supposed to have, and limit its usefulness to the collection and promulgation of statistics.

While governmental control over railroad charges through the medium of the Interstate Commerce Commission has been gradually fading away, the general railroad situation has undergone portentous changes.

Little independent carriers have been forced to the wall and absorbed by their larger competitors, which in turn have combined with or sold out to other larger competing systems, until to-day, by this centralization, the rail transportation facilities of this country are practically controlled by scarce half a dozen different interests.

By these transitions, reorganizations, and combinations added burdens have not only been placed upon the man who pays the freight, by reason of increases in the fixed charges or indebtedness of the railroads, but the public, which now has greater need of intelligent and effective Federal supervision and regulation of railroad charges, has less protection to-day than previous to the enactment of the present interstate-commerce law.

The general marked advance in rates during the past three years of unexampled prosperity to the railroads were apparently unnecessary and seemingly unwarranted upon any other theory than the intent of the railroads to exact all they could. The multiplied economies of railroad operation, together with the enormous increase in the volume of traffic, would seem to logically suggest a reduction instead of an advance. Their action, however, enables us to unmistakably forecast what they could do, unrestrained by Federal control, when by further consolidations or by other agencies competition becomes entirely stifled.

The members of the National Live Stock Association recognize that the railroads are powerful agencies of progress, and that more than any other factor they have contributed to the development of the country. The superb service they perform merits our commendation.

We expect to pay the railroads the cost of the service they render, together with a reasonable profit on their investment. We do not want the service for any less, nor ought we to be compelled to pay more. We are not presuming to say what are or may be reasonable or fair rates, but we do emphatically protest against the railroads being the sole arbiters of their charges and exacting what they think the traffic will stand, or, in plainer language, all they can get.

If railroad rates are fair and reasonable, the railroads should not fear any investigation of them by an impartial tribunal. The objections they make against the proper Federal supervision of rates by an expert commission confirms the suspicion that railroad rates need regulating.

Either the Government must assume at once an intelligent and comprehensive control over the railroad charges or prepare for absolute ownership of the transportation facilities of this country.

For these, among many other patent reasons, the members of the National Live Stock Association respectfully request Congress to give

early attention to this much-needed legislation, which has already been too long delayed.

The twenty-first section of the act creating the Interstate Commerce Commission imposes the specific duty upon the Commission of recommending to Congress such additional legislation as it may deem necessary. An examination of the annual reports to Congress made by the Commission, beginning with 1897, will show how fully this duty has been discharged and reflects credit upon the Commission.

In the first report after the decision of the Supreme Court holding the Commission powerless to fix rates, of date December 6, 1897, the Commission, speaking of the gravity of the question, says:

The aggregate freight money paid to the railroads of the United States during the year ending June 30, 1896, was \$786,615,837, and this sum was contributed, for the most part, by the people. A very slight change in rates upon any of the staple commodities amounts to an enormous sum in the aggregate. In most articles of daily use the transportation charge is a large, and often the larger, part of the cost to the consumer. The freight rate may determine whether the Kansas farmer shall burn his corn for fuel or send it to market. The traffic manager may decree whether an industry shall exist or a locality flourish. It is not only the billions of dollars invested in railway properties which this question touches, but the prosperity and welfare of the people at large throughout the whole nation. It is certainly, both from the standpoint of the railway capitalist and the humblest citizen, one of transcendent importance, and we invite earnest attention to the actual condition as this decision leaves it.

Stating the position taken by the Commission theretofore under the law, it says:

It will be seen, therefore, that the Commission has never assumed to make the rate. It has assumed that it was charged under the act with the duty of determining whether the rate complained of was just and reasonable, and if found to be unjust and unreasonable, of correcting that violation of the statute. In doing so it has been assumed that the plain, and, in fact, the only way to do this was to prohibit the charging of the unreasonable rate and compel the charging of one which was reasonable. Of the 135 formal orders made in suits actually heard from its institution down to the present time 68 have prescribed a change in rate for the future.

Then, for some pages the necessity, legality, and propriety of clothing the Commission, by amendment, with the powers exercised by it prior to the Supreme Court's decision is clearly and forcibly affirmatively discussed by the Commission. It concludes with these words:

The enactment of the act to regulate commerce was in obedience to a popular demand and to remedy admitted evils. The experience of ten years has demonstrated the necessity and justice of such an act.

Nearly every essential feature of that act has failed of execution. There is to-day, and there can be under the law as now interpreted, no effective regulation of interstate carriers. If there is to be under this act, it must be amended. From the best consideration we have been able to give the subject we believe that the most essential features of such an act must be those previously indicated.

A tribunal which regulates the common carriers by railroad of interstate traffic, which can stand for justice and fairness between these carriers and the people, must have the power to fix a maximum rate, to fix in certain instances a minimum rate, and its orders when made must mean something.

In its report for 1898 it says on this same subject:

This subject was fully discussed in our last annual report, and we are unable to add anything to the presentation then made. In that and previous reports we have not only set forth in general terms the necessity for amending the law, but have formulated and proposed the specific amendments which appear to us positively essential. With the renewal of these recommendations no duty of the Commission in this regard remains undischarged.

Meanwhile the situation has become intolerable, both from the standpoint of the public and the carriers. Tariffs are disregarded, discriminations constantly occur, the price at which transportation can be obtained is fluctuating and uncertain. Railroad managers are distrustful of each other and shippers all the while in doubt as to the rates secured by their competitors. The volume of traffic is so unusual as to frequently exceed the capacity of equipment, yet the contest for tonnage seems never relaxed. Enormous sums are spent in purchasing business and secret rates accorded far below the standard of published charges. The general public gets little benefit from these reductions, for concessions are mainly confined to the heavier shippers. All this augments to the ruin of smaller dealers.

These are not only matters of gravest consequence to the business welfare of the country, but they concern in no less degree the higher interests of public morality.

In the report for 1899 this language was used:

In its last annual report the Commission stated that attention had been called in previous reports to the vital respects in which the act to regulate commerce has proved defective and inadequate; that the present law can not be properly enforced, and that until further legislation is provided the best efforts at regulation must be feeble and disappointing. The requests of the Commission for needful amendments have been supported by petitions and memorials from agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial interests throughout the country; yet not a line of the statute has been changed and none of the burdensome conditions which call for relief have been removed or modified. The reasons for the failure of the law to accomplish the purposes for which it was enacted have been so frequently and fully set forth that repetition can not add to their force or make them better understood.

It is sufficient to say that the existing situation and the developments of the past year render more imperative than ever before the necessity for speedy and suitable legislation. We therefore renew the recommendations heretofore made and earnestly urge their early consideration and adoption.

The word "yet" is significant in this quotation. It is a dignified and severe criticism of Congress. "Yet" is still the word. Then this warning is given Congress:

It is a matter of common knowledge that vast schemes of railway control are now in process of consummation and that the competition of rival lines is to be restrained by these combinations. While this movement has not yet found full expression in the actual consolidation of railroad corporations, enough has transpired to disclose a unification of financial interests which will dominate the management and harmonize the operations of lines heretofore independent and competitive. This is to-day the most noticeable and important feature of the railway situation. If the plans already foreshadowed are brought to effective results and others of similar scope are carried to execution, there will be a vast centralization of railroad properties, with all the power involved in such far-reaching combinations, yet uncontrolled by any public authority which can be efficiently exerted. The restraint of competition upon excessive and unjust rates will in this way be avoided, and whatever evils may result will be remediless under existing laws.

In the report of 1900 this language occurs:

With reference to further legislation the Commission has little to suggest and nothing new to propose. The subject has been fully discussed in previous reports to the Congress and recommendations, both general and specific, have been repeatedly made. The reasons for urging these amendments have been carefully explained, and repetition of the argument at this time can hardly be expected. While the attitude of the Commission has been misunderstood by some and misrepresented by others, the views heretofore officially expressed are believed to be justified alike by experience and reflection.

They are confirmed by later and current observation. Knowledge of present conditions and tendencies increases rather than lessens the necessity for legislative action upon the lines already indicated and in such other directions as will furnish an adequate and workable statute for the regulation of commerce "among several States."

A mournful tone has crept into the language of the Commission, a spirit of resignation to the "masterly inactivity" of the Republican party on this very important question.

In the report for 1901 the language quoted by me from the report of 1900 is quoted and these words are added:

These statements apply with added force to the present situation.

In repeating the views thus expressed, and referring again to what has been so often and fully set forth, the Commission believes that its duty in respect of recommendations is most suitably performed.

In the report for 1902, the Commission, on pages 5 et seq., press this matter in vigorous words:

The tendency to combine continues to be the most significant feature of railway development. The facts in this regard are matters of common knowledge, and little is gained by the mention of particular instances. It is not open to question that the competition between railroad carriers which formerly prevailed has been largely suppressed, or at least brought to the condition of effective restraint. The progress of consolidation, in one form or another, will, at no distant day, confine this competition within narrow and unimportant limits, because the control of most railway properties will be merged in a few individuals whose common interests impel them to act in concert.

While this will insure, as probably nothing else can in equal degree, the observance of published tariffs, and so measurably remove some of the evils which the act was designed to prevent, the resulting situation involves consequences to the public which claim the most serious attention. A law which might have answered the purpose when competition was relied upon to secure reasonable rates is demonstrably inadequate when that competition is displaced by the most far-reaching and powerful combinations. So great a change in conditions calls for corresponding change in the regulating statute.

Continuing, the Commission says:

The fullest power of correction is vested in the Congress, and the exercise of that power is demanded by the highest consideration of public welfare.

Were it deemed possible to add weight to previous recommendations or to emphasize the need for their prompt adoption, this portion of our report might be greatly extended. It is not believed, however, that this subject can be more forcibly presented or the situation more clearly explained than has been done in former reports. If the representations already made do not induce favorable action it is certainly not the fault of the Commission. A sense of the wrongs and injustice which can not be prevented in the present state of the law, as well as the duty enjoined by the act itself, impels the Commission to reaffirm its recommendations for the reasons so often and so fully set forth in previous reports and before the Congressional committees.

The mournful tone of former recommendations has drifted into a melancholy dirge over departed hope, the dominant note of which is, "It is certainly not the fault of the Commission." Whose fault is it?

The Democrats have been charged with much, but certainly this is not their fault. Is it the fault of the railroads? Are they bosses here? Is it the fault of ignorance, of cowardice, of disgraceful subjection to the wealthy and powerful?

In its report for 1903, speaking of the Elkins law, approved February 19, 1903, the Commission says:

Valuable as this law is in the direction and for the purposes above outlined, it has added nothing whatever to the power of the Commission to correct a tariff rate which is unreasonably high or which operates with discriminating effect. It greatly aids the observance of tariff charges, but it affords no remedy for those who are injured by such charges, either when they are excessive or when they are inequitably adjusted. If the tariffs published and filed, as the law directs, are enforced against all shippers alike, the authority of the Commission to require such tariffs to be changed remains just as ineffectual as it was before this legislation was enacted. This is the point to which the attention of the Congress has been repeatedly called; this is the defect in the regulating statute which demands correction. In the previous reports this question has been frequently and fully discussed. We have been recommended at length upon the

weakness and inadequacy of the law as its provisions have been construed by the courts. We have carefully pointed out the amendments which we deem essential, and explained in detail the reasons for our recommendations. We are unable to add anything of value to the presentation heretofore made. Our duty in this regard has been performed.

"Whose duty in this regard" has not "been performed?" In its report for 1904 the Commission says:

We said in our report to Congress for 1902 and 1903, and now repeat, that in view of the rapid disappearance of railway competition and the maintenance of rates established by combination, attended as they are by substantial advances in the charges on many articles of household necessities, the Commission regards this matter as increasingly grave, and desires to emphasize its conviction that the safeguards required for the protection of the public will not be provided until the regulating statute is thoroughly revised.

The matter is "increasingly grave," says the Commission. One thing is sure—Congress can not be increasingly inactive.

