

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *February 13, 1906.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] to read Washington's Farewell Address on the 22d instant, pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 56) authorizing the extension of Rhode Island avenue NE.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 23) providing for an extension of time for completing the highway bridge and approaches across the Potomac River at Washington, D. C., with amendments; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 118. An act to amend sections 713 and 714 of "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the acts approved January 31 and June 30, 1902, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8997. An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11784. An act to authorize the recovery of the value of unlawful rebates and discriminations and penalty therefor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12614. An act to change the name of a portion of T street to California street; and

H. R. 12709. An act to allow and regulate amendments in judicial proceedings in the courts of the United States.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

S. 2582. An act to authorize the American National Bank of Graham, Va., to change its location and name;

H. R. 530. An act granting an increase of pension to George E. Ross;

H. R. 611. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Cassidy;

H. R. 724. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Coulter;

H. R. 1059. An act granting an increase of pension to Elijah Spangler;

H. R. 1072. An act granting an increase of pension to John Fisher;

H. R. 1123. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah Emaline Finklea;

H. R. 1124. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Grant;

H. R. 1125. An act granting an increase of pension to Frances Ann Batchelor;

H. R. 1131. An act granting an increase of pension to George Sargent;

H. R. 1136. An act granting an increase of pension to William D. Stauffer;

H. R. 1213. An act granting an increase of pension to John Breden;

H. R. 1280. An act granting a pension to Mary K. Lewis;

H. R. 1283. An act granting an increase of pension to Epsy Ann Austin;

H. R. 1382. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Fagley;

H. R. 1437. An act granting an increase of pension to Darius J. Brown;

H. R. 1467. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram E. Monroe;

H. R. 1545. An act granting a pension to Florence D. Rafferty;

H. R. 1554. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Spinning;

H. R. 1797. An act granting a pension to James H. Cole, alias John V. Cole;

H. R. 1884. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Purcell;

H. R. 1952. An act granting an increase of pension to Axel A. M. Nattoch Dag;

H. R. 1958. An act granting a pension to Ida L. and Clara E. Winters;

H. R. 1974. An act granting an increase of pension to William R. P. Foale;

H. R. 2083. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Slack;

H. R. 2084. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Maginley;

H. R. 2113. An act granting an increase of pension to Lydia B. Jackson;

H. R. 2169. An act granting an increase of pension to Elisha White;

H. R. 2289. An act granting an increase of pension to Algernon Lightcap;

H. R. 2291. An act granting an increase of pension to William Elmes;

H. R. 2340. An act granting a pension to Evelyn S. Beardslee;

H. R. 2342. An act granting a pension to Winifred E. Lewis;

H. R. 2345. An act granting an increase of pension to Antoinette Hannahs;

H. R. 2394. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank Buncher;

H. R. 2771. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas McCabe;

H. R. 2795. An act granting a pension to Emma Auger;

H. R. 2811. An act granting a pension to Angie A. Marvin;

H. R. 3214. An act granting a pension to Maggie Parker;

H. R. 3216. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Seeber;

H. R. 3229. An act granting a pension to Jessie Marie Hester;

H. R. 3380. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Wilburn;

H. R. 3400. An act granting an increase of pension to Anson K. Carr;

H. R. 3605. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert Lathrop;

H. R. 3678. An act granting an increase of pension to Jonathan C. S. Twitchell;

H. R. 4195. An act granting an increase of pension to Hamilton Secheverell;

H. R. 4215. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Roberts;

H. R. 4217. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Rose;

H. R. 4218. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Williamson;

H. R. 4224. An act granting an increase of pension to Christopher Pletzke;

H. R. 4225. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Cooper;

H. R. 4391. An act granting an increase of pension to William John Stewart, alias John Scott;

H. R. 4607. An act granting a pension to Annie Rohr;

H. R. 4644. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Dickens;

H. R. 4666. An act granting an increase of pension to David A. Carpenter;

H. R. 4713. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary M. C. Manning;

H. R. 4727. An act granting a pension to Emma M. Boyer;

H. R. 4730. An act granting an increase of pension to Meshack L. Jones;

H. R. 4732. An act granting an increase of pension to James Scrogum;

H. R. 4735. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Adair;

H. R. 4737. An act granting an increase of pension to Odilia Logan;

H. R. 4738. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Roberts;

H. R. 4739. An act granting an increase of pension to Lawrence B. Smith;

H. R. 4765. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Shepherd;

H. R. 4822. An act granting an increase of pension to Gabriel Smith;

H. R. 4827. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Morrow;

H. R. 4879. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Roache;

H. R. 4884. An act granting an increase of pension to John Bokart;

H. R. 4964. An act granting an increase of pension to Nancy Stillwell;
 H. R. 5015. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin R. Goodell;
 H. R. 5016. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis Carey;
 H. R. 5170. An act granting an increase of pension to David R. Pringle;
 H. R. 5238. An act granting an increase of pension to Lockett Stuard;
 H. R. 5254. An act granting an increase of pension to Travis W. Tichenor;
 H. R. 5644. An act granting an increase of pension to George J. Wilcox;
 H. R. 5808. An act granting an increase of pension to Napoleon D. O. Lord;
 H. R. 5925. An act granting an increase of pension to David L. Davidson;
 H. R. 5955. An act granting an increase of pension to Jennie L. Overton;
 H. R. 6143. An act granting an increase of pension to James Elfert;
 H. R. 6144. An act granting an increase of pension to Eli Brazelton;
 H. R. 6157. An act granting an increase of pension to Jonathan J. Boyer;
 H. R. 6192. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Mills;
 H. R. 6227. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Jones;
 H. R. 6228. An act granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Terrell;
 H. R. 6338. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard McCarthy;
 H. R. 6448. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Shaw;
 H. R. 6451. An act granting an increase of pension to Adam Wucher;
 H. R. 7418. An act granting an increase of pension to Fritz Muller;
 H. R. 7420. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Wren;
 H. R. 8090. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma H. Benham;
 H. R. 8217. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. J. Tayman;
 H. R. 8222. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Jordan;
 H. R. 8442. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Rock River at Grand Detour, Ill.;
 H. R. 8618. An act granting an increase of pension to John G. Rowan;
 H. R. 9352. An act granting a pension to Mary Van Blarcom;
 H. R. 10192. An act granting an increase of pension to Alanson B. Thomas;
 H. R. 10225. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathan B. Richardson;
 H. R. 10296. An act granting an increase of pension to James Graham;
 H. R. 10299. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Long;
 H. R. 10434. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. King;
 H. R. 10436. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Ensminger;
 H. R. 10765. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Whitson;
 H. R. 11310. An act granting a pension to Emma Aldred;
 H. R. 11403. An act granting an increase of pension to David E. Longsdorf; and
 H. R. 11596. An act granting a pension to Marion H. Long.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the second session of the third legislative assembly of Porto Rico, praying for the enactment of legislation conferring citizenship upon the Porto Ricans as recommended by the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Joint resolution praying both Houses of the United States Congress to adopt and approve the recommendation made by the Hon. Theodore Roosevelt in his last message, regarding the conferring of citizenship upon the Porto Ricans.

The legislative assembly of Porto Rico to the United States Congress:

Whereas the Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, in his last annual message to the United States Congress,

recommends that an act be adopted and enacted by virtue whereof due justice shall be done the Porto Ricans by explicitly conferring upon them American citizenship, to which they are rightfully entitled, inasmuch as the people of Porto Rico are part and parcel of the Republic, possessing the necessary fitness and education to enforce and perform the duties and exercise the rights which are derived from the Constitution thereof; and

Whereas the people of Porto Rico eagerly desire to begin to enjoy the dignity and benefits that go with the recognition of such citizenship: Be it

Resolved by the legislative assembly of Porto Rico, That both Houses of the United States Congress be petitioned to embody in an act the high and just recommendation made by the President in favor of granting American citizenship to the Porto Ricans.

Approved February 6, 1906.

THE PEOPLE OF PORTO RICO,
Secretary's Office:

I, Regis H. Post, secretary of Porto Rico, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a joint resolution of the legislative assembly of Porto Rico, entitled "Joint resolution praying both Houses of the United States Congress to adopt and approve the recommendation made by the Hon. Theodore Roosevelt in his last message, regarding the conferring of citizenship upon the Porto Ricans," approved by the governor of Porto Rico on February 6, 1906, the original of which is now on file in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of Porto Rico, at the city of San Juan, this 7th day of February, A. D. 1906.

[SEAL.]

REGIS H. POST, *Secretary of Porto Rico.*

Mr. HOPKINS presented petitions of Glaser, Kahn & Co., Eugene O. Reed Company, and Oscar C. Miller, all of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, 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 Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pittsfield, Ill., and the petition of J. L. Turner, of Mount Sterling, Ill., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of Hamilton Brothers, of Hoopes-ton, Ill., and the petition of James W. Owen, of Elgin, Ill., praying for the ratification of international reciprocity treaties; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 577, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Mattoon, Ill., and a petition of Belknap Division, No. 96, Order of Railway Conductors, of Aurora, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill," and also the "anti-injunction bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Federation of Labor of Chicago, Ill., and a petition of the Lake Seamen's Union of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to the complement of crews of vessels; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Decatur, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to one-cent postage, and remonstrating against the establishment of a parcels-post system; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of George Johnson, of Naper-ville, Ill., and the petition of O. M. Powers, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to postage rates on college publications; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the memorial of C. F. Wright, of Liberty-ville, Ill., and the memorial of Greene & Greene, of Tallula, Ill., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to establish a postal savings bank system; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Minnesota Retail Liquor Dealers' Association, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions of the Minnesota Implement Dealers' Association, favoring the recommendations of President Roosevelt relative to railroad-rate legislation; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SCOTT presented a memorial of N. H. Smith Division, No. 448, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Bluefield, W. Va., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "railroad-rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HEYBURN presented a petition of the Presbyterian Ministers' Association of Philadelphia, Pa., and a petition of the Methodist Episcopal Preachers' Meeting of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Tacoma Branch of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, and a petition of the Trades Council of Tacoma, Wash., praying for the adoption of a certain amendment to the bill relating to the complement of crews of vessels; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition of the Flint River Baptist Association, of Mount Morris, Mich., and a petition of sundry citizens of Three Rivers, Mich., praying for an investigation of the existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Pittsford Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pittsford, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the duty on denatured alcohol; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 18, American Federation of Labor, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the unauthorized use of the names or pictures of persons for the purposes of trade; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Charles S. Juade, of Powers, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the duty on linotype and composing machines or the composing parts thereof; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Petoskey, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Territory of Oklahoma when admitted to statehood; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Horticultural Society of Berrien County, Mich., 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 memorial of the City Bank, of Dowagiac, Mich., and a memorial of the Maynard-Allen State Bank, of Portland, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to establish a postal savings-bank system; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sunrise, Alaska, and a petition of sundry citizens of Hope, Alaska, praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of public roads in that Territory; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Albion, Mich., and a memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticantone law; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 568, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Alpena; of Delta Division, No. 86, Order of Railway Conductors, of Escanaba, and of Saginaw Valley Lodge, No. 188, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Saginaw, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Saginaw, Mich., and a petition of Board of Commerce of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to reorganize the consular service; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Wells-Higman Company, of St. Joseph; of the Saugatuck and Ganges Pomological Society, of Douglas; of the Ballou Basket Works, of Belding, and of the Farmers' Institute of Sandusky, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of the so-called "railroad rate bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the Hildreth Motor and Pump Company, of Lansing; of E. Bement's Sons, of Lansing, and of the Oliver Machinery Company, of Grand Rapids, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present Chinese exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Shelby, Mich., and a petition of sundry citizens of Ingham County, Mich., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cranston, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present a petition from the National Society of Colonial Dames of America in the District of Columbia, in reference to the encroachment upon the Falls of Niagara, and making an appeal for the preservation of that most important interest. I have been requested by the officers of this society to ask that the petition, which is very brief, may be printed as a Senate document, which request I make.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to printing the petition as a document? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. It will be referred—

Mr. GALLINGER. Let it be referred to the Committee on

Foreign Relations, that committee having jurisdiction, as I understand, of the matter now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The subject has heretofore gone to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then let it go there. I understood that a bill or something of that nature the Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT] introduced had gone to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I have no choice in the matter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present also petitions indorsing the action of the Colonial Dames of the District of Columbia, signed by the presidents and officers of the Colonial Dames societies in the following States: Alabama, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, South Carolina, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and the national officers of these societies. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of Ellen W. Boyd, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that the Indian Territory be admitted into the Union as a separate State; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. G. D. Willingham, of Hobart, Okla., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Territory of Oklahoma when admitted to statehood; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented a petition of Eureka Lodge, No. 14, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. ALLISON presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of Louisa and Des Moines counties, in the State of Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Eagle Grove Division, No. 164, Order of Railway Conductors, of Eagle Grove, Iowa, 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 Audubon County, Iowa, praying for the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of Company M, Fifty-third Regiment; of Company D, Fifty-sixth Regiment, and of Company H, Fifty-third Regiment, all of the Iowa National Guard, and of members of the Fifty-fifth Iowa Regimental National Guard Band, all in the State of Iowa, praying that increased appropriations be made for the support of the National Guard; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3899) granting authority to the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to dismiss midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy, and regulating the procedure and punishment in trials for hazing at the said academy, to report it with amendments, and submit a report thereon. I ask that the bill may be placed on the Calendar; and as it is a very important measure, I shall at an early day ask the Senate to take it up for consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

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

A bill (H. R. 10457) granting a pension to Lizzie Bremmer;

A bill (H. R. 10522) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Everitt;

A bill (H. R. 10308) granting an increase of pension to Dillon F. Acker; and

A bill (H. R. 8242) granting an increase of pension to John Alves.

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

A bill (H. R. 11653) granting an increase of pension to James R. Jordan;

A bill (H. R. 10588) granting an increase of pension to John H. Parker;

A bill (H. R. 10623) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Bostwick;

A bill (H. R. 8187) granting an increase of pension to Silas G. Elliott; and

A bill (H. R. 7680) granting an increase of pension to William Shannon.

Mr. PILES, 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. 3933) granting an increase of pension to Sidney R. Smith;

A bill (S. 1273) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor A. Keeler;

A bill (S. 3029) granting an increase of pension to Delia A. Hooker;

A bill (S. 94) granting an increase of pension to Albert Wines;

A bill (S. 3903) granting an increase of pension to John McCoy; and

A bill (S. 4226) granting an increase of pension to James Cain.

Mr. PILES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 548) granting an increase of pension to William Carr, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3905) granting an increase of pension to James M. Garritt, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

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. 11620) granting an increase of pension to John J. Quimby; and

A bill (H. R. 10323) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. Donahue.

Mr. KITTREDGE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3292) to incorporate the Great Council of the United States of the Improved Order of Red Men, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9944) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Martin, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (H. R. 10872) granting an increase of pension to Abram J. Hill;

A bill (H. R. 10611) granting a pension to John J. Brewer;

A bill (H. R. 9416) granting an increase of pension to Jacob M. Longworth;

A bill (H. R. 8926) granting an increase of pension to John Keller;

A bill (H. R. 8847) granting an increase of pension to Philip B. Thompson;

A bill (H. R. 8846) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Todd;

A bill (H. R. 7838) granting an increase of pension to S. Harriet Morris;

A bill (H. R. 6859) granting a pension to Eva B. Koch;

A bill (H. R. 6613) granting a pension to Thomas J. Stevens;

A bill (H. R. 6076) granting a pension to Anna M. Case;

A bill (H. R. 7576) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brummett; and

A bill (H. R. 7001) granting an increase of pension to Andrew M. Dunham.

Mr. GEARIN, 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. 218) granting an increase of pension to James White;

A bill (S. 220) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan F. Gates;

A bill (S. 623) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Evans; and

A bill (S. 641) granting an increase of pension to James M. Conrad.

Mr. GEARIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1834) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Partridge, 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. 2332) granting an increase of pension to Ashley A. Youmans;

A bill (H. R. 9142) granting an increase of pension to Herman A. Kimball;

A bill (H. R. 6538) granting an increase of pension to George H. Rice; and

A bill (H. R. 6977) granting an increase of pension to Alfred S. Isaacs.

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. 10439) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Gaunt;

A bill (H. R. 10266) granting an increase of pension to William H. Morris; and

A bill (H. R. 4826) granting a pension to Leola V. Franks.

Mr. CULBERSON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 398) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Greenville, in the State of Texas, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

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 (H. R. 11160) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Herbert;

A bill (H. R. 11144) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Pratt;

A bill (H. R. 9789) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Nicholson;

A bill (H. R. 6947) granting an increase of pension to Charles Washburn;

A bill (H. R. 8044) granting an increase of pension to Angel Hausker;

A bill (H. R. 8043) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Dodds;

A bill (H. R. 7665) granting an increase of pension to Wesley J. Banks;

A bill (H. R. 10362) granting an increase of pension to William J. Chenoweth;

A bill (H. R. 7607) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Smith;

A bill (H. R. 7240) granting a pension to Glawvina A. Pinell;

A bill (H. R. 7231) granting an increase of pension to Samuel O'Tool; and

A bill (H. R. 6941) granting an increase of pension to Alice Gearke.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, 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. 6992) granting an increase of pension to Mary Duffy;

A bill (H. R. 8288) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Carr;

A bill (H. R. 8596) granting an increase of pension to John C. Messerschmidt;

A bill (H. R. 7941) granting an increase of pension to Carlton B. Osborn;

A bill (H. R. 8253) granting an increase of pension to John Dolan;

A bill (H. R. 10722) granting an increase of pension to William H. Flint;

A bill (H. R. 10918) granting an increase of pension to Nathan W. Josselyn; and

A bill (S. 672) granting an increase of pension to James F. Hubbard.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 675) granting a pension to Ulricke Boettcher, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 4369) to amend an act approved March 1, 1905, entitled "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;" which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 4370) to appropriate the sum of \$40,000 to the Cape Cod Pilgrim's Memorial Association, to be used in erecting, at Provincetown, Mass., a suitable memorial of the landing of the Pilgrims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced the following bills; which were

severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 4371) granting a pension to Caroline B. Sloan; and
A bill (S. 4372) granting an increase of pension to Emily P. Hubbard.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 4373) for the relief of Chester Bethel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4374) for the relief of the estate of William Flannigan, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 4375) granting an increase of pension to David McCredie; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. RAYNER (for Mr. GORMAN) introduced a bill (S. 4376) to quitclaim all the interest of the United States of America in and to certain lot of land lying in the District of Columbia and State of Maryland to heirs of John C. Rives, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (for Mr. GORMAN) introduced a bill (S. 4377) for the relief of the Davison Chemical Company, of Baltimore, Md.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 4378) granting an increase of pension to Mark R. Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced a bill (S. 4379) granting an increase of pension to Roy E. Knight; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 4380) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Glenville, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. KITTREDGE introduced a bill (S. 4381) granting an increase of pension to John T. McGarraugh; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 4382) to further regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States, and to amend the laws on that subject now in force; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4383) for the relief of Elizabeth M. Earle, administratrix of the estate of J. B. Earle, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4384) to regulate the appointment, number, rank, and pay of chaplains in the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 4385) granting a pension to J. R. Clifford; and

A bill (S. 4386) granting a pension to George Thomas.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 4387) for the relief of Florence Lambert; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4388) for the relief of Robert McFarland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 4389) granting an increase of pension to Florence Plato;

A bill (S. 4390) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Alexander;

A bill (S. 4391) granting an increase of pension to Abner R. Barnes; and

A bill (S. 4392) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia A. Mobley.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 4393) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at East Liverpool, Ohio; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming introduced a bill (S. 4394) to increase the limit of cost of the post-office and court-house at Evanston, Wyo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

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

A bill (S. 4395) granting a pension to Kate Goode;

A bill (S. 4396) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Davis;

A bill (S. 4397) granting an increase of pension to Marshall Bragg (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4398) granting an increase of pension to William H. Waddle (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4399) granting an increase of pension to Alpha C. Puckett (with accompanying papers).