The Industrial Commission, a body appointed by the President, under a resolution of Congress, composed of four members of the Senate, four of the House, and ten prominent citizens, charged with the duty of investigating and reporting upon industrial conditions of the country, after more than three years of exhaustive study, in its report to Congress in February, 1902, discussed this subject at some length, saying among other things:

To the end that discrimination and inequality as between shippers and maladjustment of freight rates between competing markets and trade centers may be abolished or minimized; that the public may be assured of reasonable and stable freight rates, which will at the same time afford fair returns upon capital invested, etc., we recommend:

The definite grant of power to the Interstate Commerce Commission, never on its own initiative, but only on formal complaint, to pass upon the reasonableness of freight and passenger rates or charges; also the definite grant of power to declare given rates unreasonable, as at present, together with power to prescribe reasonable rates in substitution.

Appeal from an administrative order of the Commission should not vacate an order unless it plainly appears that such order proceeds upon error of law, or is unjust or unreasonable on the facts, in which case, and not otherwise, the court may suspend its operation during the pendency of proceedings in review.

All findings of fact by the Commission, when properly certified, should be received as prima facie evidence in subsequent proceedings in the case. New testimony offered by either party, when it appears that such testimony is material and could not have been taken in the first instance, should be taken by the Interstate Commerce Commission on order from the court. The time in which an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States may be taken should be limited to thirty days, but such appeal should not vacate the order appealed from.

It is incontestable that many of the great industrial combinations had their origin in railroad discrimination.

With reference to the Supreme Court decision in 1897, which held that the Commission had no power under the act to fix rates, the Commission says:

The immediate effect of this decision was to prevent any enforcement of orders relative to rates by the Commission. The carriers immediately refused to obey any orders which the Commission issued for the redress of grievances. This policy has been manifested with increasing clearness during the five years subsequent to the decision.

It has become more and more certain that the denial of the right not only to pass upon the reasonableness of a particular rate, but to prescribe what rate should supersede it, means the abolition of all control whatever. The entire inadequacy of rates as applied in the past, without reference to rates which shall prevail in the future, is apparent on all sides. More than this, all remedy for the parties who have borne the burden of an unreasonable rate would seem to have been removed. * * * Experience shows that almost no shippers or other parties injured actually attempt to secure the restitution of moneys already paid for unreasonable charges. In only 5 out of 225 cases down to 1897 was a rebate (or refund) actually sought, and in these cases \$100 was the maximum sought to be recovered. As a matter of fact, the damage inflicted by the existence of an unreasonable rate could not be measured by hundreds or perhaps by hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The bearing of this citation is to show that any effectual protection to the shipper must proceed from adjudication of the reasonableness of rates before and not after they have been paid—that is to say, in advance of their exaction by the carrier. Power to pass upon the reasonableness of such rates prior to their enforcement as a consequence constitutes the only safeguard which the shipping public may enjoy.

During these seven years various bills seeking to so amend the law as to vest in the Commission the power to substitute reasonable for ascertained unreasonable rates have been introduced by both Democrats and Republicans in the Senate and in the House. Notably among these are what are known as the "Cullom bill," the "Cooper-Quarles bill," the "John S. Williams bill," and many others. There have been hearings after hearings before the committees having these bills in charge, both in the House and in the Senate. This annual hearing process is going on now in the Senate and the House. Up to date we have only been hearing of hearings. Nothing but our hearing has been affected. And this protracted process calls to mind those famous chapters in Charles Dickens's celebrated novel, "Little Dorrit," entitled "Circumlocution Office" and "The science of how not to do it." I commend to these committees and the Republican leaders these chapters in "Little Dorrit," which describe that "red tape" process by which an immense amount of work is made to prevent results.

In a word, Mr. Chairman, the result of all this is nothing. The mountain has labored, but the mouse is minus. Notwithstanding

we have had two Republican Administrations since the Supreme Court's decision, each possessing complete power in every department of the Government, all this agitation and discussion, recommendations from high sources, and petitions of such reputable men, no effect has been produced upon the leaders of that great party, whose continual boast is that they meet the business conditions of the country at all times promptly and effectively.

This statement of the facts in this matter puts a huge interrogation point on this party boast.

Above all it is important that any bill you bring in meets fully the message of the President. Let there be no dodging, no weakening on the position, plainly stated and emphatically repeated in the President's message. A schoolboy can understand that the President's proposition is twofold. First, that the Commission shall be vested with power, upon examination, to fix a rate which it deems reasonable, and, second, that rate, when thus fixed, shall stand "unless and until" the railroads, by appeal to the courts, shall have it changed.

This second proposition is very important, for if individual shippers are to have the burden of litigation the power will not be effective. Already there are whisperings in the press of consultations and efforts to formulate a bill which will meet the sanction of great railroad interests.

This may be all talk, but when the bill comes in, when the child is born, its paternity will be apparent to all. We shall critically examine this child if it is ever born, you may be sure of that.

It was under these conditions that the two great parties of the country met last year in convention to declare their positions on public questions. The platform of the Republican party on this question was in exact accord with its platform of 1900 and its seven years' legislative record. Absolute oppressive silence states the case. In neither the platform of 1900 nor 1904 is there the slightest intimation of any desire or purpose with reference to this matter. There is a silence which can not be attributed to ignorance, behind which can lurk no controlling good motive; a silence which gives voice to the suspicion that the potent power of wealthy influences stilled the voice of the Republican party.

The Democratic national platform of 1900 declared:

We favor such an enlargement of the scope of the Interstate Commerce Commission law as will enable the Commission to protect individuals and communities from discriminations and the public from unjust and unfair transportation rates.

The national Democratic platform of 1904 contained this expression:

We demand an enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the end that the traveling public and shippers of this country may have prompt and adequate relief from the abuses to which they are subjected in the matter of transportation.

Neither of the Republican platforms of 1900 and 1904 make any mention of the connection of railroad rebates and discrimination with the trust question. The Democratic platform of 1904 says:

Individual equality of opportunity and free competition are essential to a healthy and permanent commercial prosperity, and any trust combination or monopoly tending to destroy these by controlling production, restricting competition, or fixing prices and wages should be prohibited and punished by law. We especially denounce rebates and discriminations by transportation companies as the most potent agency in forming and strengthening these unlawful conspiracies against trade.

I would especially press this declaration upon the attention of my Democratic colleagues as worthy of permanent adoption as a splendid statement of our fundamental Democratic position on the trust question, as well as the only national platform recognition and denunciation of the evil of railway alliance with combinations and monopoly.

Upon these platforms Theodore Roosevelt and Alton B. Parker were, respectively, nominated as candidates for the Presidency. The result of the election was a universal surprise. Theodore Roosevelt was elected by the largest popular vote and the largest popular majority ever received by any candidate for the Presidency. Whatever else may be said in explanation of this vote, the fact remains that it involved a distinct personal victory for Theodore Roosevelt. Whatever else may have impelled men to vote or to refrain from voting, it can not be denied that many, very many men voted for Theodore Roosevelt because they believed in the man. They thought him superior to his party platform and party leaders.

This clear and emphatic message of his is some evidence that these men entertained a correct idea. Long ago, however, human experience was crystallized into the proverb, "Actions speak louder than words," and the President must realize having so written himself down on this great question that the public, and especially those friends who believe in his sincerity, his adherence to conviction, his unwavering advocacy of his views,

expect that he will exert all the powers of his individuality and his high office to bring about the legislation which he recommends.

It is only natural that thoughtful men who feel kindly to him, not to speak of those who are somewhat suspicious and doubtful, will ask questions like these: Will Theodore Roosevelt press this matter so important to the body of the people with that vigor and disregard of adverse criticism which characterized his action in the Panama matter?

Will he cling to his convictions in this matter with that dogged persistence so evident and potent in the Cuban reciprocity matter? Will he use the patronage and the power of his high office and the great personality of his strong character to force this legislation, that he concededly used to force his views on the party and on the country in the two notable instances mentioned? No man realizes more than Theodore Roosevelt himself that he is writing now a history which shall be read for years hereafter; that he has been endeavoring to make a record for not turning back, either in war or in peace, from a path which he has once deliberately chosen. Will that record on this matter be broken?

Having put his hand to the plow, will he waver, and stop, permit the team to wander afield and the land lie uncultivated? It is useless to listen to the whisperings we hear that this is not an Administration measure; that this is the meritorious suggestion of the President in a nonpartisan way, and that Congress is not expected to yield one whit of its power or its judgment to the Chief Executive in this matter.

This has not been the position of the President, or members of his party on any other position, and if it should be taken on this issue he will be subject to just and bitter criticism.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BURGESS. A question; yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman has alluded to the fact that heretofore the President exercised his authority in the procuring of legislation in regard to the Cuban reciprocity treaty and also exercised his authority in regard to the Panama Canal.

Mr. BURGESS. Do you deny it?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No, sir; but I wish to ask the gentleman now. Heretofore, as I have said, the Democratic party was very insistent upon the proposition that the President had exceeded his authority in thus attempting to influence legislation.

Mr. BURGESS. I want to be courteous to the gentleman, but I yielded for a question.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Now, I ask the gentleman, Will the gentleman back up and forward the proposition to insist upon the President using his great power, his personality, and his executive office in furthering the legislation that he now seeks?

Mr. BURGESS. On this subject?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURGESS. Yes, sir; unqualifiedly. [Applause.] I would like to see the President democratic occasionally.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I thought it was considered undemocratic for a President to attempt to exercise authority over Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleague be allowed time to conclude his speech.

Mr. BURGESS. I think I can finish in ten minutes.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, then I ask that my colleague's time be extended for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that his colleague may proceed for ten minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the question just stated by the gentleman from Minnesota, I can only speak for myself. It is my opinion that any patriotic President ought in all honorable methods to exercise an influence upon Congress for his country's good.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And I agree with you fully.

Mr. BURGESS. In the last campaign, in its excitement and perhaps undue bitterness, it was openly charged that not only the party leadership, but the President himself, if not expressly, by implication, had bound themselves hand and foot to the corporations of the country in consideration of campaign contributions. Thousands of men refused to believe this grave charge. The President, by his message under these insinuating criticisms, has put himself and his party leadership on trial before the country.

He did not elect to follow the cue of his party platform in 1900 and 1904. He did not choose to preserve an unbroken silence on this question. He has thrown the gauntlet down. He has indorsed a twice-repeated national Democratic platform demand. And by that act in words he has given high evidence in justification of his sincerity in his manly denial of any promises by him directly or indirectly to the great corporate influences of the country pending the last campaign. Having stated the proposition thus clearly will he, as schoolmaster of this Republican Congress, force its working out on the great legislative blackboard? The country waits and watches.

Turning from the President to Congress, what of them? True or false, there is much talk of the subserviency of Representatives and Senators to corporation influences. These whisperings have developed but recently into open public challenges which can not be ignored. Governor Larrabee, of Iowa, a stalwart Republican, by the way, in an address before the Interstate Commerce Law Convention, at St. Louis last October, said:

Congressmen can afford relief or not, as they please. They should be like good soldiers, and do their duty regardless of personal considerations; but they are human, and they do not cultivate that unselfishness and fearlessness that is thoroughly instilled into the life of the soldier. They have to run the gauntlet of an election at short intervals. Here they find two forces interested, one active and one passive. A full consideration of the situation leads one, after all, to have a little compassion for the weak or cowardly Congressman. On the one side he finds the great corporations, active and alert, looking keenly after their interests, and on the other side the people, honest, confiding, and unsuspecting. The railroads of the country are controlled by a few persons and are thoroughly organized.

They can easily agree upon measures tending to increase their income. They endeavor continuously to control municipal, State, and national governments. They have their agents, attorneys, and henchmen employed in every county of the United States. This force is always at work. It is like the force of gravity, always active and the pressure kept up in all directions. They make extravagant contributions to campaign funds, if necessary, to protect those who serve them, frequently amounting to \$10,000, \$15,000, or even \$25,000 in a single Congressional district, and a much larger sum to control Senatorial elections. They make it a rule to elect and protect their political friends and to defeat candidates for public offices who will not be subservient to them.

This states a view of the matter which, in my judgment, is gaining force day by day. Under all these circumstances, it is but natural that this question will put every Senator and every Member of Congress under the lime light of public opinion, and the issue can not be evaded.

Some wit of the last campaign said that in that election the letter "R" was the most important in the alphabet, since it was the beginning of Roosevelt and the ending of Parker. I say to my colleagues in this Congress and to the country, seriously, that this letter "R" is now of vast importance, for the question which each Senator and Congressman must face is, Are you for Roosevelt or the railroads? Which "R" do you enlist under?

I hope to see this legislation recommended by the President passed with practical unanimity in this House. My Republican colleagues can not afford, on this question, to break with Roosevelt, because he indorses a Democratic platform demand, nor can Democrats refuse to heartily support a demand of their party because pressed by a Republican President. Here is a golden opportunity for patriotism to rise above party, and a great business question, involving the commerce, the blood of the nation, to be solved in a rational, nonpartisan way.

We pledge the President the support of this side of the Chamber.

The day of discussion is past. Bring in the bill. Let us have action. Will you? Is the day of Van Sant, La Follette, and Larrabee about to dawn? Or shall the darkness and masterly inactivity of the past seven years continue without interruption?

There has been much talk in the country of "standing pat" on the Dingley bill and opposing revision and reduction of the tariff in the interest of the people, on account of subserviency to the manufacturing combinations of the country. It strikes me that the criticism would be much more just of the party on the proposition that you are "standing pat" upon a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which took the vitality out of the Interstate Commerce Commission, by reason of subserviency to the great railroad interests of the country. Whatever the reason in either case, the fact remains that on both propositions you have a perfect "stand-pat" record, a seven years' record at that.

Mr. Chairman, a word more. I appeal to the press of the country, whose power to shape the currents of thought, to mold our destiny, to uplift our civilization, it is impossible to adequately estimate. A free and patriotic American press is justly the pride of American citizenship.

We hear these days more and more often expressed the fear that slowly, insidiously, but surely, this great agency of the na-

tion's progress is passing under the control and domination of avaricious and conscienceless wealth. God forbid that this shall be a fact. I appeal to the American editor to dip his pen in patriotic ink and write burning words which shall whip the representatives of the American people into obedience to the popular American will. [Applause.]

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, there are no requests for time on this side of the Chamber, and unless some one on the other side of the Chamber desires time further—

Mr. BAKER. The gentleman controlling the time on this side said I could have a few moments, but he is not here at present.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. BAKER. Ten minutes.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I yield the gentleman ten minutes.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the days that will be called up in men's minds for centuries to come. This is one of the days when oppressed humanity, feeling it no longer possible to bear the oppression, bursts forth into protest against the conditions and against the oppression to which it has been subjected for centuries. Yesterday a crime, almost unparalleled in the history of the world, was perpetrated in a so-called civilized country, a crime which every human being must desire to see blotted out of the memory of man; a crime so unprovoked, so wanton, so shameless, and so cruel that the whole civilized world stands aghast. And yet, Mr. Chairman, when I, voicing, as I believe, the desire and sentiment of millions of people of this country, proposed that this House should adjourn as a mark of respect, as an indication of the undescrivable horror of that wanton massacre, we had no time to adjourn, we had no time to give to the consideration of humanity's cause; we must devote ourselves to the little paltry, petty District squabbles here in the city of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to be entirely fair; I wish to be just to everybody in this matter, and because that is my desire I wish to say that one of the leading Republicans came to me immediately after my resolution to adjourn as an expression of our horror was defeated and said that he hoped the United States would not think that we had no sympathy with these murdered people in Russia because we did not adjourn. I echo that sentiment, as I think, Mr. Chairman, that nothing could be more disastrous to civilization than to have the feeling go out among the people of this and other countries that we have no sympathy for the victims of that fearful crime.

The papers, Mr. Chairman, are full of this fearful tragedy. I am sorry to say that some of the Members of this House with whom I have spoken within the past hour have said that they did not know anything of it, that they had not read a line concerning it. I can not conceive, Mr. Chairman, how any human being in whose heart pulsates any desire for or any appreciation of liberty can be indifferent; how he could let the day pass without absorbing a full understanding of the fearful tragedy that has been enacted and that probably is being enacted now.

What does the New York Times say by special cable? I will read:

St. Petersburg's streets were the theater to-day of scenes unparalleled in the history of the world.

Let us hope that is a true description. Let us hope that they are unparalleled, because if they have been paralleled so much greater the shame of other generations if they could have been guilty of such a crime as this. That paper proceeds to say:

A wholesale massacre of Russian strikers occurred. The dead and wounded are numbered by thousands.

Thousands of human lives have been taken because hundreds of thousands of workmen in that great industrial city have been brought to such a condition that they said—and some of you probably remember the appeal that was drawn up and was to have been presented to the Czar yesterday—"Be merciful to us; let us live!" That is the appeal of the Russian people, "Be merciful to us and let us live!"

Because that sentiment was voiced and because a hundred thousand men desired to peaceably present their protest against the fearful conditions from which they are suffering, what was done? The whole force of the Russian army that was available was brought into the city of St. Petersburg, and before there was the slightest indication that these people even had a desire to use any force—and there is no evidence that they even thought of force; they merely made their protest in overwhelming numbers—even before they had fully congregated as they had contemplated doing, they were shot down as if they were rabbits in a warren.

And we, we the representatives of 80,000,000 of civilized peo-

ple, can not suspend for one solitary moment the little, mean, petty, contemptible things that have taken up the time of this House for two hours to-day to express our horror at this frightful outrage. Instead of meeting the Czar we are told that they had to deal with the Grand Duke Vladimir, "and the morgues and hospitals are full of the victims of his cruelty."

Mr. Chairman, I have simply taken this opportunity to show that there is in this House at least one man who regards this massacre with a horror that is indescribable, and I do hope that this House will take an immediate opportunity to put itself on record as expressing its horror, the horror of the American people, against this fearful tragedy. If some poor lunatic, if some individual, goaded by the desperation of his race, had struck the head of the Russian Government, then the whole officialdom of the United States would have done what officialdom does everywhere, they would have said, "We are horrified; this is shocking; this is a calamity;" but when a thousand or more of human lives are struck down in the most wanton manner without any provocation, then we sit dumb.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Iowa in his own time, the time of the gentleman from Minnesota having expired.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me proper that something should be said with reference to some observations of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS]. With the general purpose of his remarks I have sympathy, and with the final declaration as to what the attitude of his party on this floor should be upon the question he discussed I certainly have sympathy; and I want to congratulate those gentlemen if he spoke advisedly as to what their action would be. But there seemed to be all through the remarks of the gentleman an attempt to make a partisan question out of this matter of railroad control. He seemed disposed to exalt the Democratic party because of what it had done, and reprobate his opponents. I want to call his attention to this fact—that every shred of legislation, every sentence that is now upon the statute books came from Republicans and from Republican bodies. The act of 1887 originated and was passed in the Senate against the opposition of the predecessor of the gentleman from Texas. Every other act that bears upon this question has come from the Republican party; and I want to remind the gentleman, lest he may say that "we have not been in power, and that we could not act," that there was a period of two years when they could have acted, and that during that period not a recommendation of any kind or character was made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and not one of importance on that subject was ever considered by that committee during that period.

I do not want this to be regarded as a partisan question. It ought to be far above that. But the gentleman took particular pains to call attention to an omission from the Republican platform and to declarations that he regarded as of exceeding great value in the Democratic platform. I remind him that his logic went somewhat askew, in view of the general result of the election. If a man upon a platform without pledges, he says, upon this question was triumphantly elected over a man upon a platform that he says had made ample pledges, what does that mean? It means simply that the American people were willing to take unpledged the candidate of the Republican party, having a distrust and an unwillingness to believe in the sincerity of the declarations in the Democratic platform. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL EXPENSES.

For executive office: For two Commissioners, at \$5,000 each; Engineer Commissioner, \$924 (to make salary \$5,000); secretary, \$2,160; two assistant secretaries to Commissioners, at \$1,200 each; clerk, \$1,500; clerk, \$1,400; three clerks, at \$1,200 each; clerk, \$600; messenger, \$600; two messengers, at \$480 each; stenographer and typewriter, \$720; two drivers, at \$600 each; veterinary surgeon for all horses in the departments of the District government, \$1,200; inspector of buildings, \$2,750; principal assistant inspector of buildings, \$1,600; five assistant inspectors of buildings, at \$1,200 each; five assistant inspectors of buildings, at \$1,000 each; temporary employment of additional assistant inspectors for such time as their services may be necessary, \$2,400; two civil engineers or computers, at \$1,500 each; clerk, \$1,000; clerk, \$900; clerk, who shall be a stenographer and typewriter, \$900; messenger, \$480; janitor, \$1,200; steam engineer, \$900; three firemen, at \$480 each; two elevator operators, at \$360 each; three watchmen, at \$480 each; one laborer, who shall also act as messenger and substitute elevator operator, \$365; two laborers, at \$360 each; property clerk, who shall hereafter give bond in such sum as the Commissioners may determine, and who shall, under the direction of the Commissioners, supervise the purchase and distribution and have custody of all supplies and stores for the use of the government of the District of Columbia, \$1,800; deputy property clerk, \$1,600; clerk, \$720; messenger, \$600; inspector of plumbing, \$2,000; seven assistant inspectors of plumbing, one at \$1,200, and six at \$1,000; five members of the plumbing board, at \$300 each; in all, \$73,499.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "four" and insert the word "five," in line 11, page 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 11, page 1, strike out "five" and insert "four."

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my making this amendment is twofold. First, I want to call the attention of this committee to what I consider a degree of incompetency on the part of the government of this city, which is most extraordinary. This city is governed in an autocratic manner. The people of Washington have no voice in its government whatever. Now, from the autocratic standpoint we ought to have an ideal government, and yet what do we find? During this winter, during the snows that were prevalent in Washington a short time ago, the places where inevitably you would be sure of not being able to walk were the streets alongside of the public parks. Those public parks, I assume, are under the control of the Commissioners; but while the people of this city are called upon to remove the snow from the sidewalks in front of their homes, if you passed along on Pennsylvania avenue in front of one of these parks, or on Fourteenth street in front of Franklin Park, or in front of any of these parks, you would have to wade through snow three or four inches deep, after the people of the rest of the city had cleared the sidewalks in front of their houses. Now, if that is not incompetency I know not what it is, and it seems to me that these Commissioners can offer no excuse for that. Here is an appropriation calling for the cleaning of the streets. The force of men employed in the cleaning of the streets at other times must practically have a suspension of that work while the snow is on the ground, and there is no attempt made to clean those sidewalks.

But, Mr. Chairman, a far greater object, so far as I am concerned, is involved in my amendment, and that is this: The Commissioners of this District are responsible for the government of this District. There is no greater crime committed against the people of the city of Washington than the deliberate, perpetual, and continuous violation of law by the assessors of this District in refusing to see the land values that exist, and in violation of their oaths, refusing to put that land upon the assessment roll so that it can be taxed at its true value.

The Commissioners are responsible. They are the men who have supervision of the various departments of our municipal government. They have control of the assessors, and there can be no pretence on their part that they are not familiar with this affair, because if there were no other reason—and there have been scores of times when the matter has been brought to their attention—I myself sent to the Commissioners of this city marked copies of the speech that I delivered here last year citing these flagrant violations of law by the assessors under which vacant property is assessed at only 4, 6, 7, or 8 per cent of its real value, while improved property—the small homes of the poor people—are assessed at 60 per cent and upward. Such discrimination, Mr. Chairman, is a crime, because in the first place it encourages the withholding of land from use; it encourages land speculation, which is the curse of civilization everywhere, while at the same time it increases the burdens of taxes upon the very people who ought to pay very little taxes and would pay a very small proportion if it were not for this deliberate, open, and continuous violation of law by the responsible officers of this city. I hope the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota] will present some defense in their behalf.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the salary referred to by the gentleman is the salary fixed by law. The places that he speaks of from which the snow was not cleared are under the War Department, and hence the gentleman's remarks are irrelevant.

Mr. BAKER. Then the War Department displays incompetency, of course, in not keeping them clean.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I say the discussion is irrelevant to this bill.

Mr. BAKER. The other matter is germane.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The simple fact is that the \$5,000 salary of the Commissioners is fixed by law. You can not get the right kind of men for a smaller sum, and I am sure the judgment of this committee will not sustain the gentleman from New York in moving a reduction of the salary.