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 4400) to grant certain lands to the town of Fruita, Colo.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 33) directing the Secretary of War to deliver medal of honor awarded to F. W. Summerfield, January 6, 1906, to J. W. Summerfield, father of said F. W. Summerfield, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FULTON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$400,000 for continuing the improvement at the mouth of the Columbia River, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PURE-FOOD BILL.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I desire at this time to ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, February 21, the Senate shall take up Senate bill 88 and proceed to vote upon the same and any amendments that may be offered to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent that on Wednesday, February 21, the Senate shall take up Senate bill 88, known as the "pure-food bill," and proceed to vote upon it and all amendments now pending or hereafter offered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and consent is given.

Mr. HEYBURN subsequently said: I desire, having made some inquiry at the desk, to make more explicit the order, so that it shall read "after the routine morning business," in regard to fixing the time for a vote on Senate bill 88.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent that Senate bill 88 shall be taken up after the close of the routine morning business on February 21 next.

Mr. HEYBURN. Unanimous consent has already been given to take it up, and I merely ask that the order be made to provide that it shall be taken up after the routine morning business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next business in order is Senate bill 529, under the unanimous-consent agreement of February 5.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

Mr. GALLINGER. I call the attention of the clerks to page 6, line 5, where an amendment was put in the bill, with the suggestion that a comma should be placed after the word "public;" that is all.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be made.

Mr. GALLINGER. On page 11, line 17, the word "desired" should be changed to the word "needed," to conform to an amendment made previously.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, line 17, strike out the first word in the line, the word "desired," and insert in lieu the word "needed," so as to read: "When the repairs shall be needed."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I offer two proposed amendments which I think it desirable to have printed and lie on the table so that they may be examined.

Mr. ALLISON. Let them be read.

Mr. GALLINGER. They might be read, perhaps.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The proposed amendments will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

After the word "vessel," in line 10, page 8, strike out the words "then the same shall be determined" and substitute the words "the United States is hereby authorized and empowered to take the vessel at once, leaving the fair actual value or fair rate of hire to be determined thereafter."

After the word "agree," in line 13, page 8, add the words "and the

provisions of this subdivision shall be embodied in every contract between the vessel owner or owners and the United States."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The proposed amendments will be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I presume other Senators desire to discuss the bill. I do not wish to be heard at the present time on the subject.

The VICE-PRESIDENT (after a pause). The Chair lays before the Senate bills from the House of Representatives.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 118. An act to amend sections 713 and 714 of "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the acts approved January 31 and June 30, 1902, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12614. An act to change the name of a portion of T street to California street.

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

H. R. 11784. An act to authorize the recovery of the value of unlawful rebates and discriminations and penalty therefor, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12709. An act to allow and regulate amendments in judicial proceedings in the courts of the United States.

H. R. 8997. An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. GALLINGER subsequently said: A moment ago the Chair referred the bill (H. R. 8997) to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Inasmuch as the Senate committee has reported a bill (S. 2070) identical in terms with this bill, and it is Order of Business No. 802 on the Calendar, I ask that without referring the House bill to the Committee it be given the same place on the Calendar the Senate bill has, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

POTOMAC RIVER HIGHWAY BRIDGE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. R. 23) providing for an extension of time for completing the highway bridge and approaches across the Potomac River at Washington, D. C.

The amendments of the House were, on page 2, line 5, to strike out "February 12" and insert "December 15;" and on page 2, line 6, to strike out "seven" and insert "six."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate agree to the amendments made by the House of Representatives.

Mr. FRYE. What is the exact effect of the amendments?

Mr. GALLINGER. To shorten the time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read as amended by the House.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the time for completing the construction of the highway bridge and approaches across the Potomac River, authorized by section 12 of the act of Congress 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," as amended by the District of Columbia appropriation act, approved July 1, 1902, and as amended by "joint resolution providing for an extension of time for completing the highway bridge and approaches across the Potomac River, at Washington, D. C.," approved February 18, 1905, be, and is hereby, extended to December 15, 1906.

Mr. FRYE. I have no objection to the amendments.

The amendments were concurred in.

DAMS AND POWER STATIONS AT MUSCLE SHOALS, ALABAMA.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask the immediate consideration of the resolution which I will read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to return to the House of Representatives House bill 297, to authorize the construction of dams and power stations on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, for the purpose of amendment.

That bill passed both Houses and went to the President. There is a difficulty in the draft of the bill which has challenged the attention of the President and raises in his mind an objection to the bill, which difficulty can be removed by amendment exactly in accordance with the purpose for which the bill was offered. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may now be considered.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, the President is requested to return to the House of Representatives House bill 297, to authorize the construction of dams and power stations on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, for the purpose of amendment.

STATEMENT OF LAND ENTRIES.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, directed to furnish for the use of the Senate a complete statement as of December 31, 1905, by land-office districts, of the total number of filings of record under each of the public-land laws, in sections, from which the respective local land officers were on said date under instructions not to receive final proofs.

Second. The total number of entries of land under each of the respective public-land laws under suspension on December 31, 1905, by reason of orders of suspension theretofore made by him or under his direction.

Third. The aggregate acreage embraced in the filings and entries aforesaid.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, unless some Senator is prepared to proceed with the discussion of the unfinished business—

Mr. TELLER rose.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Colorado rises. Perhaps he is prepared to go on.

Mr. TELLER. No, I am not.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. Allow me to complete my sentence.

Mr. CULBERSON. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was about to suggest that the unfinished business might be temporarily laid aside and the Calendar be taken up until Senators are ready to go on with the discussion.

Mr. CULBERSON. I rise to that very question, Mr. President. As there seems to be a dearth of argument on this particular question of the subsidy and the value of this bill to the country, I have received a letter from a shipowner of Galveston, Tex., in which he discusses it somewhat fully. If there is no objection, I should be glad to have the letter printed in the Record to-morrow morning, so that all Senators can have the benefit of it before the vote is taken.

Mr. GALLINGER. There can be no objection to that, surely.

Mr. ALLISON. If it is an instructive letter, why not have it read as a part of the remarks of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CULBERSON. I was simply desiring to save time. It is a long letter and gives a good many figures and details. Each Senator can read it in the morning if he desires to do so. I have no objection personally to its being read.

Mr. ALLISON. The letter may be suggestive of other things. I think perhaps it is well enough to have it read.

Mr. CULBERSON. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read by the Secretary. The Secretary will read it.

The Secretary read the letter, as follows:

GALVESTON, TEX., February 10, 1906.

Hon. C. A. CULBERSON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favor of January 29, and also of a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 20, which contains Senator MALLORY's speech on American merchant marine, in which he very much honors me by using some of the data which I sent to you at your request from the Raleigh Hotel during the first part of January.

As the matter is of utmost importance to our shipping, I trust you will kindly read also the following:

If I understand correctly, Senator MALLORY agrees that the payment of a retainer to the crew and a \$5 per ton subvention proposition to the shipowner is insufficient for the purpose outlined in Senator GALLINGER's bill, but the Senator from Florida says that if everything else be eliminated except the postal subsidy proposition he would like to have it passed to-morrow.

Paragraph No. 5 of the postal subsidy proposition provides as follows:

"From a port of the United States on the Gulf of Mexico to Cuba for steamships of the United States of not less than 14-knot speed for a semiweekly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$75,000 per year."

I pick out this number, because it seems to be the nearest in which Florida and Texas are jointly interested, and would like to point out that the provision is either impractical of execution or falls of its purpose.

It requires a semiweekly service. To establish a semiweekly service that will cover the distance, say, between Habana and Mobile, which is the nearest trading line in the American-Cuban freight traffic, and which amounts to about 550 miles each way, at least two steamers are required.

Steamers making 14 knots speed on the trial trip, in actual navi-

gation will average at the highest 12 knots, or 290 miles per day; consequently, about two days to make the voyage. A steamer requiring two days between port and port, as a matter of fact, will require two and one-half days between finishing loading and commencing discharging, because an additional night intervenes—i. e., a vessel leaving Mobile, say, on Sunday night, and requiring two days for travel to Habana, would not be available at the latter port for discharging until Wednesday morning, although it might have arrived at Habana on Tuesday night. That, therefore, means two and one-half days between ports, and then two and one-half days at sea for the return voyage gives five days at sea, to which must be added in summer time two and one-half days on account of the quarantine detention, as with yellow fever in Habana, as is actually the case now, the quarantine authorities will not admit a vessel during the summer without having been en route five days out from Habana.

We then have five days plus two and one-half days, or seven and one-half days, on the voyage, on a schedule that requires the steamer, in order to get the benefit of the postal subsidy, to make the round trip in seven days.

No provision, therefore, is made for the time required for loading and discharging, or, in other words, it is utterly impracticable to comply with the requirements of paragraph No. 5. At least, I should judge that it is not a business proposition to build steamers and take the chance of working them night and day all the time and always going without quarantine detention. I don't think Cuba has enough business power to employ three steamers from one Gulf port.

Steamers also have to be repaired occasionally, and hauled out and bottom painted, which would be impossible under the provision of paragraph No. 5—at least as far as a line from Mobile to Habana is concerned.

From New Orleans it would be still worse, and from Galveston utterly useless to spend any time figuring on it.

It might be possible between Key West and Habana, or, at the very outside, Port Tampa and Habana.

On the other hand, under paragraph No. 5, a concern can start two fast towboats running between an extreme southern Gulf port of Florida and an extreme north port of Cuba and claim the \$75,000 subsidy, as long as a bona fide passenger and freight service from the larger Gulf ports to Cuba is not feasible under the terms of the Senator Gallinger bill.

There are at present running between American Gulf ports and Cuba the following lines:

1. Plant Line, from Key West and Tampa, which is American vessels that carry practically only passengers.
2. Munson-Habana Line, from Mobile, using one Cuban steamer for their freight service and one English steamer for passenger service.
3. Munson-North Side of Cuba, using two boats, Norwegian.
4. Munson-South Side of Cuba, using two boats, Norwegian.
5. Morgan Line, from New Orleans to Habana, running one American freight steamer and one English passenger steamer.
6. Commercial Union Navigation Company, of Habana, running one Norwegian freight steamer from Galveston.
7. Galveston Steamship Company, running one Norwegian freight steamer from Galveston to the north and south sides of Cuba.

There are consequently seven lines of steamers running from American Gulf ports to Cuba.

First, Now, why should the Government give \$75,000 per year to develop American traffic between Gulf ports and Cuba?

Second, Would the payment of such a sum be sufficient if the Government requirements as now proposed were feasible?

Third, What would result if the payment of \$75,000 would give a line of American steamers the control of the Cuban business?

In answer to the first, I believe that with seven lines already in existence there is no occasion for monetary support from the people of the United States, who are expected to vote in favor of this subvention, in order to establish means of communication between America and Cuba. At least that is the argument to the taxpayer, producer, and manufacturer.

In answer to the second, I consider that \$75,000 per year for two 14-knot steamers would not offset the difference in cost and running expenses between an American vessel and a foreign vessel. An American steamer of this kind would probably cost \$250,000; two of them, therefore, \$500,000. The running expenses of these boats probably \$175 per day, or two of them \$350 per day, or a total running expense for the two steamers \$127,775 per year. The Congressional investigation shows that the cost of running expenses of an American vessel as compared with a foreign vessel is about 33½ per cent larger, and calculating 33½ per cent on the cost and running expenses of the two steamers above referred to, and proportionately greater interest and insurance on cost of vessel and depreciation, and applying against the same the subvention of \$75,000, it seems to me it is simply a question of calculation to convince shipowners that it is not good business to replace the foreign steamers now running in this trade with American vessels, particularly not if owners will take into consideration, as certainly they will, that the American boat can only be used in this one particular trade and is a dead loss should similar competition come up and force them out of business, or should business become for any reason so slack that the boats have to be employed in other unprotected deep-sea traffic, and then in competition with ships of foreign nations. Seventy-five thousand dollars applied to a semiweekly service that requires a dispatch 104 times a year means a subvention of only \$731 per trip, an amount so small that on a steamship proposition of this sort it has no bearing at all when the requirements of semiweekly service on the extremely limited time is taken into consideration. Seven hundred and thirty-one dollars per trip would not pay the extra expense of night work for two nights on a voyage, nor Sunday.

Answering the third: Assuming that all this calculation was in error, although I do not think it is, and assuming that \$75,000 is given an American line and enables them to control the business, and further taking it for granted that the American line could overcome all other difficulties of time and insurmountable distance, and such an American line had such an advantage by reason of the \$75,000 that it would drive all the remaining six lines out of business, and Galveston capital would happen to have the good luck of securing the subsidy, and no one else in the Gulf could fight the same, and Tampa, Pensacola, Mobile, and New Orleans would be driven out of the Cuban business. Then the movement would be restricted into Galveston, and feeling that we had the business grabbed, we would raise our rates to the maximum point possible and instead of giving the American farmer and producer, as now, seven lines to Cuba, all the traffic tributary to the Gulf, as far as Cuba is concerned, would have to come to Galveston; and I would like to be on the inside of the Galveston proposition.

If, on the other hand, Mobile or Tampa should get it, and Louisiana and Texas remain on the outside, why New Orleans and Galveston would simply not be in it.

It is my opinion that the Congressional investigation has fully discovered the cause that produced the decline in American merchant marine, but they have as yet not proposed a successful remedy (free ships and free crews) and that the mail subsidy, as now proposed, is insufficiently and wrongly applied.

There is a vast difference between subsidy to a Gulf line to Cuba when there are seven of them already in existence without it, and say, a steamship line between Hamburg and a German colony, or a route that must have the support of the Government not only for commercial but also for military purposes.

Speaking of Germany, I would also like to point out that German subsidies have failed to produce a general development of the German shipping, such as is in existence in England and Norway, and, as a matter of fact, the German subsidies have not produced anything but practically two large lines, who are, as a matter of fact, now dividing their territory so that they might not conflict with each other any more than absolutely necessary.

Senator MALLORY in the last part of his most interesting speech favors, as a remedy, a system of discriminating duties and believes that foreign retaliation on that score would be ineffective.

This proposition, without being now able to fully grasp its results, looks very inviting to me for the purpose of closer investigation, but the leading question that in my mind it involves is, What are you going to do with your ships enjoying the benefits of discriminating duties when business becomes slack by reason of crop failure or otherwise and in years of depression in American export and import trade? Will not we then be compelled to tie up our ships whilst foreign vessels are doing profitable business in other waters or between other continents where trade at the moment happens to be flourishing whilst it happens to be extremely slack and unprofitable on our shores?

I think we will be at a disadvantage.

If we had free ships and free crews we would never be at a disadvantage. We would always be on an equal basis with the balance of the world, and I think we then could take our chances with the balance.

Yours, very respectfully,

H. MOSLE.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] has left the Chamber. I was about to ask that Senator whether he could give me any information concerning the author of this most remarkable letter, and as to whether or not he has any connection with a foreign steamship company. I do not know whether he has or not, but have a strong impression that he has such connections. The letter will go into the RECORD and the Senator can answer at his convenience. All I have to say about the letter is that it will have very careful consideration when I have an opportunity to see it in print.

The writer of this letter advocates free ships and free crews—absolute free trade in ships and free trade for men engaged in navigating ships, the reduction of the wages of American seamen and American officers to the wages paid by Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Norway, and other nations of the world. There is not a Senator, Mr. President, who would dare to vote for such a proposition to-day—not one. The Senator from Texas will not vote for it if it is submitted to him.

So far as free ships are concerned, I think that matter has been sufficiently discussed. It was very carefully inquired into by the Merchant Marine Commission, and no Senator or Member of the House of Representatives on that Commission, Republican or Democrat, advocated free ships, and there has been no suggestion in any report made to this body in favor of free ships. It simply means that if we purchase our ships abroad we utterly destroy our shipbuilding plants in the United States. We not only reduce the wages of our seamen, as is contemplated in this letter, by having free employment or having our navigation laws changed so that there is no benefit to accrue to American seaman, but we likewise destroy the possibility of American mechanics getting employment in the shipyards of this great country of ours.

As I said before, Mr. President, I will carefully examine the letter and have something further to say about it later on; but I want to now put in the RECORD the suggestion that it is the old, moss-grown, free-trade argument that to-day has very little place in our American economic system.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I suppose there is no man in either House who would not be glad to see some measure devised and enacted which would certainly operate to build up the merchant marine. I do not rise to make any set speech, but to call attention to some provisions of this bill which I think should be carefully scrutinized and as to which the Senator in charge of it can give some information. It is one of the most difficult subjects, so far as I have been able to consider it, which has been before Congress. There are various propositions, some of which, and the most popular, the Commission have, for apparently excellent reasons, felt constrained to reject. This is the best bill upon the subject in many respects that I have known anything of. There is a series of provisions in it for which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and, I presume, although I know nothing about it, other Senators on the other side of the Chamber would be quite willing to vote with this side, and that is to establish specified lines of steam-

ships of requisite tonnage and speed power between the ports of the United States and ports of other countries with which we have some commerce and with which we desire very much more. That is a feasible, practical proposition, and one advantage in it is that, so far as the cost of it to the country is concerned, one can see the end from the beginning.

The cargo-bounty proposition is not offensive to me. I do not know how it will operate, but, so far as I know, it is an experiment in which I would be willing to invest something under restrictions and limitations which would leave Congress perfectly free in two years or five years to try it as an experiment, and to discontinue it if it shall be proven not to be successful, without subjecting the Government to a fairly well-founded charge of having held out inducements to men throughout the country to invest their money in ships upon the faith of a continuing bounty or subsidy, and then, the proposition having been accepted and money invested, of having in bad faith withdrawn it.

I particularly can not bring myself to like in this bill the provision in it for a naval reserve. I do not know where it originated. I do not quite know its concrete purpose. I can see, although I live in the interior and do not profess to know much about the sea or commerce by sea, a class to whom it would, beyond any possible question, be a concrete continuing benefit. I refer to the deep-sea fishermen, which I suppose includes the whalers, the sealers, the fisherman on the Grand Banks, and perhaps others.

Mr. BACON. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SPOONER. Oh, yes.

Mr. BACON. I should like to inquire of the Senator if he does not think, in case that principle should be recognized by us, that the practical operation of the bill ought to be extended, not only to fishermen on the Grand Banks, but also to fishermen on the Great Lakes and to fishermen, say, on this vast system known as the "Chesapeake Bay system," on which are engaged so many people? Why should they not be included?

Mr. SPOONER. I had not supposed that the fishermen on Chesapeake Bay were deep-sea fishermen.

Mr. BACON. I know they are not.

Mr. SPOONER. And I had supposed the object of this bill was to promote the construction of seagoing vessels and to create, as far as possible, a nursery or school for deep-sea sailors.

Mr. BACON. Yes; but that is not the point of my suggestion to the Senator. Of course we are seeking the promotion of seagoing vessels, and I suppose that object is one which would be as much advanced possibly in the manner I speak of as otherwise, unless it may be on the Great Lakes. They are quite large. The truth is the sailors engaged in fishing on the Great Lakes and on the waters of the Chesapeake Bay, for instance, have just as much to educate them in the matter of sea craft as those who go farther out, and I am inclined to think that they have to endure really greater hardships and greater dangers than those who go farther out to sea.

Mr. SPOONER. I doubt if that is true as to the Chesapeake Bay fishing. It may be so, but I am not sufficiently familiar with it to say.

Mr. BACON. I am not sufficiently informed to state it accurately, but they do have a great many hardships to undergo and a great many dangers to incur, and while they are within what you might call "landlocked" waters, still they are very large waters.

I was just asking the Senator—and I beg pardon for interrupting him—if that principle is to be recognized and put into practical operation, if we are to be restricted to the Grand Banks. I do not favor the system in either case, but I do not see why it should be extended to one and denied to another. For instance, I know on the coast of my own State there are a great many landlocked waters in which we have a considerable amount of shipping—small, it is true, but still shipping which instructs men in all the things that are necessary to make sailors—and men there undergo a great many dangers and hardships. I say I should not favor it in either instance, but I can not understand why it should be extended to one and denied to another.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me a moment, I would like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question.

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Georgia where in the bill he discovers the prohibition against seamen on the Great Lakes?

Mr. BACON. I do not know but possibly the Senator who drafted the bill may have intended to include the Great Lakes. Mr. GALLINGER. Undoubtedly it does include them. There is no question about that.

Mr. BACON. I have no information which could determine that.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire consider that it includes the Great Lakes?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes. Absolutely so.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire say that the naval reserve provision and the payments provided for thereunder apply to the Great Lakes?

Mr. GALLINGER. I so understand it.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly it does.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is very necessary it should include the Great Lakes if we are to get a naval reserve.

Mr. SPOONER. I am not so certain, Mr. President, that it does include them. This is a complicated system which is proposed to be put in operation, and one would suppose primarily the object of it is, from the manner in which it is drawn, to give a largess and a continuing bounty to the deep-sea fisheries. There might be controversy as to whether that is the primary purpose of it. It would undoubtedly be asserted by the Senator from New Hampshire and others who favor it that the primary purpose of it is to create a naval reserve upon which the Government may in time of stress depend for adequate skill with which to man our ships; but, to quote a phrase, it is inextricably intertwined with the provision for cargo bounty and tonnage bounty. Perhaps that is not to be avoided, but it has seemed to me, looking it over with some haste, that the interdependence between the naval-reserve provision and the other provisions would bring about a situation which would be almost intolerable and which would be calculated to defeat the purpose which it professes to have in view. The bill reads:

That there shall be enrolled, in such manner and under such requirements as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, from the officers and men now and hereafter employed in the merchant marine and deep-sea fisheries of the United States.

I have thought that the phrase "merchant marine," as used there, did not include the Great Lakes.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it certainly does include all the vessels that sail on both oceans, the Great Lakes, on the Gulf, and in the coastwise trade. I understand that to be the meaning. If it is not I myself have made a mistake.

Mr. SPOONER. The object of this bill is not to encourage the coastwise trade, for that trade derives no benefit from it.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator says that is not the object, but that is the effect of the first section of this bill so far as those who are engaged in the coastwise trade are concerned—that is to say, they, as well as those engaged in deep-sea fisheries, receive this subvention.

Mr. SPOONER. Where does the Senator find anything in this bill which makes it clear to him that the Lake sailors are included?

Mr. ALLISON. The only thing that I can find in it is that it includes all persons who are in the merchant marine, and I am quite sure that all the vessels on the Great Lakes and everywhere on the seacoast, and those engaged in the coastwise trade, are included in this first provision. I have made inquiry about that from others who know more than I do in regard to this matter, and they said that that was the intent and purpose of this first section.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, there need be no controversy over this. As originally drafted, the provision was confined to those engaged in the foreign trade, but the Commission deliberately changed it so as to include the Great Lakes and the coastwise trade. We could not get a naval reserve unless we did that, and we will be very fortunate, indeed, if we get one, broadened as the provision is.

Mr. SPOONER. I am not so sure that we shall be so very fortunate if we get it, broadened as it is.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is a question of opinion.

Mr. SPOONER. That is a question for debate. I understand the term "merchant marine" may be used in a generic sense and be as broad as the Senator construes it, or it may be used in a more limited sense. Whether it is used in a particular measure in a generic sense or in a limited sense, we are to ascertain from looking upon it from every part of the measure. I was inclined to exclude it—at least to see the possibility if not the probability of its exclusion—because the merchant marine, so far as it concerns the Great Lakes, is to derive no benefit whatever from this legislation. They are to receive no bounty, as I understand, in time of peace. Does the Senator from Iowa understand differently?

Mr. ALLISON. I understand they receive the bounty pro-

vided by the first section for four years. They, of course, receive none of the bounty under the second section.

Mr. SPOONER. I am not speaking of sailors; I am speaking of vessels. Under the whole scheme of this bill there is no purpose evidenced in it to encourage by bounty the building of a single additional ship for navigation on the Great Lakes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly not, because on the Great Lakes—

Mr. SPOONER. I am not complaining of that.

Mr. GALLINGER. You can not complain of it, because foreign ships are absolutely prohibited by statute from engaging in that trade.

Mr. SPOONER. On the Great Lakes?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly; they have got protection in every conceivable way.

Mr. HOPKINS. It is prohibition.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; it is prohibition.

Mr. SPOONER. Foreign ships would not engage very much in navigation on the Great Lakes without the prohibition, I apprehend.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not so sure about that. Canada is quite a country.

Mr. SPOONER. But let that go. I think the term "merchant marine," as found in the first section, construed with reference to the entire structure of the bill and the object of the bill, leaves it in doubt as to whether the broader or the narrower construction should be placed upon it in connection with the Great Lakes and the deep-sea fisheries.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, if he desires an amendment to that provision, those of us who are advocating this bill have no objection to having it read "including the Great Lakes and the coastwise trade." That is what we are aiming at.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator thinks this naval-reserve provision is wise, I think that amendment ought to be made.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no objection.

Mr. SPOONER. If it is not a wise provision, it is inconsequential whether it is made or not. It is this particular phase of it about which I intended to briefly address the Senate. I will begin again, for I want to analyze this provision.

That there shall be enrolled, in such manner and under such requirements as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, from the officers and men now and hereafter employed in the merchant marine and deep-sea fisheries of the United States, such officers, petty officers, and men as may be capable of rendering service as members of a naval reserve, for duty in time of war—

There is no definition of "eligibility." I suppose that is to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. GALLINGER. By regulation.

Mr. SPOONER (reading):

for duty in time of war, and who are willing to undertake such service, to be classified in grades and ratings according to their capacity as shown at time of enrollment. No man shall be thus enrolled who is not a citizen of the United States either by birth or naturalization. These members of the Naval Reserve shall be enrolled for a period of four years, during which period they shall be subject to render service on call of the President in time of war.

That, I suppose, involves an enlistment in the Naval Reserve. Is not that the understanding of the Senator?

Mr. GALLINGER. A voluntary enrollment.

Mr. SPOONER. Where comes in the compulsory element, then? They are to be paid. They are to be under the control and discipline of the Navy Department. Is it a mere simple contract from which they are to be at liberty to depart whenever they have received as much of this bounty as they desire, or when they may secure more profitable employment elsewhere? Is it intended that there shall be no binding force in this enrollment? If that is the theory of the provision, it is simply, in the last analysis of it, a scheme, so far as the sailors not connected with the deep-sea fisheries are concerned, to shovel money out of the Treasury into the hands of numerous citizens who are not bound by any enlistment paper or any contract to render service to the Government for it in time of war unless they choose.

I had supposed on reading this clause for a naval reserve that as a condition precedent to the payment of these retainers, as they are denominated in that portion of the measure, the men assumed some obligation in consideration of those payments to serve the Government if called upon by the President in time of war.

Mr. HOPKINS. I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that if the bill is deceptive in that particular, why not present an amendment covering the very point he suggests?

Mr. SPOONER. I am trying to ascertain what the bill means. If it does not mean what I thought it did, that a man is to bind himself to serve this Government if called upon during

the four years, then it is fatally defective; it is child's play; it is a prodigal waste of money.

Mr. HOPKINS. The reason I made a suggestion was that if the bill does not require the service—

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator in charge of the bill says it does not.

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not mean to say it exactly in that form. I do not know exactly what the requirements of the Navy Department may be in the event of these men offering themselves for enrollment. I only know that the British naval reserve is along precisely the lines of this provision. I know furthermore that this particular provision was prepared by the naval board, they thinking it preferable to the provision originally in the bill.

Now, the provision in question says this—

Mr. HOPKINS. What page?

Mr. GALLINGER. Page 3. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to this point: These men, in the first place, have to be willing. They are not coerced.

Mr. SPOONER. I fear they are coerced somewhat.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator will have great difficulty in doing that, with all his great ability.

Mr. SPOONER. Possibly.

Mr. GALLINGER. They are to be enrolled under provisions and regulations to which they subscribe. How far, after they have accepted that service and have become enrolled members of the Naval Reserve, the Government can lay its hands on them afterwards, I am not prepared to say. But I think it would be adequate. I think the Government would have full power to compel these men to fulfill the obligation they entered into when they became enrolled members of the Naval Reserve.

Mr. SPOONER. The truth is, as I think is obvious from a more careful reading of the bill, that the Senator from New Hampshire misconstrues it when he indicates the opinion that it does not involve an enlistment, a binding obligation to serve at any time during the four years upon the command of the President.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that that is exactly what I said—that, in my judgment, they were so bound.

Mr. SPOONER. No.

Mr. GALLINGER. They can be compelled to serve.

Mr. SPOONER. You say that now.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, a little while ago you thought otherwise.

Mr. GALLINGER. I spoke inadvertently, perhaps, or I did not understand the Senator's question. I said they could not be compelled to enlist.

Mr. SPOONER. They can not be compelled to enlist, but they are induced to enlist by the offer of this bounty, or "retainer," as it is called in the bill. The bill has strong language. It says:

These members of the Naval Reserve shall be enrolled for a period of four years, during which period they shall be subject to render service on call of the President in time of war.

Of course that involves an enlistment and an obligation, and it ought to be so. I should like to ask the Senator whether this provision involves an obligation that he reenlist?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think not. I do not know that it does. There is no obligation for a soldier to reenlist in the service of the United States Army. I do not know why this provision should include reenlistment.

Mr. SPOONER. The men are to receive this bounty during the four years, and at the expiration of the four years they are at liberty to decline to be reenrolled.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think so.

Mr. SPOONER (reading):

They shall also possess such qualifications, receive such instruction, and be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

That characterizes an enlistment, a service to which one has bound himself.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, upon proper audit, to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each officer, petty officer, or man thus enrolled and employed in the merchant marine or deep-sea fisheries, as hereinafter provided, an annual retainer as follows: For each officer of the line or Engineer Corps, having the rank of lieutenant of the Naval Reserve, \$110; for each officer of the line or Engineer Corps, having the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Naval Reserve, \$90; for each officer of the line or Engineer Corps, having the rank of ensign in the Naval Reserve, \$80; for each man with a rating of chief petty officer, \$70; for each man with a rating of petty officer, first class, \$60; for each man with a rating of petty officer, second class, \$48; for each man with a rating of petty officer, third class, \$40—

Compared with the Hanna-Frye bill, this is a marvelously liberal allowance—

for each seaman, first class, \$36; for each seaman, second class, \$20; for each seaman, third class, \$24.

There they are classified, beginning with a hundred and ten dollars, which is the highest, and going to \$24, which is the lowest.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me right in this connection to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question for information?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. It is as to the number of men, so far as can be ascertained, at present engaged in service who will be entitled to this compensation. I refer to the number of petty officers and seamen who are engaged in the deep-sea fisheries. Has the Senator any information on that subject?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not the information at hand, but will supply it later on.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Georgia must not limit it to the deep-sea fisheries. It is contended here that it applies to the merchant marine generally throughout the United States, including the coastwise trade. So the basis upon which this payment is to be made, or rather the field from which these voluntary enlistments are to be made, embraces the Great Lakes, the coastwise trade, the deep-sea fisheries, and the merchant marine of the United States engaged in the foreign service; and that of course—

Mr. BACON. The reason I limited the question to the deep-sea fisheries is that the merchant marine is comparatively undeveloped at present, whereas there are a number engaged in the deep-sea fisheries, and I did not know but that the Senator from New Hampshire had the statistics on the subject. Of course, the question of the number who will be engaged in the merchant marine is one of some uncertainty, so far as the question of the effect of this bill may be uncertain in the development of the merchant marine. I thought that the deep-sea fisheries being now something developed, probably very nearly to the limit which it will attain subsequently, the Senator might have the information. But I see the force of the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. SPOONER. The merchant marine is pretty well developed in respect to the coastwise trade—

Mr. BACON. So far as concerns the coastwise trade the Senator is correct.

Mr. SPOONER. And the Great Lakes.

Mr. HEYBURN. In view of the remark of the Senator from Wisconsin that possibly there is some room for doubt as to whether the word "marine" includes vessels on the Great Lakes, I suggest that after the word "marine," in line 21, the words "Great Lakes" be inserted. I find upon some investigation that the term "marine" applies exclusively to the high seas, except where by statutory enactment a like jurisdiction has been extended over the Great Lakes. If it will not interfere with the Senator's statement of the matter, I would suggest that amendment—after the word "marine," in line 21, on page 3, to insert the words "Great Lakes."

Mr. DANIEL. I beg leave to ask the Senator from Idaho a question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. I suggest to the Senator from Idaho that he move to strike out the words "deep-sea fisheries" and insert "fisheries of the United States."

Mr. HEYBURN. I can not hear the Senator.

Mr. DANIEL. Would it not tend to accomplish the purpose of the Senator to strike out the word "deep-sea" and leave it "the fisheries of the United States?" [After a pause.] I hardly think, on reflection, that it would. It would be a separate proposition. So I will not detain the Senate with it.

Mr. HEYBURN. I only intended to remove any doubt that might exist as to whether the word "marine" would include the Great Lakes by inserting the words "Great Lakes," and I shall ask that that amendment be considered at the proper time.

Mr. SPOONER. It will be observed, Mr. President, that there is no limitation whatever upon the number of men who are to be paid this annual retainer, and from the structure of the provision generally, I think almost every eligible man on the Great Lakes, on the rivers, in the coasting trade, or anywhere else will be quite likely to avail himself of the provisions of the act.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator will observe that there is one very important restriction, and that is that they shall be citizens of the United States.

Mr. SPOONER. Or naturalized.

Mr. GALLINGER. Or naturalized. That makes them citizens.

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly; but that is a very easy—

Mr. GALLINGER. But—

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire wish to proceed?

Mr. GALLINGER. I was about to say that at the proper time I would show, I think, by actual facts that we will not be overburdened by American citizens, either by birth or naturalization, for this reserve from our complement of sailors.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, let us see what the probabilities are about that. I do not think the Senator can show very definitely from actual facts what will happen in the future.

Mr. GALLINGER. Nobody can.

Mr. SPOONER. Nobody can. Therefore the Senator can not. Now, take the bill—

Such retainer shall be paid at the end of each year of service—

Upon what?

on certificate, by an officer to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, that the member of the Naval Reserve has satisfactorily complied with the regulations.

Now, that is right enough, because the officer designated by the Secretary of the Navy will be aware of the fact as to the conduct of the man as a member of the Naval Reserve. Then what follows?

and on certificate by the Commissioner of Navigation—

Upon what can the Commissioner of Navigation base his certificate? What is he to certify? He is to certify—

that such member has served satisfactorily for at least six months of the preceding twelve months on vessels of the United States in the merchant marine or in the deep-sea fisheries.

It goes without saying that the Commissioner of Navigation will have no personal knowledge whatever of the fact concerning which he is to make certificate. He must base his certificate on somebody else's certificate, must he not?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator just here—I do not know that it will make any difference in his argument—that it is the purpose to change that to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, who is at the head of the Department.

Mr. SPOONER. That makes it no better.

Mr. GALLINGER. Prior to this certificate there is a certification that is very accurate, and if there is a duplication of certification it will do no harm.

Mr. SPOONER. Here is what troubles me about it. So far as concerns the condition precedent growing out of the certificate of the naval officer, that takes care of itself. But whether the member of the Naval Reserve has served six months at sea satisfactorily or not is a matter which neither the Commissioner of Navigation nor the Secretary of Commerce and Labor can certify except upon information received from some one else. From whom? From the master of the ship under whom the sailor served; certainly from some officer of the ship under whose eye he has worked.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I think he is altogether too technical.

Mr. SPOONER. That is not technical.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the certificate is not satisfactory, the man will not get his pay.

Mr. SPOONER. No.

Mr. GALLINGER. So no harm is done.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; harm may be done to the sailor, but what a control, if I am right, it gives the master of a ship over this member of the Naval Reserve. The master of the ship or the shipowner may reduce the wages which would otherwise be paid to the sailor by the amount of this bounty proposed to be taken out of the Treasury to pay him as a member of the Naval Reserve.

Mr. GALLINGER. My answer to that is that it is improbable.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, my answer to that is that it is entirely probable. So far as I have been able to discover, in all of these bills there has been given tremendous attention to the building of ships, to the multiplication of ships (and our legislation generally bears evidence of that), and but very little attention to the comfort of or justice to the men who navigate ships.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator from Wisconsin is entirely inaccurate in his statement.

Mr. SPOONER. In what respect?

Mr. FRYE. Legislation has been passed ever since I have been in Congress favoring the sailors. There have been increased dimensions for them on shipboard and increased comforts on shipboard. There is a regular menu established for their provision, and all that sort of thing, and the sailors have up to this time made no complaint. Most of the legislation reported from the Committee on Commerce has been in the interest of the sailors rather than of the shipowners.