Mr. BAKER. May I ask the gentleman one question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BAKER. Does the gentleman consider that the right kind of men are obtained? Here are men who deliberately

ignore this palpable violation of law that has been brought officially to their attention several times. Are they are right kind of men? Are they men who should receive salaries of \$5,000 each?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For assessor's office: For assessor, \$3,500 and \$500 additional as chairman of the excise and personal-tax boards; two assistant assessors, at \$2,000 each; two clerks, at \$1,400 each; clerk, arrears division, \$1,400; four clerks, at \$1,200 each; draftsman, \$1,200; four clerks, at \$1,000 each; assistant or clerk, \$900; clerk in charge of records, \$1,000; two clerks, at \$900 each; license clerk, \$1,200; two clerks, at \$1,000 each; inspector of licenses, \$1,200; assistant inspector of licenses, \$1,000; messenger, \$600; three assistant assessors, at \$3,000 each; clerk to board of assistant assessors, \$1,500; messenger and driver for board of assistant assessors, \$600; temporary clerk hire, \$500; temporary clerk hire for preparing numerical book, \$2,500; in all, \$46,000.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "three," in line 5, page 4, and substituting the word "two."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 5, page 4, strike out "three" and insert "two," so as to read "\$2,500."

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, the protest I made just now against the failure, the palpable, criminal, negligence of the Commissioners in the nonenforcement of the law requiring the assessment of property in this city, having met with practically no response, I am driven to making a protest against the payment of the salary of \$3,500 to this assessor. Just think, Mr. Chairman, of the condition of affairs that confronts us. As it was conclusively shown by official reports made to this House twelve years ago, there were at that time over \$400,000,000 land value. The law in this city, just the same as the law in most of the great cities of the Union, calls for the assessment of property at its true value. In spite of the fact that \$400,000,000 of land values existed twelve years ago, and it increases at the rate of over \$40,000,000 a year, so that approximately there are nine hundred millions or one thousand millions of land value to-day, the assessor of this city deliberately violates the law by bringing in a report to the District Commissioners pretending that the land values of this city are only \$100,000,000.

Now, there is either incompetency, the grossest kind of incompetency, which would not be tolerated by a private corporation for a second, or else there is dishonesty of a palpable character. No man can honestly and intelligently be guilty of assessing property at 6 or 10 per cent of its value. Why, no child in the Washington schools 12 years of age could be guilty of such an act. If this man had intelligence enough—if this man has intelligence enough to warrant his being paid \$3,500, then he has intelligence enough to know that he is violating the law, and also that his violation of law is, as I have said before, bearing with peculiar hardship upon the very poorest people of the city.

The chairman of the subcommittee a short time ago said: "Why do not these people protest? They are the people interested." Mr. Chairman, the great mass of the people that own the small homes in Washington and elsewhere have no opportunity to protest. Most of them know absolutely nothing about assessments, except that of their own assessments. They haven't any idea that some great business buildings in this city have been shown to be assessed at 10 or 20 per cent of their value, while their homes are assessed at 60 or 80 per cent.

They have not the slightest comprehension that vast tracts of unimproved property, which are increased in value by the repeated expenditures of the General Government, are placed on the assessment roll at 6, 7, to 10 per cent of their value. They have no knowledge of that, and they would not know how to remedy it if they did, and, should they start out to remedy it, they are met with this proposition: "Don't you know that your property is assessed at less than its value, and don't you know that if you demand that property be assessed at its true value that your assessment will be increased?" Therefore, they are frightened off from any investigation; they are frightened off from making any protest, and they continue to be the victims of this crime, because it is a crime that these poor people, regardless of the single-tax proposition, regardless of the justice of my proposition to tax land values only, are obliged to pay three or four times their share of taxes. It is a crime that the poor people are compelled to pay four times as much tax as the rich man who owns the large buildings and eight to ten times as much as those who have a large amount of unimproved property.

Nothing is done to remedy it. Is the answer to that and the reason for that the fact, which is known to every man in this House, that men at the other end of the Capitol and men here are themselves large speculators of land in the city of Washington? And the appropriations which you vote here for the government of this city add to the value of the land which you as private individuals own. You are made rich by your own act when you are voting on this floor in favor of these improvements if you own land in the city of Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Personal tax board: For two assistant assessors of personal taxes, at \$3,000 each; clerk, \$1,400; assistant clerk, \$1,000; four inspectors, at \$1,200 each; extra clerk hire, \$2,000; in all, \$15,200.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I will ask the Clerk to report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 6, page 5, strike out the words "three thousand dollars each," and in lines 9 and 10 strike out the words "fifteen thousand" and substitute the words "nine thousand."

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that my protest against the continuance of the personal-property tax in this city will go for just about as much as my protest against the failure, the deliberate failure, of the Commissioners and the tax office to collect the tax from the city's enormous land values, and yet the reason that personal-property taxation exists here, the reason that business men are burdened with this taxation, the reason that people of other cities are also burdened with personal-property taxation, the reason that we have all of this crime of perjury in the matter of personal assessments, the reason that men go up to the assessor's office and perjure their souls and say they are not in possession of the personal property for which they are assessed, is that you have permitted that fund which the whole people create to be privately absorbed as ground rent, because you have refused even to give direction to the assessors of this city and the District of Columbia that they must comply with the law and put land on the assessment roll at its full value. If you did there would be no need of one dollar of taxes being raised either from personal property or from the improvements upon the land. There would be no need for taking one dollar of the wealth created by labor and capital.

If you take the fund which the community creates, which all create, which our presence here in Washington adds to, if you take that, there is no need to raise one dollar of taxes on personal-property tax or by a tax on improvements, and I therefore register my protest here against the folly, the stupidity of a legislative body that insists in perpetuating a system of taxation which mulcts the producer, which mulcts the thrifty and industrious for the benefit of him who is lazy and who does nothing except absorb the values which others create, who is the recipient of the bounty of the whole people in the form of these land values. Not one Member of this House apparently is interested in this question. Just think of it. The greatest legislative body on the face of the earth not interested in the science of taxation! No one here interested in the incidents of taxation! No one cares who bears the burden of taxation so long as some of you are reaping unearned rewards in the increased value which attaches to the land of this city because of the growth of population and because of public expenditures. Mr. Chairman, words fail me to describe, words fail me to picture what I think of this legislative body, made up as it is, of more than average intelligence, I am frank to say. Not one man cares about this subject of taxation. Just think of it! No one seems to care about this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For superintendent of stable, \$1,050; foreman of repairs, \$1,000; one clerk, \$1,500; one clerk, \$1,200; six inspectors, at \$1,200 each; two inspectors, at \$900 each; one weigh clerk, \$950; in all, \$14,700.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting some information. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill how large this stable establishment is—how many horses are kept by the District in this particular stable?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the stable is up between Ninth and Tenth, and there are, I think, about forty head of horses.

Mr. LIND. It does not include any of the fire-service horses? Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. No, sir.

Mr. LIND. Is not this a remarkable state of facts, that for

running a stable containing forty horses there are required a superintendent and a foreman of repairs, one clerk at \$1,500, one clerk at \$1,200, six inspectors at \$1,200, two inspectors at \$900, another clerk at \$950, in all \$14,000; all to run a stable in which forty horses are kept? [Laughter.]

I am only surprised, Mr. Chairman, that there is not an appropriation for a horse stenographer, and half a dozen messengers.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that gentlemen laugh, but my friend and colleague has perhaps not yet discovered what they are laughing at. It is at his simplicity in thinking that all of these people are connected with the stable. The fact is, only the first man is connected with the stable.

Mr. LIND. But they are carried on the stable roll, are they not?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Not at all.

Mr. LIND. What are they employed at?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. They are part of the street-sweeping service.

Mr. LIND. Oh, now we are getting at it. You could not in decency carry more than 24 street-sweeping inspectors under that denomination, could you?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I am rather surprised at the tone of my friend's question.

Mr. LIND. I did not mean it personally. When I used the pronoun "you" I meant the District Commissioners, not a committee of this House.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LIND. Now, if you will pardon me just a moment in this connection let us read the preceding paragraph:

Street-sweeping office: For superintendent, \$2,500; assistant superintendent and clerk, \$1,600; clerk, \$1,000; 4 inspectors, at \$1,200 each; 10 inspectors, at \$1,100 each; 3 assistant inspectors, at \$900 each; foreman of public dumps, \$900; messenger and driver, \$600; in all, \$25,100.

And now you tell us that in addition to this corps of street-sweeping inspectors this other corps of eight inspectors carried on the stable roll are also employed in inspecting street sweeping.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am quite confident that my friend and colleague was not in the Chamber when I made the general explanation of the bill, and possibly, even if he had been here, the explanation would have needed specific application in this instance.

I stated, in making a general explanation of the bill, that we were trying to get away from having men employed on the per diem system and paid out of general appropriations, because we then were not able to exhibit to the House just what men were employed and just what they were being paid; that therefore we had adopted a policy in this bill of selecting from the per diem employees paid out of general appropriations those whose employment had extended throughout at least one year, and which employment was likely to be continued, because they were engaged in a continuous kind of service, such as this of sweeping the streets, gathering the garbage, etc., and to that end we are now exhibiting in separate paragraphs, in order that the House may be advised, just exactly the employees for which provision is made.

Now, in this paragraph we have gathered up a number of people who have been heretofore paid from general appropriations for street sweeping, getting rid of garbage, ashes, and all those things.

The superintendent of the stable is a very competent man, who has general charge of this large stable, which I spoke of before. The foreman of repairs I have seen at work. He repairs a great deal of District property that is used in the street-cleaning service, like the sweepers the men use—these little push carts—and a lot of those things. He earns his money, saving his salary several times over from what it would be if we were to let out and pay for this work under contract.

The next officials, one clerk at \$1,500, one clerk at \$1,200, and six inspectors, have heretofore been paid out of the appropriation for disposal of city refuse.

Mr. LIND. What do these two clerks do?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. They keep the records of the office.

Mr. LIND. Are those clerks employed in the stable, or where are they employed?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. They have nothing to do with the stable. They are employed in the office of the administration of the disposal of city refuse. There has to be some clerical force.

Mr. LIND. You have already clerks provided in the preceding paragraph.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. That is what misleads my

friend in that it follows immediately after the street-sweeping force. We gathered up the clerks from different departments that have to do with the general subject of getting rid of refuse of the city—street sweeping, disposal of city refuse, etc. Those are gathered from a number of places.

Mr. LIND. Does not this all come under the street-sweeping department?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. It does not; no, sir. We simply gathered up—

Mr. LIND. Then why do you put it under that classification?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. We do not.

Mr. LIND. It is under that heading here.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. It is true that in the print the title "Street-sweeping office" would indicate what the gentleman has referred to; but lines 13 and 14 should be a sort of a suggestion to him that possibly there is something else besides that heading to be considered.

These are general appropriations, and I will ask my friend what he thinks is the better alternative, to bring this forward as they are actually employed, and they have been employed for years, and we have the word of the officials in charge that they are necessarily employed—

Mr. LIND. What are these two clerks doing?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Now, that is a matter of administrative detail. If we tried to answer all questions like that, we would not be through with the hearings this winter. We were given that list as of those who were actually and necessarily employed now and who have been employed for years on a per diem basis, and we have gathered them into this paragraph, showing specifically the employments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] has expired.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of my colleague [Mr. McCLEARY] be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LIND. What do these inspectors inspect if they do not inspect the horses?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. They inspect the work of the contractors who have undertaken to dispose of the city refuse at different places.

Mr. LIND. Are there eight inspectors engaged in inspecting the disposal of the refuse of this city?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The officials in charge of this work, the Commissioners, advised us that they did not have enough men to do this work.

Mr. LIND. Do you not think it would be better to give them a few laborers?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Now, let me ask my friend, suppose that he were keeping house in the city, and the ashes were not removed from his residence—

Mr. LIND. I am not keeping house.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Now, let me answer the gentleman's question. In the case to which I have referred, suppose he makes complaint to the city authorities. Does he not believe it well to have some one go and inspect that case and ascertain what the facts are, in the first place, and ascertain where the cause of the trouble is, and thus be able to bring to the proper discharge of the duty the men who have this contract?

Mr. LIND. Oh, my colleague will pardon me. I did not move to strike out the paragraph. It is not the office or the functions of inspectors that I object to; it is the number, the army of them that you provide for.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Let me ask my friend in all candor, does he believe that eight inspectors to cover this great city and ascertain whether this contract is being properly carried out are too many?

Mr. LIND. Yes; I do.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Well, that is where you differ with the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$24,879.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman in charge of the bill will kindly state to the House the meaning of the two different kinds of appropriations or the two different methods, I think it would save a good deal of time in useless discussion.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND], like myself, was misled by these two lines:

For the following, now authorized and being paid from general appropriations.

Now, we find the same provision, on the next page, for surveyor's office.

For surveyor, \$3,000; assistant surveyor, \$1,800; in all, \$4,800.

For the following, now authorized and being paid from the general appropriation.

Now, you might infer that was for the surveyor's office, but it is not, and I think that if the gentleman will kindly explain to the committee the meaning of the two lines, "For the following now authorized and being paid from the general appropriation," it will save much time in the discussion of the bill.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, let me state first to my friend from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] that I ought to have said in answer to his question that recently this work of the disposal of the city refuse has been placed under the same general charge as the street-sweeping work, and that fact accounts for the location in the bill of the employees about whom he inquired. The disposal of city refuse is a separate work, but it is put under the general control of the street-sweeping office. That is why it comes where it does in this bill. So much on that point.

Now, in answer to my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK], I will say that his inquiry illustrates again the general statement regarding per diem employments that I made in my general statement about the bill, which my friend probably did not hear. In that general statement I said that heretofore there have been a great many employees who have been carried under general appropriations. Thus, for instance, we may have appropriated a certain sum for the construction of a certain public work, say a bridge. In expending that appropriation the officers have not only had to provide for the payment of the contractor, but also for the office service and the supervisory service that was necessary in the public interest in securing the result—the building of the bridge.

The committee thought it was best not to continue that policy, and therefore we asked the Commissioners, who thoroughly agreed with us, to make for us a statement, under proper headings, of employees that were carried under general appropriations and whom it was necessary to carry the year around, and year after year, who were paid per diem salaries, to tell us how much they are being paid, and thus enable us to place them before the House with their employments and their salaries as we have done in this case.

Heretofore, as to this particular item, this bill has contained something like this: "For surveyor, \$3,000; for assistant surveyor, \$1,800," and then another sum for the surveying, "\$18,200 for additional employees."

I may say in passing that this surveying is done in part for the public and in part for private individuals. So far as it is done for private individuals they pay for the service, and the public treasury is thus reimbursed and this office is really a source of revenue.

Now, instead of appropriating, as heretofore, for the surveyor and his assistant and then appropriating a lump sum of \$18,200 for "other additional employees," unnamed and unspecified, to do the work of surveying in this District, we have transferred to the annual roll, at specified salaries, those employees who have been in this service for one or more years and who are likely to be needed continuously, leaving on the per diem roll those employees who are needed only occasionally and for short periods at a time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague be extended three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LIND. Now, in turning to page 12, I accept the explanation of the gentleman in charge of the bill that it was a good change to put the garbage service and the street-sweeping service together.

It looks reasonable that it should be carried on under one administration. But does my colleague think that it is necessary to employ one clerk at \$1,600, one clerk at \$1,500, one clerk at \$1,200, to keep the accounts of the street-sweeping service of this city? Does my colleague really think that that is necessary?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am advised by those who have charge of the administration of this office that there are daily reports to be made and records to be kept,

etc., that make this clerical force the minimum that can do the work.

Mr. LIND. Well, I wanted to satisfy myself.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase of plats and field notes of William J. Latimer, to be immediately available, \$7,500.

Mr. COWHERD. I desire to make a point of order for the present on the last item. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill if that is not new legislation?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I would like my friend to reserve the point of order, to permit an explanation of the item.

Mr. COWHERD. Very well; I reserve the point of order.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the notes referred to in this paragraph were made by a man by the name of Latimer, who was for many years a private surveyor. They cover the work of many years and refer to the territory out on the Anacostia side of the river, outside of the city of Washington proper.

The survey in that part of the District was not made under public authority. It was done by private surveyors, one of whom was this man Latimer. These notes represent the work of many years, and the committee has been advised that without these notes surveying in that part of the District can not be done except at a greater expense. The alternatives are to buy them or to have the surveying all done over again. Such a resurvey would cost more than Mr. Latimer asks for his notes. And if another survey were made it would be subject to this advantage—that if a question as to the survey were taken into court there is some doubt as to which of the two surveys would stand.

The Commissioners have urged the purchase of these notes for several years now. This year the committee, after a full hearing, concluded to recommend the purchase of the notes, for two reasons: First, we think these notes are necessary to the public interest; second, the amount specified is a reasonable sum to pay for them. We judge the public necessity from the statements of the Commissioners, and judge of the reasonableness of the sum by comparison with another set of notes made in the Georgetown district by another man, which notes we have been advised were bought some years ago for \$15,000. That was the amount first demanded by Mr. Latimer for his notes. Then he was willing to take \$10,000, and finally the District Commissioners said: "If you will take \$7,500 we will recommend that that amount be paid you."

None of us know Mr. Latimer personally. This matter has been before us for some considerable time, but we were under the impression that he was employed in the District service, and that in that employment he was receiving pay not only for the services rendered, but also for the use of the notes. Recently we have learned that we were in error in supposing that he is in the District service. We are advised that these notes are necessary, and that the sum specified is a reasonable sum to pay for them. Such notes have been held by the courts to be private property. We have no other way of acquiring them.

Mr. COWHERD. When the gentleman says it is necessary to have these notes, does he mean it is necessary that the District should have them, or that they should be in the surveyor's office for the benefit of private property owners?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Necessary that they should be owned by the city, to the end that the city surveyor, who now has jurisdiction over the entire District, may safely in the public interest, and with safety to the people who ask him to make the survey, proceed to survey the territory to which these notes are the key.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is right in saying this item first came in as a \$15,000 item, and later as a \$10,000 item. If I remember rightly it came in on a bill reported from the Appropriations Committee; and I suppose that the fifteen thousand and the ten thousand had the recommendation of the Commissioners, as this has. Am I not right in that?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. This is the first time that this has ever appeared in our bill. We have refrained from putting it into the bill upon the theory that I spoke of a moment ago, that this gentleman was serving the District, and we assumed that he was getting pay not only for his services, but for the use of his notes.

Mr. COWHERD. The gentleman will remember we had a discussion on the floor of the House two or three years ago, when this was a \$10,000 item, and I am quite certain it appeared in some bill from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. My friend must refer to some other notes.

Mr. COWHERD. No; I am quite certain I refer to these notes.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. These have never been in the bill since I have had anything to do with it.

Mr. COWHERD. In any event I want to explain to the gentleman in charge of the bill that there is now pending before the Committee on the District of Columbia, favorably reported by the subcommittee, a bill that has passed the Senate, which provides for the replatting of the land of the District of Columbia outside of the city of Washington, which the Commissioners say is absolutely necessary to be done in order that property may be properly assessed, and that that replatting once done will save an immense amount in the printing bill, in the advertising of property on which taxes have not been paid, and will make these advertisements and sales legal. As the matter now stands these descriptions of property are by metes and bounds, so that when a man refuses or neglects to pay on a piece of property they have to take a dozen or two lines of print to advertise the property. They will get rid of all that by this resurvey, when the property will be described by blocks, squares, etc. Now, I think that survey will do away with the need for these notes, whereas the notes will not do away with the necessity of the resurvey.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. In my judgment, these notes are necessary for the resurvey; at any rate we are assured by the officers in charge of this that the resurvey would be subject to two objections. We raised that question of the alternative with them, and they said, first, it would cost more than \$7,500 to make the resurvey, and, second, in case of conflict there would be some question in the courts as to which survey would stand, and therefore the safety of the property owner would be jeopardized.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is mistaken when he states that these notes will do away with the necessity of the resurvey. The resurvey is necessary because these pieces of property are described by metes and bounds on the record. It is the only description they have. Therefore the assessor must assess by metes and bounds, and when a man does not pay his taxes the publication of the piece of property must follow the description which appears upon the assessment books. Therefore this publication must be eight or ten times as voluminous as would be required after this resurvey and the platting and describing by lots and blocks of the outside property, as the property in the city of Georgetown is described. Now, these notes will not in any way change that condition.

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman permit me right there to state, further, that it has been impossible to describe the property so that it would stand the test of the courts?

Mr. COWHERD. I will not say that it is impossible, but it is practically impossible, for the reason that the description of all this property by metes and bounds would make such a voluminous document that the cost of it would be too great.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is quite true that the cost of that resurvey will be greater, probably, than the cost of these notes; but if you pay \$7,500 for the notes the resurvey will still be necessary. Therefore I must insist on the point of order.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Will the gentleman from Missouri reserve his point of order a little longer until I read an extract?

Mr. COWHERD. Let me say another word to the gentleman first. The gentleman said that the Commissioners said these notes would be necessary, even if the resurvey was made. I distinctly asked one of the Commissioners, the surveyor of the District, and the deputy assessor, and all of them stated that the Senate bill I have referred to did not include in any way the purchase of the Latimer notes.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, it is proper to say that for many years this has been before the subcommittee, and we have left it out on the general theory that I indicated a while ago, that we were getting the use of them by paying for them, and therefore it would be unwise to buy them at that time.

Now, I want to read from the hearing before the subcommittee, so that all may understand that we have used due diligence in getting at the information about this appropriation.

I asked Colonel Biddle to satisfy me on two points, first, as to the need of the notes in the public service; and second, as to the propriety of this rate or charge.

Colonel BIDDLE. In the early days of the District the surveyor, Mr. Forsythe, did not make any Government surveys outside of the city limits. He adopted the surveys of various private men throughout the county, and he accepted those surveys in his office when he wished to make use of them.

Mr. Latimer was a private surveyor in the Anacostia district and was such for a number of years, say about twenty years, and he made a large number of surveys during that time. If the office had been organized as it is now, all the surveys made by Mr. Latimer or similar persons would be in our office as the property of the District. We strike two points. One is rather a negative point. If those notes were oblit-

erated we would have to go out and make all the surveys again, costing us a large amount of money.

Mr. McCLEARY. How much?

Colonel BIDDLE. Easily as much as the notes are worth.

Mr. McCLEARY. As much as Mr. Latimer asks here?

Colonel BIDDLE. Yes, sir; not what he asks—this is what we recommend. He asks \$10,000.

Mr. BENTON. I thought it was \$15,000?

Colonel BIDDLE. First it was \$15,000, and then \$10,000.

The second point is that if the surveyor is called upon to make a survey he has not the data which is included in these notes for his starting points, for the finding of the lines, and if he makes a survey and certifies to it, it is liable to be thrown out of court on the basis of the information contained in these notes.

Mr. McCLEARY. If he makes a survey where?

Colonel BIDDLE. Over in that district, the Eastern Branch, in the Anacostia district.

Mr. BENTON. In the district east of the river?

Colonel BIDDLE. Yes, sir; it happened in two cases last year that the surveyor's office was called upon by citizens who were willing to pay the money to make surveys in the eastern district, and they declined to do it because they said the office notes were not sufficient.

Of course this paragraph is subject to a point of order, and if the gentleman from Missouri insists on it, the committee has no recourse.

Mr. COWHERD. If the gentleman from Minnesota will permit me, I will read from another report from a hearing before the Committee on the District of Columbia. It is as follows:

Plats covering most of the county of Washington have been prepared under direction of the Engineer Commissioner, as an incident to the completion of the permanent system of highway plans, which are now of record in the office of the surveyor, District of Columbia, and considered far superior to all plats now in existence. The platting was based on an extensive system of measurements and triangulation made by the engineer department on 160 sheets, 24 by 32 inches, drawn to a scale of 1 inch to 100 feet, and would, if extended to cover the entire county, consist of 260 sheets. Very little platting would be required to finish the set, as the plats that are lacking would include unsubdivided tracts, and would have very few lines upon them.

These plats are the only ones of the county drawn on so large a scale and in a shape for ready reference, and constant use of them by the various departments is tending to their destruction.

This work, I understand, would have to be done if the notes that are mentioned here are purchased. It is questionable whether the notes would be of any value if this resurvey is made, and for that reason I think the item had better go out until it can be further considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri insist on his point of order?