Mr. SPOONER. A year ago, or at the last session, a bill passed the Senate and was amended in the Senate having reference to the manning of ships and the efficiency of the deck crew on ships. That bill died on the table in the House of Representatives. I believe it died on the table of the House of Representatives because the Senate had incorporated in it an amendment which was intended to throw around the deck crew of the ship safeguards absolutely obvious to those who have solicitude either for passengers or for crew. I will read it:

Provided, That except in the case of steamers navigating rivers exclusively, at least 75 per cent of the navigating crew, exclusive of licensed officers, shall be individually effective hands.

That does not define itself. But the Senate amendment explained it:

That is, of a rating not less than able seaman, and no one shall be signed as an able seaman unless he shall be 19 or more years of age and shall have served at least three years on deck at sea or on the Great Lakes.

The provision in this bill, and it contains a definition, is:

That upon each departure of said vessel from the United States at least one-sixth of the crew shall be citizens of the United States, or men who have declared their intention to become citizens, and of the deck force—

The deck or navigating force, the men who in time of stress of danger are the safeguards of the ship and its human freight—

excluding licensed officers, at least one-half shall be able seamen, who are hereby defined to be men who have had two years or more experience at sea on deck.

This matter of undermining a ship, of not having the requisite number of able seamen—and when I say able seamen I mean men who reach up to a standard, which in the world is deemed requisite, in the way of experience, proved courage, knowledge of navigation, the dangers which confront a crew on an ocean-going vessel—is not simply of importance to the owner of the ship, nor simply of importance to the passengers on the ship, to the great mass of waiters on the ship, to the men who are of no avail in time of accident, except to make a rush for the boat; but it is important to the crew, it is important to the men who are fit to be in the deck crew. They are all interested in that. If they are surrounded by an unjust proportion of men very much less efficient than themselves, it involves overwork upon their part, and not simply overwork, but it involves danger to them as it does to the ship.

It does not rest simply on the statement of the seamen's unions; it does not rest simply on the statement of those who go down to the sea in ships, and who have banded together, as all other men who work have banded together to promote in fair ways the interest and the safety of their craft. The importance of this matter of manning and of absolute efficiency in the crew on deck has received the attention of Parliament in Great Britain. It was thoroughly investigated. The reports show that very little testimony could be secured from the masters of ships or the owners of ships. The testimony came mainly from men who manned the ships.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator refer to the testimony taken by the Merchant Marine Commission?

Mr. SPOONER. I do not know whether it is the Merchant Marine Commission or not.

Mr. GALLINGER. It was; and if the Senator will read the testimony, he will see that seamen were called at every port which the Commission visited and were given hearings by the hour.

Mr. SPOONER. I am not talking about your Commission.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, I beg pardon.

Mr. SPOONER. I am speaking of the English commission.

Mr. GALLINGER. I beg the Senator's pardon. I will say to him right here, if he will permit me, that the Merchant Marine Commission, which formulated this bill, gave hearings to seamen in every port which it visited, and it listened attentively and patiently to them hour after hour, and endeavored in formulating the bill to do them no harm.

Mr. SPOONER. Did the Commission learn of nothing that could be reasonably desired by the sailors in the construction of this bill, involving \$40,000,000 expenditure?

Mr. GALLINGER. The Commission did not discover that there were any very profound grievances on the part of the sailors.

Mr. SPOONER. Were there any?

Mr. GALLINGER. I presume so.

Mr. SPOONER. Are they remedied in this bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. This bill is not a panacea for all the ills of the world.

Mr. SPOONER. No.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; but—

Mr. SPOONER. But if we are to embark upon the experiment of building up the merchant marine and the Naval Re-

serve, it is part of our duty to make the seafaring life as attractive as it was once; to give attention to ships, and none the less to the men who man them.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator what provision he would insert in this bill which would tend to make seafaring life an attractive one?

Mr. SPOONER. For this loose provision of the bill—

That upon each departure of said vessel from the United States at least one-sixth of the crew shall be citizens of the United States, or men who have declared their intention to become citizens, and of the deck force, excluding licensed officers, at least one-half shall be able seamen, who are hereby defined to be men who have had two years or more experience at sea on deck—

I would substitute a larger percentage of able seamen.

Mr. GALLINGER. Americans?

Mr. SPOONER. Of Americans. I would require them to have had a longer experience at sea, and I would not close the door either, as this bill has closed it, as the Senate did not close it on another occasion, on the sailors from the Great Lakes.

Mr. GALLINGER. This bill does not close it on the sailors on the Great Lakes.

Mr. SPOONER. Let us see whether it does or not.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if he is aware of the fact that on the Pacific coast only 5 per cent are American seamen?

Mr. SPOONER. I am aware of that fact.

Mr. GALLINGER. How are you going to increase the proportion if you have not the men?

Mr. SPOONER. We can get the men, I suppose. You expect by this bill to get the men.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope so, but we will not have them at the start.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator says the men on the Great Lakes are not excluded. I read from the bill:

Able seamen, who are hereby defined to be men who have had two years or more experience at sea on deck.

"At sea on deck." Does that leave any room for the splendid sailors on the Great Lakes?

Mr. GALLINGER. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. SPOONER. I am reading from page 8 of the bill, subdivision 3.

Mr. GALLINGER. That has nothing to do with the Naval Reserve.

Mr. SPOONER. I am not talking about the Naval Reserve. I am not through with that, but I passed from it to this other proposition. I will go back to the Naval Reserve. If there had been a decent number of efficient men on the *General Stocum*, there would have been infinitely less loss of life, if any, and it is not good legislation nor is it good administration that renders it possible for shipowners to gather in dollars from men, women, and children without taking the precautions reasonably to be prescribed by law to have their ships manned by men who know the sea and who know what to do in an emergency, and have the courage to do it. I came across the ocean once on a great steamship with my family when the crew of able-bodied seamen had been taken off at night on a strike and their places filled by men picked from the slums of Liverpool, and there were not ten able seamen on the ship. Happily it was a smooth voyage; but no ship with hundreds of people ever ought to be permitted, Mr. President, to leave port to start upon an ocean voyage unless there are upon that ship the requisite number of seamen of experience.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. FRYE. I should like to have the Senator define what he means by deck force.

Mr. SPOONER. It does not mean the cabin, of course.

Mr. FRYE. Is the Senator sure? Does it mean the waiters, and all that sort of thing?

Mr. SPOONER. Does it mean the waiters?

Mr. FRYE. In my opinion it does, and by the Senator's requirement of 75 per cent of able-bodied seamen there is no passenger ship on the Lakes that could run.

Mr. SPOONER. If the bill in its provision about able-bodied seamen includes the great army of waiters and the cooks and the laundrymen and the stewards, it is for the interest of the people of the United States not to pay out any money for the construction of additional vessels.

Mr. FRYE. The language of the bill is "able-bodied seamen." The language the Senator uses is "deck force," which is a totally different thing, as I understand it.

Mr. SPOONER. I read it from the bill. It says:

That upon each departure of said vessel from the United States at least one-sixth of the crew shall be citizens of the United States—

I understand the word "crew" to be a generic word and to take in all the employees of the ship—

or men who have declared their intention to become citizens, and of the deck force, excluding licensed officers, at least one-half shall be able seamen.

I did not understand that to be applicable to the waiters.

Mr. LODGE. I do not understand it, either.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Maine seems to understand it that way.

Mr. FRYE. It does.

Mr. SPOONER. It does? Then there may be, in compliance with the law, no sailors of experience on the deck provided that among the waiters and stewards there are some able seamen who have served at sea two years on deck. Is that what it means?

Mr. GALLINGER. As the Senator addresses himself to me—

Mr. SPOONER. I address myself to anybody.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say that I do not agree with the Senator from Maine, although he may be right, that it includes waiters, cooks, etc.

Mr. FRYE. I did not say that it included cooks, etc.

Mr. SPOONER. Waiters.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understood the Senator to say that it included waiters and cooks.

Mr. FRYE. I did not.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say in reply—

Mr. FRYE. I did not say it included cooks and laundrymen, but the Senator from Wisconsin went on to enumerate them.

Mr. SPOONER. Why should it not include stewards if it includes waiters?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say on that point, the only difficulty those of us who tried to construct a reasonable bill encountered in this direction was the protest that it would be impossible under certain conditions to get even one-sixth of the crew Americans, and I think on the Pacific coast it will be an extremely difficult matter to do.

I want to add, Mr. President, that this bill for the first time, I think, has prohibitions of that kind; that we are making restrictions in this bill much more severe than have heretofore been made in the matter of having trained men on shipboard who can take care of ships in a case of emergency. We can not have one-half the crew Americans if it is impossible to get them. We can not have one-half the crew able seamen if they do not exist. The Commission investigated this matter with the utmost thoroughness and came to a deliberate conclusion. This is not any guesswork; it is not any haphazard legislation that is proposed. Of course it is subject to criticism, but some of the criticism that the Senator is indulging in I think is not quite fair.

Mr. SPOONER. If it is not fair I should regret it. I have no motive on earth to make an unjust criticism upon the bill. But I believe that every interest from the standpoint of humanity and every interest from the standpoint of making sea life attractive again ought to lead the Senate in enacting legislation of this sort to look out for the interest of the sailor—

Mr. GALLINGER. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. SPOONER. And the passenger. It ought not to be left open to debate as to what constitutes a navigating crew or deck force as contradistinguished from the waiters and the stewards.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me on that point, I should like to read a paragraph from the report of the Commission, which was charged with this duty:

Authorized representatives of the seamen have been heard by the Commission on the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Gulf of Mexico. They have had a conspicuous part in almost every meeting, and their evidence is fully set forth in the published volumes. As a rule, this testimony is to the effect that general conditions of life in the American merchant marine—wages, food, quarters, etc.—are superior to those in foreign services, but that the discipline is often more exacting and the work more arduous. These seamen witnesses frankly acknowledge the beneficial effect of legislation enacted in recent years by Congress, but they ask for further measures of relief. The Commission would, therefore, commend to the friendly attention of the proper committees—

The Commission did not feel that this bill was the proper place for these remedial measures.

The Commission would, therefore, commend to the friendly attention of the proper committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives requests offered by the sailors as to the load-line law, the adequate manning of seagoing ships, imprisonment for desertion in foreign ports, and certain standard qualifications of seamen.

The Commission recommended to the proper committees of Congress the consideration of these measures which did not properly belong and which could not well be incorporated in a law of this kind.

Mr. SPOONER. Why did the Commission take so much testimony all over the country if they were so obviously without the purview of the Commission's action?

Mr. GALLINGER. The Commission were very much gratified to find that even the wildest foreign seamen, and there are a great many of them in this country as wild as hawks, admitted that our legislation was beneficial, and that they were receiving better, far better, quarters and better treatment in every way than were given to seamen on foreign ships. That was a great gratification to the Commission.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask the consideration of the Senator who has the bill in charge of an amendment in the twenty-fourth line on page 8, which shall admit in the definition of "an able seaman" men who have served three years on deck on the Great Lakes, where the navigation is quite dangerous, if not more dangerous, than it is at sea, and where the skill required in the handling of a ship is of as great utility on the lake as it would be on the ocean. That provision was in the bill which passed the Senate, and I read it a little while ago.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think there can be no objection to that. I have that impression. I will look it over.

Mr. SPOONER. Now, I will go back—and I want to be through—to the Naval Reserve. When I left that subject I was asking the Senator from New Hampshire upon what evidence of satisfactory service for six months by the naval-reserve men the Commissioner of Navigation is to certify?

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I will read six lines from the existing law.

Mr. SPOONER. Very well.

Mr. GALLINGER. I read from the postal-aid law of 1891:

SEC. 8. That said vessels shall take, as cadets or apprentices, one American-born boy under 21 years of age for each 1,000 tons gross register, and one for each majority fraction thereof, who shall be educated in the duties of seamanship, rank as petty officers, and receive such pay for their services as may be reasonable.

Now, in some way the Navy Department, without the provision even that we have in this bill, gets that information. I presume they get it from the commanders of the vessels; I do not know.

Mr. SPOONER. All that has to be certified is that the apprentice was on the ship and made the voyage.

Mr. GALLINGER. Exactly; and he gets his pay for it.

Mr. SPOONER. The law requires no certificate as to the character of service, does it?

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, yes; he has got to be trained in seamanship.

Mr. SPOONER. He is being instructed in seamanship; that is all.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly; but the point that I make is that if we can not trust somebody to make a fair return of the naval reserve men, certainly we ought not to trust them to make a fair return of those boys; but we do trust somebody under existing law.

Mr. SPOONER. The certificate has got to be that such a person has served satisfactorily—that can only be determined by some one on board the ship—for at least six months of the preceding twelve months on vessels of the United States in the merchant marine or in the deep-sea fisheries, and if the captain of the ship does not certify that the person served satisfactorily for that period it is incompetent for the officers of the Government to pay to that man the retainer. Now, what greater power could be given over a sailor's ability—I do not phrase that happily—to secure this retainer than is provided here as to the evidence upon which it is to be paid?

Suppose the captain of the ship or the owner insists upon paying less wages because of this payment by the Government, is it not entirely within his power under such a procedure as that to enforce it? If a mean captain, a tyrannical captain, a captain who has been prejudiced by mates against a sailor or in anywise does not see fit to make this certificate, is there any manner in which justice can be brought about?

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, the captain has precisely the same authority over these boys under existing law if he is a mean captain and has mean mates and they want to punish a boy or deprive him—

Mr. SPOONER. That is a small matter, and this is a large one.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the principle is the same, whether big or little.

Mr. SPOONER. That deals with a few boys, and this is expected to deal with thousands of men.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope so.

Mr. SPOONER. And the more it deals with the better it will suit.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator right there if he will be kind enough to indicate a different process from what is provided in the bill on that point?

Mr. SPOONER. If I do not, and this is a serious defect in

the bill, as I think it is, it looks as if there is something the matter with the plan.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Senator to suggest a better plan.

Mr. SPOONER. I can not.

Mr. GALLINGER. If we can not get anything better—

Mr. SPOONER. I suppose it must be based upon the certificate of the captain. Now, when you come to require a man to join the Naval Reserve in order to get employment on ships, as in some degree this bill does, it gets to be very material.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will allow me right there, there is no inhibition for these men to get employment in the service of the Navy or of the merchant marine.

Mr. SPOONER. What men?

Mr. GALLINGER. These naval-reserve men.

Mr. SPOONER. No.

Mr. GALLINGER. They need not join the Naval Reserve. That is the only inhibition.

Mr. SPOONER. But certainly some of the men on these bounty-paid ships must be of the Naval Reserve.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. And that in a constantly increasing number up to one-fourth. If the captain of a ship sees fit to deprive a sailor of this bounty from the Government, he may be able to keep him from getting employment in the merchant marine at all. Now, what follows, Mr. President? Here is a peculiar proposition. Here is a six-months' service. I suppose that is intended to refer particularly to the deep-sea fisheries. This takes care of itself.

Then this:

Each officer, petty officer, or man of the Naval Reserve thus enrolled, who has not served for six months of the preceding year on vessels of the United States in the merchant marine or in the deep-sea fisheries, but has complied with the other prescribed requirements for enrollment in the Naval Reserve, shall receive one-half the annual retainer as enumerated above.

That is, from \$110 down to \$24. He need not have served a day at sea on a ship during the year.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is explainable, if the Senator will permit me. That is not a provision I am at all insistent upon. It is a provision that was placed there at the earnest solicitation of the Navy Department, and their purpose is that men who have served in the United States Navy, but who are not now in the service, might come in under that provision. They have had their experience, and they would be very valuable men in time of need. It will not take a great many. They conform to all the requirements of the statute except the one matter of having been six months at sea, they having been perhaps ten years at sea formerly. That is what that is intended to cover. I do not care whether it remains in the bill or not.

Mr. SPOONER. Every able-bodied seaman in the United States of proper age and citizenship could enroll himself in that reserve and without going to sea at all.

Mr. GALLINGER. Provided—

Mr. SPOONER. He could be engaged in other business—

Mr. GALLINGER. Provided he had served as a seaman and is acceptable to the Navy Department.

Mr. SPOONER. And draw one-half of this bounty from the Government.

Mr. GALLINGER. American seamen on land are not very numerous, I will say to the Senator. There are very few of them.

Mr. SPOONER. I construe it correctly, then?

Mr. GALLINGER. You do.

Mr. SPOONER. That is the purpose?

Mr. GALLINGER. That is the purpose, and the provision was inserted at the earnest solicitation of the Navy Department.

Mr. SPOONER. The Navy Department earnestly solicits a good many things that Congress does not do and ought not to do.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is right.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not think a man who has been in the Navy and has experienced the supreme difficulty of getting out, no matter what the exigency or situation may be at home, would put himself in a position where he could be tolled in again for this little pay under existing regulations.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then it will do no harm.

Mr. SPOONER. But it would not be confined to those people. It is not confined to those people. Any man in the United States who has served, after this amendment or, as the Senator construes it now, in the coastwise marine or merchant marine on the Lakes—perhaps the merchant marine on the rivers—and is otherwise qualified, may enroll himself; and while those who have spent six months at sea get the full pay those who do not spend an hour at sea get the half pay. There is an indefiniteness of generosity about that that is inexpressible. It compares rather unfavorably with the tenderness and considerate-

ness with which, as I view it, both the bill and the law have treated the men upon whose fealty and courage and skill the ships and their passengers and crew and freight depend.

Here is the sixth subdivision of section 3. We get the connection here between this naval reserve and the payment of this bounty.

Sixth. A vessel shall not be entitled to the subvention above provided for, unless during the period of employment in the foreign trade or deep-sea fisheries the following proportions of the crew of the vessel after the dates specified shall have been enrolled in the naval reserve: After July 1, 1908, one-eighth; after July 1, 1912, one-sixth; after July 1, 1917, one-fourth.

In section 7 also it is provided:

That all contracts hereafter made pursuant to the act of March 3, 1891, before mentioned, or pursuant to sections 5 and 6 of this act, shall provide that on each voyage the following proportion of the crew shall be enrolled in the naval reserve: After July 1, 1908, one-eighth; after July 1, 1912, one-sixth; and after July 1, 1917, one-fourth.

A man, Mr. President, who is willing to be put in that duress, who, in order to secure employment in his calling on a ship at sea will bind himself in time of peace to serve four years whenever called upon in time of war, to get this money out of the Treasury, is not the kind of a man to be relied upon for national defense in time of war. Good sailors, self-respecting sailors abhor it. They say that it is an insult. They say it is a governmental tip, and is predicated upon the false assumption that they do not love the flag which floats over the ship upon which they sail out on the sea; that their patriotism is to be bought by this bounty from the Treasury, and that the people of the United States and its Government are not looking to the past and the prompt enlistment of sailors in the past in time of trouble, willing to trust to their patriotism.

The idea—and some would have to do that in order to get employment in the merchant marine—that a man must enlist, must take this pay which he does not earn, perchance simply paid for the right to call upon him any time during four years if the exigency demands it, and that he must enter upon that obligation in order to obtain service on one of these bounty-paid ships, is repulsive. It is a new way of building up or making a recruiting establishment for the Navy. The sailors say it is a governmental press gang after a fashion, and they do not like it.

I will not take the time to read them, for I want to yield to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], but I will ask permission to put in the RECORD one or two resolutions of sailors' organizations protesting against this provision.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions referred to are as follows:

Lake Seamen's Union resolution.

Whereas the United States Senate is about to vote upon the subsidy bill: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Lake Seamen's Union, in meeting assembled, That we respectfully but earnestly protest against the bill in its present form, and appeal to the Senate to strike out subsections 3 and 6 of section 3, for the following reasons:

First. Subsection 3 appears to give some advantage to the seaman, but in reality lowers the standard of efficiency by authorizing the vessel to go to sea with but half of the crew able seamen. They have done so in the past, but in violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the law.

Second. Subsection 6 provides that the owner must have a certain number of naval reserves to get the subsidy. This means that the seaman must be in the reserves in order to get employment. This is a discrimination pure and simple, and we protest against being selected for this while other men may, under ordinary conditions, choose whether they will enlist or not until the nation needs all its men.

Third. It would compel us to be in the military service from 21 to 47 or quit the sea.

Fourth. Under such conditions we would rather quit the sea, since it would be a notice to us that we must, as seamen, give up any hope of improvement in our life. We have asked for laws in accord with American ideas, and we are getting more servitude and more discriminations against us.

Fifth. The discrimination is coupled with a bonus, which places us in the position of receiving, while in health, money which we have not earned, and which is therefore in the eyes of honest men dishonorable.

Sixth. The striking out of these two sections leaves it to each seaman to choose for himself whether he will accept the bonus or not, and this, we respectfully suggest, is a privilege granted to all other servants. As workmen we ask to be permitted to retain so much of the respect of our fellows and ourselves as our present status has made it possible for us to keep.

On behalf of the Lake Seamen's Union.

V. A. OLANDER, Assistant Secretary.
T. A. HANSON, Chairman.

CHICAGO, ILL., February 9, 1906.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 10, 1906.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the seamen I hereby respectfully and earnestly protest against the adoption of the subsidy bill as now before the Senate. The protest is based upon the following reasons:

1. Section 1 offers to us a bonus, for which we never asked and against which we most emphatically protest. When this country needed men we always volunteered, and Congress has no right to assume that we will do otherwise in the future.

2. The same section puts us under the absolute authority of the Secretary of the Navy to "receive such instructions and be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe." To re-

fuse would mean punishment for desertion under the naval regulation.

3. The bonus shall only be paid on condition that we have served in some private vessel to the satisfaction of the owner thereof for six months or more during the previous twelve months. The bonus shall be paid "on certificate by the Commissioner of Navigation that such member has served satisfactorily for at least six months" on some merchant vessel of the United States." None but the owner of the vessel can give such certificate.

4. Subsection 6 of section 3 and section 7 provide that the owners are not to receive the subsidy unless they employ in their vessels an increasingly large number of members of the naval reserve. This makes industrial employment contingent upon enlistment in the Navy, and is a more drastic form of conscription than is now practiced by any country.

5. This bill makes the seamen's bread dependent upon service in the Navy not only during war, but during peace as well.

6. The seamen may not, under this bill, choose for himself whether he shall volunteer; he must or else he must leave the sea.

7. He can not, like an honest man, refuse to accept money which he has not earned. He must either so behave himself as to fail in getting a certificate of good conduct, he must leave the calling, or he must accept, no matter if what self-respect he may possess is thereby wounded or destroyed.

8. He must at all times be ready to go to war upon the call of the President against anybody in any cause for anybody. He may not, like a citizen may, refuse to serve until the President shall by the need of the country deem it proper to call upon all men in the country's defense.

9. The industrial employer could, and, as we know him, we know that he would reduce the present all too low wages by so much as the Government would be paying. To dispute his right to determine the rate of wages would be to fail in getting that certificate of good conduct necessary to get this bonus. Real seamen will without doubt fail.

11. Seamen are too ill paid and poor to live like other men, but we have yet, in spite of our status under the law and the pity with which we are considered, sufficient self-respect to appreciate the true value of the gift which it is contemplated to force upon us.

On behalf of the organized seamen of the United States.

Very truly, yours,

ANDREW FURUSETH,
Chairman Legislative Committee.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator yield to me one moment?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. The deck crew, I said, includes waiters and stewards. It includes all deck stewards, and all men who are employed by the deck stewards, as well as the scrubbers and painters and everything of that kind.

Mr. SPOONER. The able-bodied seamen "wash down" the deck and all that.

Mr. FRYE. The able seamen are needed to handle the boats.

Mr. SPOONER. You do not need the able seamen to scrub the deck, but you need the able seamen in time of peril and in time of storm. They scrub the deck in time of sunshine and smooth sea.

Mr. FRYE. Under the United States statute, wherever the word "seaman" or "crew" is used it includes everybody on board of a ship having anything to do with the working of the ship. So there ought to be a pretty strict definition if you undertake to make a provision of law.

Mr. SPOONER. That is what I think, and it is not in the bill.

Mr. FRYE. Then, there is another thing which I think the Senator overlooked in the remark I heard about the certificate required. There is entered on the log of a ship everything about the conduct of a sailor, his qualifications as a sailor, his manner of service, and when he is sick where he goes to the hospital. Everything of that kind is on the log of the ship, and that log is deposited with the shipping commission; so that all those difficulties which the Senator raises about the granting of a certificate are without foundation in fact.

Mr. SPOONER. I doubt that. But is there any harm to have some provision in the bill which would render it difficult to reduce the sailor's ordinary pay by the amount in whole or in part—

Mr. FRYE. You can not reduce the sailor's pay. Good gracious! You can not get sailors on the Pacific coast. To-day sailors earn from \$100 to \$125 a month—more than captains—on the ordinary tramp ships.

Mr. GALLINGER. Foreign tramps?

Mr. FRYE. Foreign tramps. The sailors' union is running the Pacific coast business, and that is shown by the wages which they compel them to pay.

Mr. SPOONER. Of the bounty or retainer?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I wish to put in the RECORD a statement in reference to the Naval Reserve. A careful calculation shows that we have in this country, including the Great Lakes, about 96,500 seamen. Of course they are not all Americans; probably not more than fifty or fifty-five thousand of them are. Great Britain has 250,000 seamen, and Great Britain has been working a great many years under a retainer somewhat smaller than this bill provides to get a naval reserve. She has succeeded in getting 33,500 men out of 275,000.

Mr. FRYE. Is there any objection to putting in the Senator's bill a limitation of 10,000 as the number of the Naval Reserve?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly not. The Merchant Marine Commission and the Committee on Commerce of this body, who

considered this bill, hoped that in the course of ten years, under the provisions of the bill, we might get 10,000 naval reserves, but I have very little hope that we shall succeed in doing it. As the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] suggests, there is no objection on the part of anybody, so far as I know, to limiting the Naval Reserve to 10,000.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. Just one further remark.

The Senator from Wisconsin suggests that he is going to put in the RECORD a statement from certain seamen in opposition to this bill—resolutions, I believe. I presume I have a copy of them here. They come from the Pacific coast. They are signed by Mr. Ellison. I wonder that it was not Mr. Furuseth who signed them. We took testimony on the Pacific coast in regard to this matter, and we heard Mr. Furuseth and Mr. Livernash and those men at great length. I want to state just one question and one answer, if I can turn to it. Representative MINOR asked what proportion of the men on the Pacific coast were Americans, and Mr. Jortall replied: "I think 5 per cent." I have a table showing that on the Pacific coast there are only about 5 per cent who are American seamen. These resolutions come from foreigners who are on our ships receiving our wages, which are larger than they can get on foreign ships; also participating in a better food schedule and better quarters, and yet they refuse to become citizens of the United States, and yet they protest against this legislation on the ground that it is going to be oppressive to them.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I have very little information upon the subject either of the Navy or of the merchant marine. It has never been my good fortune to serve either in the other House or in the Senate on committees having jurisdiction of those subjects. But I have been very much interested in the exposition of this matter given by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and I have certain suggestions to make, and shall be glad to have the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire as to their value.

I assume that aid is necessary, first, because American ships cost for construction about 25 per cent more than foreign ships, and, second, because the administration of American ships costs about from 30 to 50 per cent more.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, he had better reverse those figures as to the difference between administration and construction.

Mr. NEWLANDS. And say that the difference in the cost of construction is 50 per cent and the difference in the cost of administration is 25 per cent?

Mr. GALLINGER. Thirty-five and 25 per cent would be nearer the correct figures.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I assume that so long as those conditions stand there will be no ships built in America for the foreign trade, or very few, because, even assuming we should be willing to pay more for the construction, the constant factor of the greater expense of administration would always stand against the American ship in the trade of the world.

I understand that our object is to enlarge our merchant marine, first, for the purpose of enlarging our foreign trade, and, second, for the purpose of supplementing our Navy with a service from which we can draw both men and ships in case of emergency. The difficulty we have now, as I understand it, with our Navy is that we find it difficult to get men to man our ships, and the merchant marine, which is a training school for the Navy, is undeveloped.

Assuming, therefore, that the Government must do something, I wish to avoid as far as possible subsidizing private interests; and the question arises in my mind as to whether we can not avoid subsidy by making a portion, at least, of the merchant marine a part of the Navy itself, so that the vessels so constructed will be ready in case of emergency for the use of the Navy and during time of peace can be used in the merchant marine.

What do we need in the way of supplementary shipping in order to maintain the efficiency of our Navy? We have the report of the General Staff of the Army, in which, being asked by this Commission their opinion as to what number of ships and what tonnage of ship will be required for the purpose of supplementing our Navy in the protection of our insular possessions should they be threatened by a great military power, they say they would require 228 vessels of an average tonnage of from 6,000 to 6,500 tons each, and they adopt 14 knots per hour as the standard for that tonnage. They say that the total tonnage required would be about 1,368,000 tons.

The Senator will recollect that in the discussion of the affairs of the Oceanic Steamship Company it was developed that each steamer owned by that company cost about \$1,000,000. Those steamers go at the rate of 14 knots an hour; they cost from

\$900,000 to \$1,000,000, and they are of about 6,500 tons each. So that it appears that if the necessary vessels are to be constructed and placed in the service of our merchant marine simply for the purpose of supplementing the Navy in its work, the expenditure of about \$228,000,000 will be necessary. If those ships are necessary, if in war they are an essential part of our Navy, and if, under existing conditions, it is utterly impossible for us to secure those ships because of the deficiency in our American merchant marine, I ask whether it is not a part of the construction of our Navy to supply these supplementary ships and to have them on hand in case of emergency? Would it not be well to diminish to the same degree the expenditure of our Navy, now aggregating over \$100,000,000 annually, and just to the extent that you take off from that appropriation to apply the difference to the construction of these steamers of 6,500 tons capacity, each one of them costing a million dollars? We could go on constructing these ships, say, at the rate of five or ten a year, involving a cost for construction of not more than \$10,000,000. Then how would those ships be utilized? By having them at hand in case of war we could use them just as we used the *St. Louis*, just as we used the *City of Peking* and other ships that were chartered from private corporations during the late Spanish war; and during time of peace could we not let out those ships to private corporations at a rental involving a return of a certain percentage of their cost?

It seems to me that, under existing conditions, we could hardly expect private corporations to build these ships. Even if you grant a subsidy the shipbuilders will be fearful that it may at some time be withdrawn. It is exceedingly probable that should there be a change of Administration the subsidy would be withdrawn, and this fear would endanger the success of the proposed legislation. It would also compel them to demand a larger amount in the way of subvention or subsidy because of the risk as to the time during which they would receive it.

Now, how would these ships be manned? This very project, as I understand it, involves the creation of a naval reserve—a naval reserve which would ultimately reach 10,000 men. It is proposed that the officers and seamen in that naval reserve shall receive an annual sum from the Government as a perpetual retainer. They are enlisted for a fixed period of time, subject to call at any time for active duty should there be war, and meanwhile they are paid a certain sum for the privilege that the Government has of calling upon them at any time for active service.

What is this sum? Under the pending bill the sum averages about \$50 per annum apiece for officers and men—not more than from twenty-five to thirty dollars per annum, I believe, for the men and a larger sum for the officers. I do not believe that that will be sufficient to make up the difference between the foreign wage and the domestic wage, and unless the Government pays the excess which the American seaman demands over the foreign seamen we can not expect American shipowners to go into competition with foreign shipowners in foreign transportation. We must give the men the domestic wage. If that wage is 35 per cent above the foreign wage we must see to it that they get it, and they must get it either from the shipowners or from the Government—one or the other.

American shipowners can not pay it, because they can not engage in foreign transportation in competition with the entire world and pay 35 per cent more for their administration than their competitors. It would simply mean that they would run the business at a loss, or they would go out of business, or, rather, they would never enter it at all. So it seems to me we must face the necessity of allowing each man of the naval reserve a larger amount than is allowed him in this bill.

Ten thousand men with an annual retainer of \$50 per annum would cost the Government \$500,000 a year. An annual average wage of \$100 would cost the Government \$1,000,000 annually. It seems to me we would have to pay them at least \$100 per annum, and perhaps more, so that for 10,000 men the United States would pay from \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000 per annum simply for the right to call upon them for their services in case of war or emergency. The more the Government pays the less the shipowner will pay, and if by this annual governmental pay we can cover the difference between the domestic pay and the foreign pay the American shipowner will be able to run and administer his ships.

Assuming now that the Government should within the next ten years, we will say, or within the next few years, construct twenty ships, we will say, of 6,500 tons capacity, how could they be employed in time of peace so as to return the Government an interest upon the investment? I ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether it would not be possible to organize private corporations resembling the Oceanic and Australian

Steamship Company, to which reference was made the other day? That company was organized in San Francisco and is engaged in trade between San Francisco and Australia. It has four ships of 6,500 tons capacity, and I believe they are ample for the present trade between San Francisco and Australia. Would it not be possible to organize similar lines, or two or three similar lines, for service down the coast toward South America, or is that covered now by private enterprise?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will examine the bill, I think he will see that we provide for just that contingency by establishing certain lines, some of which run from the Pacific coast, though possibly they do not cover the exact routes the Senator suggests. We carefully inquired into it, however, and thought that we put the routes where they would increase American commerce and American trade. That is what we are after.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator inform me how many such routes are covered by this bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. There are seven steamship routes provided for where we have not at the present time a single American ship, and then there are three additional routes—ten routes in all.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Is there any estimate as to the number of ships that will be necessary upon those routes?

Mr. GALLINGER. That can be ascertained very accurately. It is not stated in the report, and I can not tell the Senator off-hand the exact number.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I presume four or five for each line would be required.

Mr. GALLINGER. Quite likely, though some lines would get along with two or three.

Mr. NEWLANDS. But it would average, I imagine, four or five. That number would be ample, would it not?

Mr. GALLINGER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. For seven lines that would make twenty-eight or thirty ships, costing a million dollars apiece. Now, we will assume the Government constructs those ships as a part of the Navy and then lets them out to private corporations, at a rental that will replace the ships, let us say, in twenty years, and meanwhile give an interest of 3 per cent upon the investment. Those ships would then be the transports, the scouts, and the supplemental ships that are necessary in time of emergency, and time of war—just such ships as we employed during the Spanish war—and they would be manned by men belonging to this naval reserve numbering 10,000 men, and those men would be paid partly by the ship company and partly by the Government, the Government contributing from 25 to 30 per cent of their entire pay simply for the right to call upon those men for their services in case of war.

In addition to that a certain amount of military discipline, it seems to me, could be maintained. We could put upon some of these ships at least one naval officer, who could give the men the preliminary training that would be required for service on a man-of-war, and thus we could gradually supplement the fighting ships with the scouts, the transports, and the colliers—all of them absolutely essential to the complete working of the Navy, all of them absolutely necessary in case of war, and yet all of them serving a useful purpose in time of peace.

The construction of these ships would keep our shipyards busy. I think that Congress would probably not assent to the construction of these ships abroad in order to secure them at a less cost, for one of the purposes of all this legislation relating both to the Navy and the merchant marine is to maintain American shipyards, and of course we can not maintain shipyards unless we build ships on American soil.

So we have as essential to this entire system the naval and mercantile shipyards, the fighting vessels, and the carrying vessels, and I see no reason why we should not enter in an experimental way upon such a plan. It would entirely do away with subsidy to private interests. We could keep control over the corporations which lease these ships from the United States. We could control their incorporation under national laws, and, it seems to me, as the control over commerce between the States and with foreign nations is intrusted to the National Government we should see to it that these corporations are organized under national law, so that we can keep proper control and receive proper information regarding their receipts and expenditures.

The vice of this entire system of subsidy is that we allow a corporation to be organized under State law, and then we subsidize that corporation without having any control over it, without having any knowledge or inspection of its books and accounts, and without having any knowledge as to whether it needs a subsidy or not, except such as is given in casual hearings and inquiries. It does seem to me that by incorporating

these shipping companies engaged in foreign trade under a national law and maintaining control over them, and requiring publicity as to their accounts, we could see to it that no advantage over the Government was secured; and we could, by this gradual method, involving an expenditure of very much less than is contemplated by this bill, enlarge our mercantile marine, enlarge our Navy, and enlarge the force upon which the Navy must call in case of war.

Now, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire—and I make the inquiry in all candor, because I do not profess to have much information upon this subject—whether this plan would be practicable?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will reply by asking the Senator what he thinks would become of a bill if he should introduce it and send it to the Committee on Naval Affairs, involving the principle for which he has been arguing? In other words, as I understand, the Senator is in favor of the Government of the United States building thirty or forty merchant marine ships, costing a million dollars or so apiece, and letting them out to private parties to operate upon a rental. If the Government goes into that business, why not into building factories and every other conceivable industry that the Senator could think of? Why confine it to ships?

Mr. NEWLANDS. My answer is that these ships are an essential part of the Navy, absolutely necessary, according to the statement of the Navy itself and of the General Staff of the Army, to supplement the Navy itself when the use of the Navy is required.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Now we keep a navy in existence, though we have no war, simply because its use will be necessary in an emergency. It is just as essential that we should have these supplementary ships, these transports, these colliers, and these scouts. These thirty ships would cover that class.