Mr. COWHERD. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Hereafter in all cases of payments for opening, widening, extending, and straightening alleys and minor streets under the provisions of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, the accounting officers shall take into account the assessment for benefits and the award for damages, and shall pay only such part of said award in respect of any lot as may be in excess of the assessment for benefits against the part of such lot not taken, and there shall be credited on said assessment the amount of said award not in excess of said assessment.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I do not make a point of order, but I would like to ask the necessity of this legislation on page 22, lines 6 to 15.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The gentleman refers to the word "hereafter?"

Mr. COWHERD. Hereafter and the line following; that is new legislation, I understand. The point I want to ask the gentleman is this: I understand he puts this in for general legislation. A similar item appears in all street-opening bills.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. This paragraph, except the word "hereafter," has always appeared in the bills. We have inserted the word "hereafter" simply to make the provision part of the permanent law, so that we can omit it in bills that may follow.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, reserving a point of order, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill, referring to lines 4 and 5, on page 22, for purchase or condemnation of streets, roads, and alleys, \$1,000, if he knows of any existing legislation that authorizes that appropriation?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The only legislation that I am aware of is that it has been in every appropriation bill for many years. I am sure my friend does not want to block a large public work by a very little thing. He does not want to stop the progress of a large thing for a very small thing. It sometimes happens in the progress of paving a street that a little triangle runs out into the street, worth perhaps a hundred or two hundred dollars. One way to proceed is to wait and get legislation; let the great work stop, wait until Congress convenes and have the committee of which my friend is a distinguished member pass upon it, get an act authorizing the purchase of the specific piece. The other way is to have a general provision like this in an appropriation bill authorizing the Commissioners to go and acquire the little piece of ground and proceed with the work. We resolved the alternative in favor of this provision.

I asked Colonel Biddle, when the Commissioners were before the subcommittee, to justify this expenditure and his answer was this:

Mr. McCLEARY. On page 41, "condemnation of streets, roads, and alleys, \$1,000." What have you done with that appropriation?

Colonel BIDDLE. We buy a little piece of street or alley or roadway to enable us to carry on whatever work we are doing and which the ownership of the property by private individuals would prevent us from doing. It often happens that there is a little strip of land needed in order to properly do the work, and under this paragraph we can buy it. Some years we do not use the appropriation at all and some years it comes in very handy.

Mr. McCLEARY. Show us by a hypothetical illustration what sort of a case that would be.

Colonel BIDDLE. Suppose we had to pave a street and we found that there was a little piece of property abutting out into it which had not been acquired, and that we could not make a good job without owning that little piece, and this enables us to purchase to a small extent any land which may be needed for such purposes. Often it is not used at all, but at times it would prevent the carrying on of our work.

Mr. McCLEARY. That is in certain cases that have been provided for?

Colonel BIDDLE. Yes, sir; at times to make connections between two or three points. Sometimes we have to cross a piece of private property, and it enables us to do so. An illustration is Baltimore street, near North Capitol, where \$250 were spent for a small piece of land necessary to enable a pavement to be laid.

Now, that is the spirit of it all.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the explanation of the gentleman is perfectly satisfactory to me; and I wish to say that I do not wish to interpose any captious objections, especially where it pertains to small matters, as the gentleman suggests.

However, a precedent in small matters often leads to greater ones, and my recollection is this: That during the last session of Congress it was expressly determined by this House that hereafter, in the condemnation of this land for street purposes, the United States should pay no part of such condemnation proceedings or for the purchase of any lands for the opening of streets whatever. That matter was squarely brought before the House at its last session, and it was so determined. I have some recollection of the fact, because I prepared the bill.

Therefore, I wanted to know from the chairman if this particular appropriation was under previous legislation to that.

Now, in this connection, perhaps it will save further time if I would say that following this, beginning on line 16, I find—

Construction of county roads: For construction of county roads and suburban streets as follows:

One of the items thereunder is \$37,245. Now, if that is in the same position as regards legislation as the small one to which the gentleman refers, it simply carries out my contention that if you allow an entering wedge for a small matter it will extend into a very large matter. On the following pages I discover another item which is plainly without any existing law, namely, Anacostia Bridge, which item will soon be reached, seeking to appropriate \$375,000.

Now, if the gentleman thinks that in the interests of good government in this city we ought not to object to a matter because it is small, when and where will he draw the line and say we ought to begin?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, we have not reached the paragraph beginning on line 18, but inasmuch as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] has raised a question about it, I trust that I will be pardoned for saying a few words regarding it.

That paragraph is for completing the opening, grading, and macadamizing of Fourteenth street from its present terminus, Lydecker avenue, to Piney road, \$37,245. In last year's appropriation bill we authorized this work and provided \$20,000 to begin it and authorized the Commissioners to enter into a contract for the completion of the work.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Excuse me, but was that based upon existing law when it was put into the appropriation bill?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. That might not have been based on existing law then, but it is existing law now. We have a contract out, and people in good faith are acting upon it, and this is simply to carry out that contract. Last year, if my friend had interposed his objections, they might have been both legally and morally sound, but I think the gentleman will see that under existing circumstances it would not be proper for him to press his point of order on this when the paragraph is reached, because it is to carry out a contract that has been authorized and people have entered into it in good faith.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman says that last year an appropriation was authorized without existing law amounting to \$20,000, and because that was allowed to go by he now asks for \$37,000 more to continue that illegal proposition.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. No; that is not quite the statement of it. The statement of it is that last year we au-

thorized a work which was to cost \$59,000, and we appropriated \$20,000 toward the work and at the same time authorized the Commissioners to make the contract for the whole work, because that would be in the public interest. The work would cost less in that way. The reason why there is less than \$39,000 here is that we have taken out of that some employees that were put on the "per diem" roll—and here is one of the places where the reduction is being made—so that instead of \$39,000 we ask for \$37,245.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I think I can explain the position and relieve the gentleman of his quandary. This proposition was turned down by both the Senate District Committee and the House District Committee as being an undesirable and improper improvement to make, or, in other words, that there are other parts of the city that should be given attention before this. The House District bill was passed and went to the Senate without the appropriation, but in conference the committee was obliged, as I understand, to take this amendment on the appropriation bill. I do not think that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] was responsible for it at all. The matter had been before our committee for two sessions, and we rejected it because we decided not to report it to the House.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Yes; as I remember it went on in the Senate and was retained in conference.

Mr. BABCOCK. It was practically forced upon the House.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I understand Senator GALLINGER, chairman of the Senate committee, was one of the conferees, and not only assented to it but insisted upon this Fourteenth street improvement.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] proposes to call for an adjournment at 5 o'clock, and I understand there is some business of the Committee on Printing which it is contemplated to bring forward this afternoon. Therefore I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, before that motion is put, I would like to ask if my point of order upon this proposition is reserved, and if so, if it can be taken up again tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Minnesota, if the gentleman will withhold the motion for a moment, that when that paragraph was read the gentleman from Missouri rose stating that he did not wish to reserve the point of order and discussed it. The Chair is somewhat in doubt whether the gentleman from Minnesota can make the point of order.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I arose at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not see the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And you called my name and I yielded for my friend from Missouri.

Mr. COWHERD. If the Chair will permit me, the discussion I had with the gentleman in charge of the bill was the next paragraph, beginning in line 6, and I understood the gentleman from Minnesota to make his point of order on lines 4 and 5.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] has just stated the fact that we had passed the paragraph, and therefore the point of order of my colleague came too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MANN, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 18123, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

PRINTING AS A DOCUMENT A COMMUNICATION RELATING TO INSPECTION SERVICE OF STEAMERS.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a document for the use of the Members of the House a communication received by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries relating to certain bills relating to the inspection service of steamers engaged in the waters of the country. It relates largely to the report made by the commission in regard to the burning of the *General Slocum*.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that a communication addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may be printed as an executive document. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 4728. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Smith;

H. R. 16802. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into contract for the collection and disposal of garbage, ashes, and so forth.

H. R. 17100. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across Sunflower River, in Sharkey County, Miss.;

H. R. 2871. An act to incorporate the Mutual Investment Fire Insurance Company of the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 17577. An act authorizing the Lindsey Lumber Company, a corporation of Escambia County, Ala., to construct a bridge across Conecuh River at or near the town of Pollard, in said county and State.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 5798. An act to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across the Missouri River at Yankton, S. Dak.

PRINTING OF A COMPILATION OF THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF RIVERS AND HARBORS.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution 164, reported favorably from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to consider a House joint resolution reported from the Committee on Printing, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 164) for the printing of a compilation of the laws of the United States relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors.

Resolved, etc., That there shall be printed 3,000 copies of a compilation of the laws of the United States relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors passed until and including the laws of the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, of which 600 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 1,400 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 copies for the use of the War Department, the said compilation to be printed under the direction of the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if this includes all the appropriations made for rivers and harbors. Does this include all the appropriations made for rivers and harbors?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. It includes all the laws passed relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors.

Mr. MADDOX. Does it include the appropriations themselves?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MADDOX. Up to date?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MADDOX. Beginning when?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. 1790.

Mr. PAYNE. What is the estimated expense?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. The estimated expense is \$1,545, and I would say in this connection that the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors states that the publication of these laws is essential to the intelligent working of that committee.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Does it embrace every law that has ever been passed in reference to the subject of rivers and harbors?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire by what method these documents are to be distributed.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Six hundred are for the use of the Senate, 1,400 are for the use of the House, and 1,000 are to be placed at the disposal of the War Department.

Mr. CLARK. I know; but which one of these rooms is going to have charge of this—the folding room or the document room?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. They will be placed at the disposal of the Members of the House and the Senate in the folding room.

Mr. CLARK. That is all right, then.

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

House joint resolution No. 164 was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

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

PRINTING LAND AND PENSION DECISIONS.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 65.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 65, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to print from stereotype plates and to bind 100 copies each of volumes 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 20 to 32, Land Decisions, and volumes 12, 13, and 14, Pension Decisions, for sale and distribution by the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That five copies each of all volumes of Land Decisions, already issued and to be issued, be delivered to the Committees on Public Lands of the Senate and House of Representatives, and that five copies each of all volumes of Pension Decisions, already issued and to be issued, be delivered to the Committee on Pensions of the Senate and to the Committees on Pensions and Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE AND AMERICAN COMMERCE.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 90.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 90, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed and bound in cloth 6,000 copies of the Report on the Development of the American Merchant Marine and American Commerce and of the testimony taken in connection therewith, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Merchant Marine Commission, of which latter 100 copies shall be bound in half morocco.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE REGISTER OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 86.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] asks for the present consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 86, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed from existing stereotype plates and bound in cloth 1,500 copies of the Executive Register of the United States, 1789 to 1902, of which 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the necessity for this document.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I do not understand.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask some explanation of this document.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I would say that this is a complete register of all the Presidents and their cabinets, including record of the dates of appointment and confirmation or rejection, entrance upon duties, etc., from the foundation of the Government down to the present time. It is the only compilation of this character that has ever been made, and it is a compilation of great value.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What will be the cost of it? How many books will it take to contain all this information?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. The cost of it will be \$650.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. One volume?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. In one volume.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thought when this matter was first brought up that it was just the ordinary blue book, containing the names of the executive officers at the time it was printed. I understand now that it is a compilation of all the people who have ever served.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. All of the Presidents and members of their Cabinets, with other exceedingly valuable information.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does that include all of the executive officers of the Government from the beginning down to now?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is this a privileged matter, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] it does not include all the executive officers of the Government, but all of the Presidents and members of their Cabinets—those who served through an entire Administration and those who have served for a short time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. As Cabinet officers?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And it is confined to them?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. It is confined to them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It does not give all of the executive officers of the Government?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Oh, no.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What is the object of the publication?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Well, it is to be published in order to have a complete list of all the Cabinet officers, giving the dates of the terms for which they served. It would be a valuable book of reference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In order to have this complete, it would have to be done over at every Congress, would it not?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. No, sir; it would have to be kept up from now on to make it complete, but this would answer the purpose for several years to come.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If we establish the idea, then it is our duty to give to the people a complete list of all the men who have ever been President, Vice-President, or Cabinet officer.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Of course, they would have to be kept up by reprints or supplements or something of the kind, and possibly ten or fifteen years from now it may be deemed expedient to have republication or reproduction of this.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. How has the matter come before the House—as a matter of privilege?