Mr. GALLINGER. My answer to the Senator is that his theory is beautiful, sounds well, and looks attractive; but it is as impracticable, in my judgment, as any other theory the Senator could possibly evolve. I do not believe this country is ever going into the building of ships and then letting them out to private parties upon a basis of 3 per cent income, as the Senator suggests.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I quite agree with the Senator in that, and if the Navy did not require these ships I should regard the thing as entirely impracticable; but they state that we do require these ships. We require them just as much as men-of-war. When men-of-war are needed, the use of these colliers and these transports and these scouts is needed; and we all know to-day that if a great naval war were to occur we could not get enough ships from our present merchant marine to supplement the Navy. We know that.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is absolutely correct in making that statement. That is the fact, and it is a deplorable fact.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is a deplorable fact. It is an absolute naval necessity that we have these ships, and I base my proposition upon that.

Let us see about the cost of it. Thirty ships, enough to serve all these lines to which the Senator referred, would cost \$30,000,000. Three thousand men would be required on these ships. They should be enlisted in the Naval Reserve.

The pay of \$100 per annum to 3,000 men would cost \$300,000 per annum, or in the course of ten years it would cost \$3,000,000. Add that to the \$30,000,000 for the ships, and you have a total cost of \$33,000,000. The bill which is suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire provides for an expenditure of \$40,000,000 in ten years, and at the end of that time the Government has nothing to show for it; whilst under the plan I suggest the Government would have thirty ships, worth approximately \$30,000,000. The rental received from the ships could be applied to building ships for new lines of trade. So it seems to me this plan has the advantage of that plan upon the score of economy.

Then, there is another thing I wish to criticise, and that is this: Wherever the Government makes a subsidy it should compel the corporation which receives the subsidy to incorporate under national law. The State is utterly incompetent to deal with the question of foreign trade, and the national law should provide, just as the interstate-commerce law does, for publicity as to receipts and expenditures. As it is, it is utterly impossible for us to tell, except from the statements of interested parties, as to whether or not these subventions are required. If a national corporation is subsidized, and you have on record sworn statements regarding its receipts and expenditures, and you find that in performing a certain service it meets with a certain loss, you know accurately just what loss has got to be

filled by Government aid. As it is, there seems to be no accuracy of adjustment in these matters.

It seems to me the plan which I have proposed entirely does away with the suggestion of subsidy, which is repellant to the mind of almost everybody. The Government undertakes the construction only of those ships that are absolutely necessary to its service. It enters upon the employment of men who are absolutely necessary for its service, but simply as a matter of economical administration, lets out those ships and lets out those men to private corporations in time of peace, so that the Government may not be put to this large expenditure of administering ships for which there is no present use. That does not involve the ordinary significance of paternalism or of Government ownership, the construction of public utilities, and so on. It is simply building up a proportionate navy.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to inquire whether it would not create rather a formidable competition to any private ship-building industry if the Government should build twenty great ships and rent them to private corporations for carrying purposes? Would it not probably discourage, if not destroy, ship-building by individuals, who would have to enter into a field of competition with these Government ships, rented on a basis of 3 per cent profit on the cost of the ship? Does it seem to the Senator that any private individual would or could build ships to compete in the carrying trade with those Government-built and Government-equipped ships, rented on a basis of 3 per cent on the cost of building?

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Senator entirely misunderstood me if he thought that I proposed that the Government should build these ships. What I proposed was that the Government should let out contracts for the ships, and they would be constructed in private shipyards, just as all the other ships of the country are now.

Mr. HEYBURN. I understood the Senator to say distinctly, in reply to the question asked him by the Senator from New Hampshire, that the Government would build these ships and lease them on a basis of 3 per cent profit upon the original cost.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I may have stated that, but I used the word "build" in the sense that the Government would pay for the building of the ships, not that it would actually construct them itself. The Senator will recall that I insisted upon shipyards as a part of the naval establishment. Shipyards are absolutely essential, and the private shipyard is absolutely essential. I do not propose to usurp their functions.

Mr. GALLINGER. After the Senator gets these ships built, how is he going to get them operated when it costs 25 per cent more to operate American ships than foreign ships?

Mr. NEWLANDS. As to that, let me say to the Senator right here that I propose that these ships shall be manned by the men employed in the Naval Reserve, and I propose that the Government shall pay a much larger sum to those men than is provided for in this bill. The bill provides for an average, for officers and men, of \$50 a man per annum, which, in my judgment, is not enough to equalize conditions. I should say from a hundred to a hundred and fifty dollars per annum, and thus relieve the shipowner of 25 or 30 per cent additional expense he is now under in administering his ship, as compared with a foreign ship.

Mr. GALLINGER. You would give a subsidy in a little different form than is proposed in this bill.

Mr. NEWLANDS. You may call it a subsidy, but it is the pay of men in the United States service and who are subject to be called at any time for military duty. It is simply an army on furlough engaged in the pursuits of peace in times of peace, subject at any time to the call of war.

Mr. ALLISON obtained the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to submit an amendment to be read, printed, and lie on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, in line 7, after the word "ninety-eight," add:

Nor shall these subventions be paid to any vessel of less than 200 tons gross register engaged in the foreign trade, or to any vessel of less than 20 tons gross register engaged in the deep-sea fisheries.

Mr. FRYE. That is safe.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be printed.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from New Hampshire has relieved me very much by the limit of 20 tons in the deep-sea fisheries.

Mr. President, I do not expect to occupy any great length of time in the discussion of this bill. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] in one respect, and that is that it is the best bill I have seen presented to the Senate for some time at least, as respects its provisions. I do not know whether I now understand the general purpose of the bill. If I understand it, the first proposition is found in the naval-reserve plan, which proposes to give a subvention to all the sailors who now sail in American ships on the ocean, to all the people who are engaged in the Newfoundland or deep-sea fisheries, and to all the other people who are engaged in any fisheries, whether on the Atlantic or Pacific or on the Great Lakes. In other words, this subvention is open to all the people who are now engaged in navigation on the ocean or on the Lakes.

As I understand the bill, there is nothing in it which compels any man, who allows his name to be enrolled, to come under the provisions of the laws which appertain to the Navy. There is nothing in the first section of the bill at the present time—and here I differ in construction with the Senator from Wisconsin—that constitutes a binding obligation upon any person who becomes a member of the naval reserve, other than a civil contract. In order to make the naval reserve what its friends propose for it and what it ought to be if it is to be a reserve, there should be an enlistment in the Navy, subjecting those who enter the service to all the articles of the Navy service, both in time of war and in time of peace. Again, if we do not engage in war within four years, these men are not required, even by civil contract, to enter the service of the Government.

I did not understand the Senator from New Hampshire to claim in the discussion he had with the Senator from Wisconsin, that the people who enter the naval service are required to subject themselves to the laws which appertain to the Navy. Do I understand the Senator so to construe the bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think I ought to take a little time to think that out before giving a definite answer.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. GALLINGER. My own impression is that the word "enrollment" substantially covers the Senator's contention, and that it is practically an enlistment. If that be so, it answers the objection that the Senator makes.

I am fortified in that view by the fact that the Navy Department itself framed the provision, and it seems to me the wise men there would not have made a provision which would be inoperative or fail to accomplish the purpose they have so much at heart. The Navy Department is very anxious, and has been for years, to secure a naval reserve.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to have that made clear in the pending bill, if it is not clear now. I propose to strike out the word "enroll" and insert "enlist, subject to the laws and regulations governing the Navy." Otherwise I do not think this will be of any great value.

So far as concerns the officers who are to receive a hundred and ten dollars a year, I have no doubt in case of war, particularly a war with a foreign country, if they could not get into the service otherwise, they would give several hundred dollars to become an officer.

I am sorry to see in the bill this general provision respecting the naval reserve. I think it ought to constitute a separate measure providing for a naval reserve; but I am conciliated by the observation a Senator made to me on the subject, that if we undertake to put it on a naval bill or make it a separate bill covering the naval reserve, we will find it will cost us a great many millions in the end. So I am somewhat reconciled to it, because I think it will not cost us very many millions annually, provided we adopt an amendment, suggested by the Senator from Maine, I believe, that it be limited to 10,000 men.

I should think it ought to be limited for the present to three or four thousand. Probably in the first four years we would not enroll under this bill 10,000 men unless we put them into the naval service, and if we did, very few sailors and officers would enlist, in my judgment.

There are two or three amendments I wish to propose to this provision. They relate to the payment of money. We have had a great deal of discussion—not public discussion, but a great deal of discussion among Senators—as to the gradual growth of these indefinite appropriations that run along without anybody knowing what they amount to unless you take the trouble to dig into the archives of the various Departments. So I hope the Senator from New Hampshire in charge of the bill will allow me to make some amendments that will provide for annual appropriations, so far as this bill is concerned, and especially this clause. I wish to offer two or three amendments.

On page 4, line 11, I move the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, line 11, strike out the words "in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" and insert in lieu thereof the words "to be annually appropriated therefor, upon estimates to be annually submitted to Congress in the Book of Estimates;" so as to read:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, upon proper audit, to pay out of any money to be annually appropriated therefor upon estimates to be annually submitted to Congress in the Book of Estimates to each officer, etc.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie over.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it might very well be adopted now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that action upon amendments now would be in contravention of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true. Let it be printed and lie over.

Mr. HALE. Let the amendment be stated again.

The Secretary again stated the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie over.

Mr. ALLISON. I also wish to offer an amendment, on page 4, in line 10, after the word "audit," to insert "by the Auditor of the Navy Department."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, line 10, after the words "proper audit," it is proposed to insert "by the Auditor of the Navy Department."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and go over.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 5, line 7, I move to strike out "Commissioner of Navigation" and insert—

Mr. GALLINGER. It is proposed to insert the "Secretary of Commerce and Labor."

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator has another amendment in mind. On page 5, lines 4 and 5, I move to strike out "by an officer to be designated;" so as to read:

Such retainer shall be paid at the end of each year of service on certificate by the Secretary of the Navy.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie over.

Mr. ALLISON. In line 7, page 5, I move to strike out the words "Commissioner of Navigation" and to insert "Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will permit me, the first clause refers to the manner in which a person has conducted himself as a member of the naval reserve, whether he has obeyed the regulations and been subject to discipline, and all that. But the second certificate goes only to the manner in which the man has discharged his duties on shipboard.

Mr. HALE. On a merchant vessel?

Mr. SPOONER. On a merchant vessel. The Secretary of the Navy would have no facilities, under existing law, which would enable him to make such certificate.

Mr. ALLISON. I only followed the error, if it be an error, of the committee, because they have inserted "by an officer to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy." If the Secretary can not ascertain it himself, he ought not to designate an officer to do it. Therefore I am not subject to criticism.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not think the Senator's amendment is open to criticism, so far as it relates to the first certificate.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the next certificate.

Mr. SPOONER. But when it comes to the next certificate, he moves to strike out "Commissioner of Navigation" and insert "Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. ALLISON. No; I do not. I move to insert "Secretary of Commerce and Labor."

Mr. GALLINGER. The "Secretary of Commerce and Labor." That is right. But the Senator did say inadvertently "Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will lie over and be considered to-morrow.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly. I want to have the amendment stated at the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator please restate his last proposed amendment?

Mr. ALLISON. The last amendment I proposed is in line 7, page 5, to strike out the words "Commissioner of Navigation" and insert "Secretary of Commerce and Labor."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 7, strike out the words "Commissioner of Navigation" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of Commerce and Labor."

Mr. ALLISON. That is right. On page 5, lines 23 and 24, I move the amendment I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 23, it is proposed to strike out the words "not otherwise appropriated" and insert in lieu thereof the words "to be annually appropriated therefor, upon estimates to be annually submitted to Congress in the Book of Estimates."

Mr. ALLISON. I will offer another amendment, in order to get it before the Senate, in lieu of the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire. On page 5, line 24, before the word "hereafter," I move to insert "of over 500 gross registered tons."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 24, after the word "vessel," it is proposed to insert the words "of over 500 gross registered tons."

Mr. GALLINGER. I will take this opportunity to say that the amendments the Senator has offered are doubtless in the direction of improving the bill, especially in the method of paying out the money. On the last amendment which the Senator has offered, however, I shall want to be heard, as I think by that amendment he will exclude a large class of ships that ought to be encouraged. But we can talk about that to-morrow.

Mr. ALLISON. I proposed my amendment in order that we might have two plans before us to talk about, rather than one.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well.

Mr. ALLISON. While I have the floor I will say that I can not see what great advantage it will be to pay a subsidy to or provide for a steamship of less than 500 tons, either in the merchant marine service or in time of war. If there is any steamship of less than 500 tons which would be used in the merchant marine and would be valuable in time of war, I do not know what it is.

Mr. FRYE. Does the Senator propose to make any difference between a sailing ship and a steamship?

Mr. ALLISON. I might in the last analysis, if I can not do any better.

Mr. FRYE. There is a good deal of difference when you come to gross tons between a sailing ship and a steamship.

Mr. ALLISON. That is to say, the steamship has a larger average tonnage.

Mr. FRYE. The steamship has a very much—

Mr. ALLISON. Heavier gross tonnage.

Mr. FRYE. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. That is what I supposed.

I wish in suggesting these amendments to show some defects in the bill that I think ought to be corrected, and I am making them in good faith. Whether I shall be able to vote for the measure later or not, I certainly have not done very much harm to it thus far.

Mr. President, there is another amendment I had prepared, but I do not find it on my desk. However, I will call attention to it here. There is no provision in the bill for any repealing clause. I do not know that it is necessary, but there are so many complicated provisions in it that I think there should be a repealing clause. Of course, that repealing clause would not interfere with any contracts already made under the provisions of the law; but I think we should put everybody upon notice that if we find any trouble about the bill we will have the right to amend it, except as it applies to specific contracts already made.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I presume I am correct in the assumption that even without that provision Congress would have that power.

Mr. ALLISON. I think so, although there are so many direct and indirect provisions here I was a little afraid the statute of limitations might be applied as respects some of them.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will allow me, the object of inserting that amendment is not because of the question of power, but it is to put everyone upon notice that Congress reserves the right to exercise the power without being subject fairly to the charge of bad faith.

Mr. GALLINGER. I certainly know of no objection to that proposed amendment. It is the usual form.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it ought to be put in.

Mr. GALLINGER. If put in, contracts already made ought to be protected.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. I hope if the Senator offers the amendment as to gross tonnage, limiting it to 500 tons, he will make a distinction between steamships and sailing ships, and not have it apply to sailing ships.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not believe that this subsidy or subvention ought to be granted to a steamship of less than a thousand tons burden; but I made it 500 tons in order to include both steamships and sailing ships. If we expect by this means to enlarge either our foreign or domestic trade, it seems to me that we must encourage the building of ships of at least a thousand gross tons, whether they be sail or steam, but certainly steamships.

Mr. SPOONER. Are there any 500-ton steamships?

Mr. ALLISON. There are probably very few such ships, but I do not want to encourage the building of them.

Mr. President, more for the purpose of having the Senator from New Hampshire express his views upon the various provisions of the bill, I want to reserve a criticism as respects the second provision of the bill.

Mr. HALE. On what page?

Mr. ALLISON. On page 4 or 5.

Mr. GALLINGER. The second section.

Mr. ALLISON. There are three things in the bill. One is to help the fisheries and the people who are sailing about on our coasts from one little place to another with very small sailing vessels. Sub silentio the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] says we have nothing to do with the coasting people. I understand the first section of the bill deals with all the people who sail on our coasts whether by steam or by sailing vessels. They are all gathered into this naval reserve, as I understand it, and they are all to take the chances of war for four years, if they are officers, receiving \$440 at the end of the four years if there is no war. If there should happen to be a war within those four years, I think very likely, unless we would largely increase the pay, they would prefer to remain on the merchant ship rather than to enlist in the Navy even as officers; and if we continue to enlarge the number of officers in our Navy as we are doing now we will find very little opportunity for the commander of a merchant ship to become the commander of any ship in the service during war, unless it be a transport or something of that sort. So it does apply in this indirect way to the reserve feature.

The second provision of the bill is the provision authorizing anyone to build an American ship and sail it. I do not think there is any limit as to tonnage as respects these ships, either.

Mr. GALLINGER. None, except the Senator's proposed amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. That would apply to both.

Mr. President, we had a very excellent bill in many ways some years ago before the Senate, and it passed the Senate, but it provided for a subsidy on an entirely different basis from the bill now before the Senate. That bill as it passed the Senate provided for ships of low speed to engage in our foreign trade and receive a certain sum for each hundred miles traveled; and it was supposed that the ships would make so many voyages to foreign ports and return in a year. There was some provision in it, I think, that required them to make a certain number of voyages if they had a certain rate of speed, and with a greater speed a larger number of voyages, and so forth.

I am making these criticisms to be corrected if I am mistaken. As I understand the pending bill, if I build a ship under it I can sail from the port of Norfolk to London or any other foreign port, from there to another foreign port, and from there to still another foreign port, and if I sail on the 14th day of February and can get back to Norfolk by the 13th of February of the next year and can get a proper certificate for this bounty or subvention of \$5 a ton, or whatever it is, I can secure it from the Treasury.

In other words, I could make one voyage to Europe and another voyage back again, sailing to the Philippines in the meantime, or to China, and get this subsidy. If that is not the purpose of the bill, then if I am mistaken I shall be glad to have the Senator from New Hampshire correct me.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that very likely technically that is so; but it is not expected that under the provisions of section 2 of the bill any ships will be put on the North Atlantic trade. There is no expectation that ships will sail to London or Liverpool. The purpose is to encourage cargo ships. There was very severe criticism against the Frye-Hanna bill that it did not take care of the cargo ships, where they will sail to a point nearer home, with which countries we are needing trade, and where we can materially increase our trade. But I think there was no idea that under that provision there would be any great trade established between this country and England or Germany.

Mr. ALLISON. The criticism I make is that no trade will be

established under it between this country and any country; that a tramp ship can go the world around under this bill and get as many cargoes as it can and whenever it can, and return here within ten days of the lapse of a year and get the subsidy.

Now, that does not encourage foreign trade with the United States, as it seems to me. If a ship goes out on the sea as a tramp ship to compete with all the other tramp ships on the ocean it will do as they do. It will go to the port which will enable it to secure the largest cargo at the best price. Therefore, it is no encouragement, it seems to me, to American shipping in the way of securing foreign trade between foreign ports and the United States. That is one objection which appears to me to be a serious one to this bill.

The third provision of the bill is a provision intended to establish new lines of steamers between certain Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific ports in our country and South American and Asiatic ports. I am in favor of all the provisions in the bill so far as I have seen them, although I was somewhat shaken by the suggestions of the correspondent of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] when he said there would be no subsidy granted either from Mobile or Galveston. I think if we establish these lines as we propose to establish them with countries with which we have now very little trade we ought at least to give them the opportunity of establishing trade with these countries before we put in competition with them a lot of tramp ships. We are giving here a subsidy to people who roam around the world, and then we also subsidize specific lines.

I am in favor of that provision of the bill not on the general ground so often stated, that the cost of building a ship here is 25 per cent greater and the cost of running a ship 33 per cent greater, but on the ground that there is a large trade in the countries named in these last clauses which we ought to have, and which we are fairly entitled to have, but which we can not induce our shipping men to establish lines for without giving them a subvention of some kind. As I understand the general provision here, beginning with section 2, page 3, I object to it because I think it will have the effect of greatly interfering with the provisions we have made for special lines.

There is another thing that has struck me in examining the bill, which has given me some trouble. We subsidize all the steamships and all the sailing vessels between the ports of the United States and the ports of the Caribbean Sea and between the ports of the United States and the ports of the Dominion of Canada in the northeastern portion of our country as well as in the northwestern. When we had this question up before us two or three years ago, I remember very well we made an exemption, not upon an enlarged debate, but by general consent, by which these provisions should not apply to the Canadian provinces or to Cuba.

The trade of the United States with Cuba last year was \$130,000,000, in round numbers, in the aggregate—exports and imports. Our trade with the islands of the Caribbean Sea is very great. All this trade is now constantly increasing. Nearly half of our trade, as I gather, of the \$130,000,000 is now in American ships between here and Cuba. It may be that that is too large an estimate.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, while I have not the figures at hand at this moment, the Senator's estimate, I am sure, is very much too high.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well. I would like to have American ships do all the trade if we could do it; but not if we must do it at the expense of paying this double bounty, because that is what we are doing, Mr. President. For the ships that ply between near-by ports we are to pay the sailors and we are to pay the subvention to these tramp ships, and we are also to pay a subsidy to the mail ships under the last clause of the bill.

Mr. President, I commend very much the Senator from New Hampshire and the gentlemen who have prepared the pending bill and prepared it with great pains and made great sacrifices in the investigation of the questions leading up to it. I commend them for all that. They have given us very much valuable information. But I do think that if we are to increase our trade with foreign countries we must begin with those countries that we do not now have access to with American ships, and that in a trade such as our trade with Cuba and the local trade between the northeastern portion of our country and the Canadian provinces they are not pressed—I will use that word—as the other parts of the country are pressed, in order to reach foreign ports.

I have not seen the statements of the Commission. They may have taken testimony to show that, notwithstanding our trade with Canada is very great, it is not conducted in American ships. I do not know how that is, but surely there must be ships under our flag, either by sail or steam, or both, that ply between our ports and the Canadian provinces.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think, Mr. President, it would be safe to say that the small proportion of our trade with the Dominion of Canada by water is largely done with sailing vessels, and it is a very small proportion of the entire carrying trade to Canada.

Mr. ALLISON. I suppose the greater portion of our carrying trade with Canada is by rail.

Mr. GALLINGER. By rail; certainly.

Mr. HALE. I suppose the Senator from Iowa appreciates what I can say is the underlying proposition of this bill, not to increase trade and commerce. There is plenty of that.

Mr. ALLISON. Our trade?

Mr. HALE. Our trade. It will naturally increase. But the object is to increase the carrying trade in American ships.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; I understand that. If I did not say so, I ought to have said it.

Mr. HALE. The Senator gave an illustration of the trade with the people of the Spanish Main. It is large; it is increasing; and that is a matter of gratification; but what the bill seeks to do is to so frame legislation that the carrying of that great trade, which is already going on, shall be not in foreign ships, but in American ships. That is the substance of the pending bill. There are \$200,000,000 that to-day go to foreign shippers, to foreign vessels, for the freighting of this immense commerce of the United States, and without interfering with that, and in the end incidentally increasing it, the purpose of the bill is to so legislate as to divert some portion of that freight money—I would be glad to see a very large portion of it—into the hands of our own citizens. I believe it to be entirely practicable that under a suitable bill one-half of that immense amount of money instead of being paid to and received by and enjoyed by foreign ships can be received by our own ships, and thus add to the material prosperity of the country.

The trade, the commerce, is largely already established, but it is the freighting, it is the carrying, it is the money that is paid for it that goes into the hands of our rivals that we are trying to divert, so that we will get a portion of it.

Mr. ALLISON. I thoroughly agree with all the Senator has said as to what our effort is, not only to enlarge our trade, but to enlarge our trade in our own ships. When my friend interrupted me, I proposed to call attention to the fact that in the bill we passed three years ago we did not think it worth while to deal with the trade either with the provinces of Canada or with Cuba. I assume the situation was regarded as so important in other directions that it was thought best to develop this trade through our reciprocity provisions and the friendly relations we have with both Canada and Cuba.

Mr. President, it may be that the ships which are provided for in the second title of the bill will come into competition with the Canadian situation and with the ships of other countries in Cuba, but I very much fear that it will go very little in that direction, or, at least, very little farther than it would go without the subvention proposed in the first two clauses.

I know that our trade is very large with Cuba now. I know that under provisions already in force there is being established a considerable trade with Cuba, and we are maintaining it at this time. But what I hope to see now is a bill which will not only enlarge our trade, but will enlarge it in our own ships. I believe in that, if possible. I wish also to enlarge our trade in directions where we are fairly entitled to it because of our imports and exports, and we know that we are not likely to secure any great portion of that trade until we give subventions to special lines of steamships on the Atlantic and on the Pacific coasts; and I am for both.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, in reference to Cuba, I will state that our imports last year amounted to \$86,000,000 and our exports to \$38,000,000 in round numbers. We imported more than twice as much as we exported to Cuba. I have ascertained since the Senator raised that question that we have been carrying in American ships about 35 per cent of that trade. It is decreasing very rapidly just now from some cause or other, just what I do not know. The maximum which we have carried was 35 per cent.

Mr. ALLISON. Our entire trade with Cuba amounted to about \$130,000,000 last year, and if with that amount of exports and imports we could only secure 35 per cent of the trade between our country and Cuba in American ships, especially when some of those ships are subsidized in a small degree and when the transportation is so easy, what a commentary that is on our situation.

Take a large sailing ship or a small steamship and you can put alongside of it tows, as they are called, boats with sails, as I have seen them on the New England coast, carrying a great many thousand tons, a single fleet of ships, and under this bill, as I understand, every one of those ships or canal boats

would have a subsidy in the form of tonnage. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if I am not correct that if I take a tow from Norfolk, which has one large sailing ship or a schooner or a steamer, and there run along, trailing after it, five other great ships, each with sails, the tonnage will not be reckoned on the basis of the contents of the gross tonnage of those ships?

Mr. GALLINGER. My answer would be that I should think not. I do not think that a scow would be called a ship.

Mr. ALLISON. I only gather that idea from the fact that in the bill passed three years ago it was found necessary to exclude them, and I supposed that they were excluded in that bill because its framers were afraid that otherwise they would be included.

Mr. GALLINGER. If they ever undertake to take a tow of that kind across to Habana, I hope they will have a pleasanter voyage than I had.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope so, too. It is not probable that they would take a tow of that kind to Habana, but I think it is quite possible they might take it across the water to New Brunswick or some other port.

I make these suggestions in order to present to the Senate the difficulty that I see in giving my support to this bill and to show the importance of making some changes in phraseology respecting these matters.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I did not want to interrupt the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Allison] while he was speaking, but I now wish to ask him a question. In the first place, I suppose the main purpose of this bill is to increase our exports and perhaps our imports, but certainly to increase our exports. I want to know what objection there is to a ship sailing out of Norfolk, carrying scows, or whatever you call them, if the ship can do it? If the purpose is to carry American goods in American ships, does it make any difference whether they are in scows or tows or whether they are carried in any other way, so that they are carried?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think there is any objection to that, and I should be glad to have them carried in that way; but in the case of a ship with tows going to a port, we will say, in Mexico or in Canada, I should hardly think it was wise for this country to pay \$5 a ton for the contents or for the gross tonnage of that ship, including the scows. That is my opinion.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to ask the Senator who has the bill in charge whether there has been a reprint of the bill since January 30? I think there have been some changes since made in it.

Mr. GALLINGER. There has not been a reprint since that date.

Mr. TELLER. Then I have the last print of the bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; but there are certain amendments which have been made, which the Senator will find in italics, which have been adopted by the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. They are all in this bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. They are all in that bill.

Mr. TELLER. Have there been any amendments adopted since the bill was printed?

Mr. GALLINGER. I had one amendment adopted this morning. I will say to the Senator, not remembering, as the Chair afterwards ruled, that the amendment ought to lie over.

Mr. TELLER. I find on page 7, commencing in line 8, that sections 1 and 2 of an act approved April 15, 1904, entitled "An act to regulate shipping in trade between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago," etc., seem to be suspended by this bill for a time. Will the Senator explain why that is done?

Mr. GALLINGER. We passed a law in April, 1904, confining shipping to the Philippines to American bottoms after July of the present year, as I remember it.

Mr. TELLER. I remember the law very well.

Mr. GALLINGER. It has been found impracticable to put that law in operation for various reasons, as I understand. Both the President and the Secretary of War have recommended that it should be postponed until 1909.

Mr. TELLER. Well, Mr. President, as I did not vote for that bill and thought it was very objectionable, I should like to know what objection the Secretary of War and others have now found against it?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not consulted them personally about the matter. I simply know that they have thought it was not wise to engage in that trade under existing economic conditions in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. TELLER. Then why put it in this bill? Why not deal with that subject separately?

Mr. GALLINGER. It might have been dealt with separately, but it was thought this was a good place for it. We are deal-

ing with transportation matters. We are dealing with shipping, and this related directly to that subject. So we put it in this bill. That is the only answer I can give the Senator on that point.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Gallinger], with the permission of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Teller], why it is necessary to give 30 per cent additional to vessels sailing between the Pacific ports and the Philippine Islands?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is simply on the same hypothesis that we give subventions to other vessels. We want the trade of the Philippine Islands, and we want to encourage American shipping to go to the Philippine Islands. In our former legislation we practically made the Philippine Islands trade coastwise, although we did not use that term. I doubt whether we properly could do so; but we did restrict the trade absolutely to American ships. Now, in suspending this provision of law, it was thought wise to give American ships some little encouragement by way of increased subvention.

Mr. ALLISON. As I understand it, we give them 30 per cent in addition to what we give to other ships.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; we give them 30 per cent in addition.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLISON. I only wanted to know the reason why it was done. I should hope, if the Senator from Colorado will allow me just one word more—

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. I should hope that 30 per cent would satisfy those people having ships under our flag. I would be in favor of extending that period beyond 1909 and giving them 30 per cent in the meantime, because I think that three years from now it will be a very great hardship upon the Philippine people to be compelled to transport whatever they may produce between our country and the Philippines in American ships.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, recurring to the part of this bill relative to the naval reserve, I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire his construction, in order that we may test somewhat the practical operation of it. As I understand the first section—I am reading now from an amendment proposed by the committee—it is entirely a voluntary matter on the part of any of these officers, petty officers, or men, whether or not they will be enrolled as contemplated by this bill. If they are enrolled, the same section of the bill on page 4 provides that they shall—

receive such instruction and be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

Now, if I am correct in my construction of the bill as I have just read it, it may so happen that upon any given vessel there may be a part of the crew enrolled and a part of the crew not enrolled. I think that would be the natural consequence of it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BACON. Of course under this provision there would be certain discipline prescribed for those officers and men who are thus enrolled, and certain regulations as to their conduct, drill, and other matters of detail, which would all in their exercise make up the efficiency of an officer or a man on shipboard. That would be limited to those men thus enrolled. Would it be practicable in the operation of a vessel that a part of the crew should be subject to one discipline—one series of regulations—whereas another part of the crew would be under altogether different regulations or under different discipline?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the only answer I can give to that is that, as I understand it, Great Britain has found it practicable. She has 33,500 of these men in her service, and I have been informed that they are enrolled and trained in precisely the same way that is proposed here. The Navy Department recommends this. I presume the Department has no question as to the feasibility of the scheme.

Mr. BACON. I would ask the Senator if he is informed whether or not in the British service it is true that on these vessels where they have this naval reserve a part of them are enrolled and a part of them are not enrolled?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think so, for the reason that they have 290,000 seamen in the service and they have 33,500 naval-reserve men. I have no idea that those naval-reserve men man a ship exclusively.

Mr. BACON. It may be, though, that they have different requirements by which those who are enrolled are upon one ship and those who are not enrolled are upon another. I am asking for information. I do not know, and I should like to know whether the Senator is informed on that point. It seems to me that there would be much confusion necessarily arising.

Mr. GALLINGER. I can only give my opinion that the system is the same as is proposed in this bill.

Now, as to one other point raised more particularly by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. He insisted that this enrollment did not amount to anything; that we ought to have enlistment if we are going to do anything with these men. I telegraphed the general board of the Navy Department, under whose supervision this provision was prepared, asking them what "enrollment" meant. I do not know that this will meet the objection which the Senator from Wisconsin raised, but I want to read the reply by telegram just received:

"Enrollment" is a pledge for future service. "Enlistment" is a pledge for present and continuous service to a fixed date.

Signed by the general board.

I have thought that this enrollment was practically equivalent to enlistment; that men pledged themselves to perform this service under the conditions and requirements of the Navy Department; that there would be no doubt of their being subject to call, and that they would have to respond; but if that is not so, the bill can be strengthened in that respect if it is thought desirable.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, will the Senator—

Mr. BACON. Will my colleague pardon me just a moment?

Mr. CLAY. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. To recur to the matter about which I spoke a moment ago, since I asked the information from the Senator from New Hampshire I am informed by a gentleman, who says that he is not mistaken and can not be as to the fact, that the system of Great Britain does not consist in that which was suggested of a mixture upon the same ship of men who are enrolled and men who are not enrolled and in a discipline and regulation as to one which is not required of the other. I am informed that the system is this—that the men who are thus enrolled are disciplined upon the men-of-war, the naval vessels of Great Britain, for a limited period of time, during which they have to observe the regulations which are prescribed for that discipline, but that after that they go into the merchant-marine service as any other sailors, officers, or men, without any special discipline on that ship and without any special regulations upon that ship. Mr. President, while of course I was yielding to the suggestion of the Senator that it had been found in practice in the British service that such system was not objectionable and was not confusing, upon this statement of fact made to me I am still of the opinion that the provision made in this bill, under which there is evidently a contemplation that there shall be on the same ship part of a crew under one discipline and another part of the crew of the same rank without that discipline and without those regulations, is utterly impracticable.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, while very likely I was mistaken in the broad statement I made about the British naval reserve, I will ask the Senator where he finds anything in this provision that prohibits our Navy Department from doing precisely what he says is done in Great Britain?

Mr. BACON. Well, I do not know that it does prohibit it—

Mr. GALLINGER. They are to be enrolled—

Mr. BACON. But it strikes me, if that is the contemplation, there ought to be some such provision. Of course, these men can not be put upon the men-of-war without some authority of law. They are not in the employment of the United States so long as they are enrolled in this way until they are called for in case of necessity by the President. That is a provision of the bill. So that, if it is designed or if it is thought that that system should be adopted, it seems to me it ought to be more specifically prescribed and authority given for these men, when they enroll, to be for a limited time upon the men-of-war, and afterwards allowed to go under that enrollment in the service of the merchant marine.

Mr. GALLINGER. The naval reserve is similar to the militia of the States. It is a naval militia, and I take it that under this provision the Secretary of the Navy can have them drilled in such way as he may see fit. I suppose that certain vessels could be given up to that purpose. I see no inhibition in the bill in that direction, and I think, while very likely it would be confusing for a portion of the crew to be subjected to drill, yet they might have certain instruction, even if it is a mixed crew.

Mr. BACON. The Senator will see, however, that there is no provision in this bill for these men to be paid anything during the time of such instruction and drill except this bounty, because, of course, those who would employ them in the merchant marine hereafter would not pay them wages during the time when they were being thus drilled and disciplined by the Government.

Mr. GALLINGER. All I can say in reply to the Senator is that I will look carefully into that. The debate will continue to-morrow, and if there is any weakness in the bill in that respect it ought to be cured. There is no question about that.

But these men are to be under the Secretary of the Navy, subject to the requirements to be made by the Secretary. I apprehend that that was all taken into consideration by the Department when this provision was framed.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, if there is any justification whatever for this bill, it is that possibly we might increase the number of American ships that the Government might have the benefit of in case of emergency, in case of war. Nobody here, so far as I have heard the debate, has ever claimed that we would get any less rate on our goods exported or imported because they were carried in American bottoms. The shipper would get nothing less; the consumer would get nothing less. But I suppose it is hoped that we may get ships that can be called into the service if it becomes necessary.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] a few moments ago touched upon that question. This bill is fatally defective as to that, as will be found on page 8, unless it has been amended, and I can not find that it has been. It provides:

That said vessel may be taken and used by the United States, for the national defense or for any public purpose, at any time, upon payment to the owner or owners of the fair actual value of the same at the time of the taking, or a fair rate of hire to be agreed upon, etc.

Here is a provision that renders it utterly impossible for the Government to get possession of ships in the hour of extremity. I called the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to this ten days ago. It seems to me that it is a section that needs revision. There ought to be a provision that if the parties do not agree, the Government can take possession of the ships at once, the payment to be determined afterwards.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that I offered an amendment to-day covering that point.

Mr. TELLER. Very good. If that is so, I do not want to waste the time of the Senate discussing it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator was entirely right. The Senator raised that question the other day and satisfied me that he was entirely right, or some other Senator did—I do not know but that it was the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]—and I drafted an amendment which I think the Senator will see completely covers that objection.

Mr. TELLER. I would not say, Mr. President, that in time of great emergency the Government might not take a ship of a citizen, because we have done such things.

Mr. GALLINGER. The amendment covers that.

Mr. TELLER. But we can avoid that by simply amending it.

Now, I want to say just a word or two about the naval reserve provision. I think that principle is correct. It is a valuable feature of the bill. I do not believe, as I have said before, or as the Senator from Nevada expressed it to-day, that the pay is sufficient to induce this enrollment. I think it very desirable that we should train some American sailors, but I think, further, when you come to attempt to reorganize the American merchant marine and the naval reserve that there ought to be some method by which a man who has distinguished himself as captain of a merchant ship might be called into the service of the Government, and that he might have some opportunity to advance in the service. I do not see anything in this bill to enable the captain of a merchant ship or the mate of a merchant ship to have any preference or for the Government to have any claim upon him.

Mr. GALLINGER. He gets the rank of lieutenant in the naval reserve, I will say to the Senator, under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. TELLER. The captain may get that. Yes, Mr. President, possibly he does. I do not know whether he would be at the command of the Government, as he ought to be, in time of war; but the chances are a thousand to one if he was offered a good place he would take it.

It is notorious that the best-manned ships we ever had were not manned by those who had technical education at a military or a naval school, but by men who got their education on the high seas. I believe that will always be the fact. I believe the men who have gone out as commanders of merchant ships will be better equipped, on the whole, than any other class of men that you can get. Certainly there is one thing about it, that practically all our fighting that has been done on the ocean in the past—except, perhaps, in this last little bit of affair that we had with Spain, which did not amount to much—has been done by the men who were common sailors on the commercial ships, men having no military training whatever. That is the class of men that I want to see taken care of, and I should like very much to see the Senator, before he allows this bill to go to a vote, offer an amendment to raise the wages of these men who are supposed to be enrolled. I think we can better afford to pay them than we can to pay the ships.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. As I understand this bill, the whole matter of regulation is left to the Secretary of the Navy. He can make a captain out of a seaman and he can make as many captains as he chooses without limitation of any kind upon his discretion in respect to the details of this arrangement.