The SPEAKER. A report from the Committee on Printing, by the direction of that committee, and not privileged, requires unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This is a request for unanimous consent. Well, Mr. Speaker, I dislike so much that I can hardly express it to make any objection to a proposition offered by the gentleman from Indiana, but I believe I will have to do so in this case.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will say to the gentleman that this is the only complete report of this character we have.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand; but I do not understand it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to furnish the people with a complete register of the officeholders, except those that live, and for the purpose of transacting business with them. But that can not be true so far as George Washington is concerned, because he is dead; and it can not be true of Albert Gallatin, for example, for he is dead. Now, when Congress furnishes the names of executive officers now, there is reason in that, because a man finds out who they are in order to communicate with them and attend to public business; but there can be no Democratic or genuine Republican reason for furnishing a book containing the names of all the officeholders in the past; wherefor I object to that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi objects.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF THE GETTYSBURG NATIONAL PARK COMMISSION.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 17.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 17) to provide for the printing of 8,000 copies of the consolidated reports of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, 1893-1904, inclusive.

Resolved, etc., That there be printed 8,000 copies of the consolidated reports of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, 1893-1904, inclusive, of which 2,000 shall be for the Senate, 4,000 for the House of Representatives, 1,000 for the office of the Secretary of War, and 1,000 for the Gettysburg National Park Commission.

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

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to a third reading; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

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

LES COMBATTANTS FRANÇAIS DE LA GUERRE AMÉRICAINE, 1778-1783.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take from the Calendar and consider House joint resolution 155.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to take from the House Calendar and to consider the following joint resolution of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 145) providing for the publication of 4,000 copies of a translation of the book entitled "Les Combattants Français de la Guerre Américaine, 1778-1783."

Resolved, etc., That there be printed and bound 4,000 copies of the book entitled "Les Combattants Français de la Guerre Américaine, 1778-1783," the work to be first translated under the direction of the honorable Secretary of State and indexed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the House, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Secretary of State.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what that is that has just been read. The Clerk's French is so entirely exquisite that I am not entirely certain that I know what it is. But if I understand, it is the French combatants in the American Revolutionary war—les combattants de la guerre Américaine. I believe we better not go into the general historical publication business.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi, before entering an objection, that this will be a complete compilation of all the soldiers from France who assisted us in the war of the Revolution, in the Army and in the Navy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. A roll of honor.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. A splendid roll of honor, too. The historians of the country will take care of them as they do of other historical matters, and our archives are open to them and they can get all of these names, and all the balance of it, and we had better let history be written by the people who make a profession of writing history. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi objects.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I move to reconsider and lay on the table the motion to reconsider the votes by which the other resolutions were passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that motion will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the matter which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from consideration of House bill 9548, and Senate amendments to the same, that the House nonconcur in all of the Senate amendments excepting Senate amendment No. 2, and agree to said amendment No. 2 as amended by the Committee on War Claims, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman if that will do away with private-bill day to-morrow?

Mr. MAHON. So far as I am concerned I do not want it; but as chairman of the committee—

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to say to the gentleman that there is one matter that we would like to get up to-morrow, and that is a resolution referring certain bills to the Court of Claims, and get rid of them.

Mr. MAHON. I think, as chairman, that we should have this go through.

Mr. GIBSON. I am answering the question propounded by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. I would not care if this resolution should come in. I am not going to object to this request that is made.

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

Mr. MAHON. I suggest the conferees, Mr. Speaker.

BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER AT SHREVEPORT, LA.

Mr. BREAZEALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 17333) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Red River at Shreveport, La.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, the title of which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry, but I announced the other day that I should object to requests for unanimous consent after 5 o'clock. The bill is all right, but I shall be forced to object.

VENEZUELAN CASES BEFORE THE HAGUE COURT OF ARBITRATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message of the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying documents, was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

The Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State covering the report of the agent of the United States in the arbitration of the Venezuelan cases before The Hague Tribunal, with accompanying appendices.

The attention of Congress is invited to the request of the Secretary of State that 500 copies of the report and appendices be printed for the use of the Department of State.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1905.

SPECIAL DISBURSING AGENTS.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. GRAFF, the Committee on Claims was discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 6314) for the relief of certain receivers of public moneys acting as special disbursing agents in the matter of amounts expended by them for per diem fees and mileage of witnesses in hearings, which amounts have not been credited by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department in the settlement of their accounts, and the same was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

And then, on motion of Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting an estimate of appropriation for construction of a military hospital in the Moro Military Reservation at San Juan, P. R.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting an estimate of appropriation for publication of report of the census of the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, making recommendations as to bill S. 5763—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a detailed statement of the expenditures of the Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1904, including supplemental accounts—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, calling attention to an accumulation of useless papers—to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. NEVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1973) to regulate the practice in United States courts in regard to instructing juries therein, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3901); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17989) to regulate certain criminal procedure in the Indian Territory, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3902); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TAWNEY, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16799) making Texas City, Tex., a subport of entry in the customs collection district of Galveston, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3903); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17131) granting an increase of pension to James W. Cross, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3776); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16654) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Buswell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3777); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17117) granting an increase of pension to George H. Brusstar, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3778); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16473) granting a pension to John R. Karns, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3779); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17543) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Brashear, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3780); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LUCKING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17734) granting a pension to Susan M. Salsbury, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3781); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15233) granting a pension to Mattie M. Hawkins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3782); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17977) granting an increase of pension to William Barnhard, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3783); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18003) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Rowan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3784); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17261) granting a pension to Mary A. Gibson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3785); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17849) granting an increase of pension to James Freeman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3786); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17073) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Shewmaker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3787); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17771) granting an increase of pension to J. B. Nulton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3788); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16308) granting an increase of pension to Webster Eaton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3789); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17731) granting an increase of pension to William Stewart, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3790); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17374) granting an increase of pension to Georgia A. Harlow, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3791); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16581) granting an increase of pension to Eli Dabler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3792); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17240) granting an increase of pension to Luther Kaltenback, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3793); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16685) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah M. Adams, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3794); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17437) granting an increase of pension to A. H. Glassmire, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3795); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LUCKING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16961) granting an increase of pension to Lydia McCardell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3796); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14232) granting a pension to Pauline W. Stuckey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3797); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15337) granting an increase of pension to Levi L. Martz, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3798); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14395) granting an increase of pension to Frank Lovely, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3799); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15084) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Miller, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3800); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LUCKING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10628) granting a pension to May C. Rapp, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3801); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11859) granting an increase of pension to Deborah H. Bliss, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3802); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7761) granting a pension to Quintus Hummel, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3803); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5390) granting a pension to Katharina A. Mueller, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3804); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5641) granting an increase of pension to Morris B. Slawson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3805); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4385) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Thompson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3806); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5113) granting an increase of pension to Almon W. Gould, reported the same

with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3807); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3406) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Peaks, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3808); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LUCKING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2114) granting a pension to William McCloud, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3809); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3064) granting a pension to Mrs. Kate Good, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3810); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1887) granting an increase of pension to William J. Stewart, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3811); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16072) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Barry, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3812); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16740) granting an increase of pension to Laura Coleman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3813); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17595) granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Hogan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3814); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16589) granting an increase of pension to Martha Peck, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3815); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16540) granting a pension to Annie Orr, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3816); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17046) granting an increase of pension to Hartvig Engebretson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3817); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17092) granting an increase of pension to John Jeffers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3818); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11855) granting an increase of pension to John Cross, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3819); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15788) granting an increase of pension to Silas W. Bullock, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3820); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6116) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Sams, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3821); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LUCKING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5523) granting an increase of pension to James Minnick, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3822); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4722) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Trough, reported the same without amendment, ac-

accompanied by a report (No. 3823); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5975) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Lytton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3824); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5943) granting an increase of pension to Jared Prindle, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3825); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5941) granting an increase of pension to Alma Yohum, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3826); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6196) granting an increase of pension to William C. Dickinson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3827); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6195) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Feigley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3828); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6194) granting an increase of pension to William S. Moorhouse, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3829); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6193) granting a pension to Jacob O. White, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3830); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6191) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Van Norman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3831); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6085) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Delamater, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3832); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5953) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Thurston, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3833); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5856) granting an increase of pension to William V. Morrison, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3834); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5802) granting an increase of pension to Luther M. Bartlow, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3835); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5670) granting an increase of pension to James W. Stickle, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3836); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5550) granting an increase of pension to Martin Mack, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3837); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5432) granting an increase of pension to Elias Stillwell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3838); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4691) granting an increase of pension to Leonard L. Lancaster, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3839); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the

bill of the Senate (S. 4159) granting an increase of pension to George W. Gray, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3840); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3939) granting an increase of pension to James Miller, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3841); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3635) granting an increase of pension to John M. Godown, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3842); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2572) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Lucas, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3843); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2419) granting an increase of pension to Jane M. Black, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3844); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2074) granting an increase of pension to James A. Harper, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3845); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 104) granting an increase of pension to Abner Taylor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3846); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 69) granting an increase of pension to Frances C. Brown, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3847); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2189) granting an increase of pension to Joseph K. Armstrong, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3848); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2828) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe E. Lyda, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3849); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2913) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Givin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3850); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3435) granting an increase of pension to Mazilla Lester, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3851); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3517) granting an increase of pension to John B. Hammer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3852); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6094) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim W. Harrington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3853); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4239) granting an increase of pension to William H. McCann, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3854); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5426) granting a pension to Henry O. Kent, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3855); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5712) granting an increase of pension to Sally Dickinson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3856); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5757) granting an increase of pension to William A. Luther, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3857); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5841) granting an increase of pension to Nelson P. Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3858); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5842) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Parish, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3859); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5868) granting an increase of pension to May C. Buck, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3860); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5938) granting an increase of pension to Owen A. Willey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3861); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5527) granting an increase of pension to John A. Kingman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3862); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 355) granting a pension to Sarah Jane Simonds, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3863); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5766) granting an increase of pension to Andrew S. Graham, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3864); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4760) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Riggs, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3865); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 184) granting an increase of pension to John Bartlett, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3866); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6130) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Harmon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3867); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6321) granting a pension to Hattie F. Davis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3868); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6092) granting an increase of pension to Elijah W. Gordon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3869); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6091) granting an increase of pension to William Welch, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3870); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6004) granting an increase of pension to James Hulme, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3871); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5961) granting an increase of pension to Warren P. Tenney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3872); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5958) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Bartlett, reported the same without amendment, ac-

companied by a report (No. 3873); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5940) granting an increase of pension to Jason R. C. Hoyt, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3874); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5939) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hall, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3875); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6192) granting an increase of pension to James McGinnis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3876); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5971) granting a pension to Cordelia Bird, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3877); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5451) granting an increase of pension to George W. Benedict, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3878); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6074) granting an increase of pension to William Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3879); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5815) granting an increase of pension to James McKim, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3880); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5812) granting an increase of pension to William T. Graham, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3881); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5809) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Wetherell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3882); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5808) granting an increase of pension to William Steele, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3883); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5678) granting a pension to Margaret McKee Pentland, formerly Margaret McKee, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3884); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5698) granting an increase of pension to Martin Schubert, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3885); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5568) granting an increase of pension to Flora B. Bonham, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3886); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5540) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Bradley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3887); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4888) granting an increase of pension to Pierpont H. B. Moulton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3888); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4135) granting an increase of pension to Jane Francis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3889); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the

bill of the Senate (S. 4121) granting an increase of pension to James D. Beasley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3890); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4075) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Shepherd, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3891); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3074) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Davisson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3892); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2707) granting an increase of pension to James M. Clemens, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3893); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1420) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus S. Young, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3894); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1794) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Walkinshaw, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3895); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 830) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Muchmore, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3896); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 141) granting an increase of pension to James W. Kinkead, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3897); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 826) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bertolette, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3898); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 825) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Collins, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3899); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4778) for the relief of Pay Inspector E. B. Rogers, United States Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3900); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13316) granting a pension to Phoebe Damoth—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 16394) granting a pension to Sarah C. Johnson—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 17890) granting a pension to S. M. Carson—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 18195) to revise and amend the tariff laws of the Philippine Archipelago, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 18196) to amend section 4405 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18197) to amend section 4463 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the complement of crews of vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18198) to amend sections 4417, 4453, 4488,

and 4499 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the Steamboat-Inspection Service, and section 5344 of the Revised Statutes, relating to misconduct by officers or owners of vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18199) providing for the appointment of a commission on marine construction—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18200) to amend section 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18201) to amend sections 4418, 4433, 4480, and 4483 of the Revised Statutes, and to repeal sections 4435, 4436, and 4459 of the Revised Statutes, all relating to the Steamboat-Inspection Service—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18202) to amend sections 4415, 4416, 4423, 4426, 4449, 4452, 4470, 4472, 4498, and 4233 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to steamboat inspection—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 18203) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Lyman County and Brule County, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama (by request): A bill (H. R. 18204) for the organization and maintenance of an expedition for the investigation of all phenomena connected with the sea, for the advancement of physical science—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRISON (by request): A bill (H. R. 18205) for the purpose of giving a greater elasticity to the currency, particularly to the end of making more stationary throughout the year the interest rates on loans, by furnishing a sufficient circulating medium to relieve the pressure incidental to the movement of the fall crops—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 18206) in amendment of an act entitled "An act to increase pension for total deafness"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 18207) to amend sections 1, 5, and 6 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a wagon, toll, and electric railway bridge over the Missouri River at Lexington, Mo.," approved April 28, 1904, extending the provisions thereof to steam railway cars, locomotives, and other motive power, and extending the time for commencing actual construction of said bridge—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 18208) to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes so as to remove certain restrictions upon the transportation by steam vessels of gasoline and other products of petroleum when carried by motor vehicles (commonly known as automobiles) using the same as a source of motive power—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 18209) to amend "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," approved June 17, 1902—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 18210) to amend section 4399 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 18211) to improve and to continue the improvement of the Coosa River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18212) to amend the Bowman Act, volume 22, Statutes at Large, page 485—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: A bill (H. R. 18213) to amend sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act to determine the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of the United States and to regulate the removal of causes from State courts, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1887, as amended by an act approved August 13, 1888—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 18214) providing for an additional appropriation for the public building at Littlefalls, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 18215) to extend the lines of the Capital Traction Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 18216) providing for the holding of Federal court at York, Nebr.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 204) relative to ceding the Isle of Pines to Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRICK: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 72)

providing for the publication of the Declaration of Independence, with the biographies of the signers and of the Secretary of the Congress—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BAKER: A resolution (H. Res. 466) relative to the alleged criminality of Hon. Paul Morton when vice-president of the Southern California Railway Company—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRINCE: A memorial of the Illinois general assembly, approving all measures to promote the improvement of the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 18217) for the relief of the estate of Mark S. Gorrill—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18218) granting an increase of pension to William D. Lamb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18219) for the relief of Capt. Rogers F. Gardner—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18220) granting an increase of pension to Mary Cushing Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 18221) for the relief of Ransom Day—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18222) for the relief of the Masonic Lodge of Bexar, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 18223) to authorize the restoration of the name of Charles B. Kerney, late a captain, Porto Rico Provisional Regiment of Infantry, to the rolls of the Army, and providing that he be placed on the list of retired officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 18224) to grant an honorable discharge to William M. Hanley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 18225) granting an increase of pension to Garcelo Leighton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18226) granting an increase of pension to Terence McDuff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18227) granting an increase of pension to Orlena F. Seaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 18228) granting an increase of pension to William Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 18229) granting an increase of pension to Fayette E. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 18230) granting a pension to John C. Matheny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 18231) for the relief of the heirs of S. H. Ayres, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLETT of California: A bill (H. R. 18232) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Dennis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 18233) granting an increase of pension to Michael Harmon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18234) granting an increase of pension to Eliza B. Bond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18235) granting an increase of pension to William Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 18236) granting a pension to Emmet W. Crozier—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 18237) granting a pension to Thomas Bramel—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18238) for the relief of Jacob I. Cohen and J. Randolph Mordecai, administrators of M. C. Mordecai—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 18239) granting an increase of pension to George W. Farmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 18240) to correct the military record of Aaron Loughner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 18241) for the relief of John H. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 18242) granting an increase of pension to Mary Goodposter—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAMAR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 18243) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Hubbard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18244) granting a pension to William F. Monday—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 18245) granting a pension to Lois L. Nutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 18246) for the relief of the heirs of Charles A. Folsom—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MCGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 18247) granting an increase of pension to Philiar L. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 18248) granting a pension to Elizabeth P. Gilcrease—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 18249) granting an increase of pension to James H. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18250) granting an increase of pension to Jane Lynch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 18251) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18252) for the relief of B. G. Chandler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18253) for the relief of Griffin Callahan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18254) for the relief of Phillip D. Wright—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18255) for the relief of the estate of Caswell B. Derrick, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18256) for the relief of William M. Hilliard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18257) for the relief of Mrs. Cassa Simpson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18258) for the relief of the estate of Preston Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18259) for the relief of the estate of Sidney F. Tate, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18260) for the relief of the estate of James Wooley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18261) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Ward, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18262) for the relief of Francis Wilkes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18263) for the relief of Joseph Lightfoot—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBB: A bill (H. R. 18264) granting an increase of pension to Frank Schumer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 18265) granting a pension to Michael V. Hennessy—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 18266) for the relief of John D. Rodgers—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18267) granting an increase of pension to James H. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 18268) granting a pension to Annie Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18269) granting a pension to John Broad—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 18270) granting a pension to Robert C. Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 18271) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Bowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18272) granting an increase of pension to John A. Orwig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 18273) granting an increase of pension to Soren Julius Thor-Straten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADE: A bill (H. R. 18274) granting an increase of pension to Clark Whitmoyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18275) granting a pension to George King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 18276) granting an increase of pension to L. E. Cropper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 18277) granting an increase of pension to Andrew H. Boon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of United Irish League of United

States Societies and Ancient Order of Hibernians, condemning Hay treaties—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of William Lohead, favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the American Forestry Association, favoring protection of forests of the country—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Pilot Commissioners, against bill H. R. 7298—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the executive committee of the Bar Pilots of Pensacola, Fla., against bill H. R. 7298—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Colorado City Lodge, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Cigar Dealers' Association of America, against reduction of tariff on tobacco from Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chinese community of the Territory of Hawaii, for redress of wrongs of Chinese in the island—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of residents of the District of Columbia, against legislation on Sabbath observance in the District—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Central Furniture Company, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring enactment of bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Brazier Automobile Works, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the National Business League, at Chicago, against unjust discrimination in freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Edward G. McCollin et al., against increased armament on sea or land—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of 13 business firms of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE: Petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers of New Haven, Conn., favoring bill H. R. 13359—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: Petition of 33 residents of Goshen, Ind., favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 31 residents of South Bend, Ind., favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 20 residents of Winamac, Ind., favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 16 residents of South Bend, Ind., favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of D. H. Cake and 28 others, of South Bend, Ind., favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Leslie R. Bunker et al., asking appropriation to deepen and widen the waters of the "Pool," Cranberry Islands—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Agnes Kemp et al., favoring international arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. Alfred Kelley, favoring the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, against an increase of armament on sea or land—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of James Rhodes Moylan et al., against increase of armaments on sea and land—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Agnes Kemp et al., against intoxicating liquors in Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of the South Woodlawn Improvement Society, of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring establishment of forest reserves in Appalachian and White mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Providence, R. I., favoring an antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Providence, favoring a stringent Sunday law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Young Woman's Christian Temperance

Union of Providence R. I., against sale of opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Petition of citizens of the Seventeenth district of Ohio, favoring a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Patrick C. Cooper—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Denver Chamber of Commerce, against reduction of tariff on sugar from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chinese community of the Territory of Hawaii, relative to their wrongs in the islands—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Yonghiogheny Lodge, No. 218, of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition of Central Labor Union of Washington, D. C., in reference to compulsory education in the District—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Central Labor Union of Washington, D. C., in reference to child labor in the District—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DENNY: Petition of West Baltimore Woman's Christian Temperance Union, for passage of bill prohibiting sale of liquor on Government premises—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the Denver Chamber of Commerce, against reduction of tariff on sugar from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. W. Perkins, against reduction of tariff on tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Thomas E. E. Bunel Company, favoring bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. A. Sewall, favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petition of New York State Tobacco Growers' Association, opposing reduction of present tariff rates on tobacco coming from the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of Floyd Find et al., favoring bill H. R. 4072—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Retail Merchants' Association of LaSalle, Ill., favoring Government regulation of freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Hammond & Person, of New Jersey, favoring repeal of tax on butterine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Armstrong Cork Company, of Chicago, favoring the Quarles-Cooper bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Petition of citizens of Orange, Mass., favoring an antipolygamy constitutional amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of the Delta Chi Society of the Pearl Street Baptist Church, of Providence, R. I., for suppression of alleged outrages in the Kongo Free State—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Young Women's Christian Temperance Union of Providence, R. I., favoring arbitration treaties with civilized nations—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Providence, R. I., for excluding gambling matter from the mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Young Women's Christian Temperance Union of Providence, R. I., favoring divorce reform by constitutional amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Young Women's Christian Temperance Union of Providence, R. I., against sale of liquor on Government premises—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Papers in support of bill for increase of pension for William Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON: Petition of citizens of Rochester, N. Y., against passage of bill H. R. 4859—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Norwood and Norfolk, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., against bill H. R. 4859—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition for the benefit of the heirs of George B. Simpson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of the Forest City Land and Lumber Company, favoring bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNT: Petition of the Kregel Casket Company, favoring bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. W. Perkins, against reduction in tariff on tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the St. Louis Cotton Exchange, favoring Government control of freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of Superior Division, Order of Railway Conductors, favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of Ne Plus Ultra Lodge, No. 12, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Ottumwa, Iowa, favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Commercial Club of Oskaloosa, Iowa, favoring Government control of freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of the Lead (S. Dak.) Commercial Club, favoring Government control of freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of the United Commercial Travelers, of Portsmouth, Ohio, favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of citizens of California, against repeal or alteration of present sweet-wine law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of senate and assembly of California, against tax on brandy used to fortify sweet wines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany bill for the relief of James Lynch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for the relief of James H. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Felix Weeden—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Lagrange College—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Berhet C. Chandler, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Griffith Callahan, of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Caswell B. Derrick, of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Philip D. Wright, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William H. Hillard, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Joseph Lightfoot, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Cassa Simpson, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Preston Smith, of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Sidney F. Tate, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of James Woosley, of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Francis Wilkes, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Samuel Ward, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of William Cunningham, of Lawrence County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Peter H. Gold, of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Bradford Hambrick, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Enoch R. Kennedy, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of William M. Underwood, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of David Crow—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition for relief of the Methodist Church of Bellefonte, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBB: Papers in support of bill for relief of Frank Schumer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Petition of Cigar Makers' International Union, relative to proposed reduction of tariff rates on tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Business League of Chicago, favoring equitable freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of L. R. Skinner Lodge, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of Arkansas City (Kans.) Lodge, Order of Railway Conductors, favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Kansas State board of agriculture, favoring railway regulation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of Elk Grange, of Russell, Pa., favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of Pecos Valley Lodge, No. 573, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of retail druggists of Newbern, N. C., relative to bill H. R. 13679—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, resolution of Interstate Commerce Law Convention of St. Louis, against unjust discrimination in freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WACHTER: Papers to accompany bill for increase of pension of Soren Julius Thor Straten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: Petition of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Indiana, favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 28 residents of Richmond, Ind., favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 24, 1905.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal stands approved.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office calling attention to the accumulation of papers in his office not needed for the transaction of current public business, of no permanent value or historical interest, and urging that prompt measures be taken looking to their disposition. A Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, consisting of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. LONG], has been provided for that purpose, and the Chair will refer the communication and accompanying papers to that committee, if there be no objection.

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 joint resolution (S. R. 17) to provide for the printing of 8,000 copies of the consolidated reports of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, 1893 to 1904, inclusive.

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

H. R. 7022. An act to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1901;

H. R. 17109. An act to define the limits of square 1131, in the city of Washington, D. C.; and