Mr. TELLER. If the Secretary of the Navy can not do so, the President can. It is certain that somebody can. But I was suggesting that we ought to offer an inducement to the right class of men to become captains and mates of ships. If a young man makes up his mind that he is going to be a sailor, and he knows that in a certain emergency he may be called to a distinguished position of rank in the service of his country, he is a little more apt to take up that business than he would if he knew he was to remain a common sailor all his life or even if he should succeed in becoming the captain of a merchant ship. That is what I was trying to suggest.

Above all, I should like to see the sailors paid a sum sufficient to induce them to go into the service. As suggested by the Senator from Nevada, \$50 on an average is not enough, in my opinion. When the Senator from New Hampshire cites Great Britain there is no parallel, because Great Britain has a different class of population, that can not secure the wages which the men in this country whom we would like to bring into this reserve can secure. I think we had better pay a million and a half dollars to that class of men than pay it out in a great many ways that we are paying it out now. We might economize somewhere else if we feel too poor to establish a good, substantial American naval reserve.

Mr. GALLINGER. On that point, Mr. President, I think I would be quite as much disposed to treat these men overgenerously as any other Senator; and it may be that the amount named is not as high as it ought to be. It is much higher than Great Britain pays. The Navy Department sent—

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. Allow me to finish the sentence. The Navy Department sent the schedule to me, and I called some gentlemen in conference who had to do with the construction of this bill. The Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] raised the objection that the amounts suggested by the Navy Department were too low, and under his guidance the amounts were increased and were made what they are in the bill at the present time. The Senator from Florida, I think, was satisfied—and he has a great deal of knowledge on this question; I am sorry he is detained from the Chamber by illness to-day—that these amounts would be sufficient, but if it is thought otherwise, I certainly will not resist any reasonable increase.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. The first section of the bill as amended provides for a naval reserve, as I understand, and all the sailors and officers engaged in the coasting trade and the foreign trade are eligible to become members of the naval reserve, and they are to be paid a small amount, ranging from a hundred and ten dollars, I think, to \$24 a year in addition to the amount they receive from the owners of the ships on which they are working.

I should like to ask the Senator whether we are creating the naval reserve because we need it for the purpose of national defense, or are simply paying the men this amount by the Government in order to increase the wages of American sailors? Is not that the real object and purpose of this feature of the bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator, it is not. We are creating this reserve substantially for the same purpose that we are maintaining, at an enormous expense to the Government, the militia in the several States.

Mr. CLAY. I will ask the Senator this question. I understand the object and purpose of this legislation is to have American products carried in American bottoms to foreign countries. That is the principal object and purpose of the bill. At this time there is no general complaint that we have not a large foreign trade, but as a matter of pride we are anxious to have our manufactured products and our farm products carried in American bottoms.

I will ask the Senator why it is necessary to pay a bounty to the sailor engaged in the coasting trade? If you are trying to have your American products carried in American bottoms, why is it necessary that those engaged in the coasting trade and in the trade on the Great Lakes shall be included?

Mr. GALLINGER. For the simple reason that the naval-reserve feature of the bill has nothing whatever to do with the

proposition of carrying American goods in American bottoms or of extending American trade. It is an entirely separate and distinct proposition, and it was found that if we confined the naval-reserve feature to the foreign trade, we had so few American sailors that we would not have any naval reserve.

Mr. CLAY. Does the Senator intend to say that the naval reserve is to be created, not with a view of helping and of developing the shipping interest of the country, but purely for purposes of national defense?

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, indirectly—

Mr. CLAY. Do I understand the Senator to say that?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it accomplishes both purposes. I think it will give us a better class of seamen, and it will give us a force of seamen who in time of emergency will be of great value to the Government. It will serve that double purpose.

The purpose of this bill is not only to carry American products in American ships, but it is to extend American trade. We have not any too much foreign trade. It is a disgrace that we have not any more foreign trade in South America, for instance, and we hope by establishing lines there, run by Americans, which, in turn, will result in the establishment of American commercial houses in those countries, to extend very much our foreign trade.

We did find, in taking testimony, that some shippers complained very bitterly that they were sustaining great losses in shipping in foreign ships; that no attention was paid to their goods when they arrived at the foreign destination; that the foreigner was more interested in goods from his own country and in affairs that concerned his own people than he was in American products, and that if there were breakages, which frequently occurred to a very large extent, they could get no redress from the foreign shipowner.

We are of the opinion that when we get American ships we will not only carry American goods, exports and imports, in American bottoms, but that those ships, sailing to countries where our trade to-day is not as great as it ought to be, will result in a greatly increased trade for the American people; and in that way we believe, or at least some of us believe, that the expenditure provided for in this bill will be paid back many fold.

Mr. CLAY. As I understand, there was not any opposition to establishing new mail routes where needed. I believe the opposition to the bill simply insisted on striking out the second, third, and fourth sections. I never heard of any opposition to the feature which had reference to establishing new mail lines where they are needed.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I quite agree with the Senator from New Hampshire in the expression of regret that we have not direct trade with South America, as well as with other countries, but particularly South America. Some time, a week or so, ago there was a little colloquy between the Senator from New Hampshire and myself upon this subject, in which I endeavored to bring out the fact, under the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire himself, that so far as cargo ships were concerned they were not calculated to develop trade between the United States and any given port; that they were calculated for general trade and not for the development of any special line, and that the only hope, practically speaking, of the development of trade and the establishment of new lines between this country and certain given ports where we now have no lines of transportation was in the manner contemplated in the fifth and sixth sections of the bill, providing for liberal mail compensation to be given to ships which would run between this country and those given ports.

Now, I am very much in sympathy with that part of the bill, as stated by my colleague, and I would be willing to go a very considerable length in that direction. I believe it is a matter of extreme importance that this trade should be developed; that we should have the lines of communication which would enable us to develop that trade. I am, on the contrary, not favorable to the other part of the bill, and for the purpose of giving the opportunity for a test of that question and as an earnest of good faith in the matter, stating I am willing to support this bill so far as it relates to giving a liberal mail compensation for those routes, I offer the amendment which I now send to the desk, to strike out the first four sections of the bill. I ask that it may be printed and lie on the table for action at the time contemplated by the unanimous-consent order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia offers an amendment, which will be printed.

Mr. BACON. It may be stated.

Mr. KEAN. Let it be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out from the bill sections 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the discussion of the

day ends, simply as a matter of information—I do not expect thereby to change anybody's opinion concerning this bill or any feature of it—I want to read a dispatch which was sent out from Washington. It is taken from a Boston paper, and I have seen it in the New York papers, under date of February 10:

SWIFT LINE TO CHILE—CONGRESS OF THAT COUNTRY APPROPRIATES \$250,000 ANNUALLY TO ESTABLISH STEAMSHIP COMPANY TO PANAMA.

WASHINGTON, February 10, 1906.

The Chilean legation has been informed that the Chilean Congress has just appropriated \$250,000 annually for a steamship line to establish more direct communication between Valparaiso, Chile, and Panama. The trip now takes twenty-two to twenty-four days, because ships make frequent and long stops in towns on the coasts of Chile and Peru.

It is the intention of the Chilean Government that ships shall make the trip in a much shorter time, thereby establishing a much more rapid connection with New Orleans and New York and other American harbors.

This shows that poor little Chile is ready to spend a quarter of a million dollars a year to establish a line of steamships to extend her commerce. I have the profoundest hope and expectation that this great country of ours, which has wealth in excess of the combined wealth of England and France of \$5,000,000,000, will not haggle a great while about giving some aid to our shipping, so that we may extend our commerce to foreign countries.

Mr. BACON. The Senator will note that the particular enterprise upon which Chile is about to enter is of the very class I have just alluded to as that which I would myself prefer.

Mr. GALLINGER. Precisely.

Mr. BACON. It is the establishment of lines of transportation between given points.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. BACON. I am willing to assist properly in that direction.

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not read this item in criticism of anything the Senator said.

Mr. BACON. I understand.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand the Senator's position.

Mr. BACON. But I desired, as the Senator gave such a fine opportunity, to make application of it in support of the suggestion I made.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am delighted to have the Senator's support for half the bill. I hope he will see additional light and vote for the bill in its entirety to-morrow at 5 o'clock.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, there has been handed to me at my desk a letter from the president of the American Federation of Labor, having reference to something in the pending bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The communication referred to is as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., February 13, 1906.

HON. WILLIAM B. ALLISON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: The Senate of the United States has before it and under consideration S. 529, commonly known as the "subsidy bill." Bills of a similar character before previous Congresses have been given considerable attention by the working people of our country and their views expressed thereon, and particularly is this so in reference to the principle involved as well as certain features of the bill in the third session of the last Congress, being H. R. 17098. Comparison and perusal of this bill with S. 529 shows a marked similarity in purpose, method, and principle, and it is both the presentation to you and through you to the Senate of the United States that I am impelled to address this letter to you.

October, 1905, Mr. Daniel J. Keefe, president of the International Longshoremen's Association and vice-president of the American Federation of Labor, requested an opinion from me upon the subsidy bill (H. R. 17098), and because a perusal of my reply to him and because I am convinced that in effect the reply applies equally to the present subsidy bill (S. 529) I quote that letter herein. It is as follows:

"Thus far I have been unable to write one word of my reports, the other work requiring so much of my attention. In spite of being overwhelmingly busy, I have tried to comply with the request contained in your favor of October 12 in regard to the Grosvenor bill, H. R. 17098, of the Fifty-eighth Congress, third session, being a bill on the merchant marine and fisheries, commonly known as the 'subsidy bill.'"

"I have also read the report of the committee, Report No. 4136, Fifty-eighth Congress, third session, House of Representatives, and which accompanied H. R. 17098. Of course I do not pretend to say that I have thoroughly digested the provisions of the bill and report. To make any such claim would be futile, because it would require thorough study to entitle one to reach conclusions upon which one can so definitely assert.

"However, from a casual reading and a fair conception of their purport, as well as some experience with measures of this character, I submit to you the following tentative conclusions, which were forced upon my mind, or, rather, I submit the following for your consideration in connection with this subject:

"In connection therewith I need not, however, mention the fact that the American Federation of Labor has repeatedly and almost unanimously declared against the ship-subsidy bills that have been introduced in the various Federal Congresses. I only need briefly call your attention to the few points to which I shall refer.

"You will observe on page 5 of the bill, from line 13 to 16, inclusive, there is a provision that if one-sixth of the crew are American citizens of the United States, or men who have declared their intention to become citizens, that the vessel shall be entitled to subvention.

In other words, five-sixths of the crew may not only be aliens, but could be Asiatics, and in view of the fact that the tendency of the ship companies, like other employers, is toward a desire to get the cheapest possible labor, it is not difficult to understand that the shipping companies receiving this subsidy would hire as many of the aliens as possible—that is, five-sixths of the crew—at a low wage, and through this means endeavor to force down the wages of the one-sixth of the crew necessary to be employed to entitle it to the subsidy.

"On page 6 of the bill you will find a provision that a vessel shall not be entitled to the subsidy unless the members of the crew shall be enrolled as naval volunteers, and on page 2 of the bill it provides that they shall be enrolled for a period of three years, during which they shall be subject to render service on call of the President in time of war."

"One can readily see that the shipping masters will make the enrollment into the naval volunteer service a condition precedent to such employment, and that the failure or refusal of a seaman to enroll as a volunteer in the Navy, and subject to a call in time of war, will be sufficient cause for shipping masters to refuse to give these men employment at all.

"Of course every American must feel, and should feel, that in time of need Americans should readily respond to the call for troops on land or sea to defend the interests and honor of our country, but I believe you will agree with me that when a man's employment in times of peace depends upon his enlistment in either the Army or the Navy that such a provision is tantamount to compulsory enlistment, and practically constitutes conscription.

"Then, again, on pages 11 and 12 you will find that a tax or duty is imposed upon foreign vessels carrying products to the United States of from 8 cents to 16 cents tonnage per year. It is not difficult to discern that every cent of such taxation will be placed upon the products which the people of the United States will have to pay on every article they consume, at any rate during the period from the enactment of the bill until every article brought from a foreign country is brought in ships flying our flag. And surely between such period and the entire carrying of foreign trade by American vessels a considerable time will elapse.

"In the entire bill there is not one provision that makes one solitary gain for the men who make their living by going down to the sea in ships.

"In the report of the committee a pious wish is expressed that other committees of Congress should take this matter into consideration, but these perfunctory declarations mean little or nothing. If the committee had any idea for the improvement of the condition of the seamen, they certainly could have drafted it in the bill they had under consideration.

"I regret that I have not any more time to devote to the consideration of this matter, but the above is submitted to your careful consideration as the conclusions reached at the first flush after reading and noting the contents of the bill and the report of the committee. You will, of course, understand that I am not an expert in maritime affairs. I speak from the standpoint of the layman who has had some little experience in dealing with matters of this character, and in that spirit and understanding I ask you to accept it for what it is worth."

Omit from this quoted letter the word "volunteer" and substitute the words of the present bill, "naval reserve," and the applicability will thus be obvious.

It may not be amiss to call attention to the fact that on page 4, lines 6 to 9, in accordance with the provisions therein stated, the seamen coming under the operation of the bill, if it were enacted into law, would, while employed by private concerns, still be subject to such orders and regulations as the Government, through its Secretary of the Navy, may prescribe, again making conscription practically absolute as a condition for the employment of a seaman on a private vessel.

On page 5, lines 3 to 11, the following language occurs:

"Such retainer shall be paid at the end of each year of service on certificate, by an officer to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, that the member of the Naval Reserve has satisfactorily complied with the regulations, and, on certificate by the Commissioner of Navigation, that such member has served satisfactorily for at least six months of the preceding twelve months on vessels of the United States in the merchant marine or in the deep-sea fisheries."

In other words, this provision of the bill makes the seaman who has entered in the Naval Reserve dependent upon the whim and fancy, favoritism and displeasure of his private employer before even the seaman may receive the Government's largess.

Without discussing further the general principles of the bill, it appeals to me with irresistible force that the particular features of the bill to which I have addressed myself should commend themselves sufficiently strong to you, so that they may act as a protest against their enactment into law.

The workmen of America love our country, and there are no more loyal in all the masses of the people than are those who are enrolled in the membership of the trade unions of our country. It is in their name that I address you, and suggest further that wisdom and foresight and patriotism, as well as economy, should suggest a definite method by which men, American by birth, citizenship, or sympathy may be recruited from the merchant marine of America for the naval strength of our country in times of stress and war as well as in peace.

Very respectfully, yours,

SAML. GOMPERS,
President American Federation of Labor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate requesting the President to return to the House of Representatives House bill 297, to authorize the construction of dams and power stations on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, for the purpose of amendment.

DECORATION FOR PROF. SIMON NEWCOMB.

Mr. SPOONER. I desire to withdraw the motion made by me on the 8th instant to reconsider the votes by which Senate bill 4198, granting permission to Prof. Simon Newcomb, United States Navy, retired, to accept the decoration of the order

"Pour le Mérite, für Wissenschaften und Künste," was ordered to a third reading, and passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin withdraws the motion to reconsider the votes by which Senate bill 4198 was ordered to a third reading, and passed. The Chair hears no objection, and the bill stands passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KEAN. 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 seventeen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 14, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 13, 1906.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

George E. Anderson, of Illinois, now consul at Amoy, to be consul-general of the United States at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

CONSUL.

Albert R. Morawetz, of Arizona, now consul at Nogales, to be consul of the United States at Bahai, Brazil.

TERRITORIAL ASSOCIATE JUSTICE.

Benjamin F. Burwell, of Oklahoma, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma.

SECRETARY OF NEW MEXICO.

James W. Reynolds, of New Mexico, to be secretary of New Mexico, to take effect January 13, 1906.

MARSHALS.

John R. Abernathy, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the Territory of Oklahoma.

James M. Millikan, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of North Carolina.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Elwell S. Crosby, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Bath, in the State of Maine.

Myron H. McCord, of Arizona, to be collector of customs for the district of Arizona, in the Territory of Arizona.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Harry B. Ward to be postmaster at Duquoin, in the county of Perry and State of Illinois.

Augustus Gibson to be postmaster at McLeansboro, in the county of Hamilton and State of Illinois.

Harley R. Moberly to be postmaster at Windsor, in the county of Shelby and State of Illinois.

James W. Prouty to be postmaster at Roseville, in the county of Warren and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

Luther D. Branden to be postmaster at Greensburg, in the county of Decatur and State of Indiana.

Robert L. Cox to be postmaster at Fowler, in the county of Benton and State of Indiana.

James H. Jones to be postmaster at Newcastle, in the county of Henry and State of Indiana.

Willis L. McCampbell to be postmaster at Middletown, in the county of Henry and State of Indiana.

Albert V. Randall to be postmaster at Shelbyville, in the county of Shelby and State of Indiana.

MISSOURI.

Clarence Conger to be postmaster at Unionville, in the county of Putnam and State of Missouri.

NEW YORK.

David W. Cornell to be postmaster at Chappaqua, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Frank A. McCoy to be postmaster at North Tonawanda, in the county of Niagara and State of New York.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

John E. Sullivan to be postmaster at Plankinton, in the county of Aurora and State of South Dakota.

TENNESSEE.

Joseph N. Ellis to be postmaster at Jefferson City, in the county of Jefferson and State of Tennessee.

Monroe C. Monday to be postmaster at Knoxville, in the county of Knox and State of Tennessee.

John M. Wooten to be postmaster at Morristown, in the county of Hamblen and State of Tennessee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 13, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ST. FRANCIS RIVER, IN CLAY COUNTY, ARK.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13567) to authorize the Campbell Lumber Company to construct a bridge across the St. Francis River, in Clay County, Ark., at or near the point where the section line between sections 21 and 28, township 19 north, range 9 east, touches said river.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from Arkansas if this bill has been approved by the War Department?

Mr. MACON. Yes, sir; and is so indicated in the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

On motion of Mr. MACON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS PERDIDO RIVER AT WATERS FERRY, ALA.

Mr. WILEY of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk with amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13548) to authorize the commissioners' court of Baldwin County, Ala., to construct a bridge across Perdido River at Waters Ferry.

The bill was read at length.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. WILEY of Alabama, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title:

S. R. 32. Joint resolution instructing the Interstate Commerce Commission to make examinations into the subject of railroad discriminations and monopolies, and report on the same from time to time.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution (S. R. 32) instructing the Interstate Commerce Commission to make examinations into the subject of railroad discriminations and monopolies, and report on the same from time to time—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BRIDGE ACROSS ARKANSAS RIVER, VAN BUREN, ARK.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill. Without objection, the Clerk will read the substitute.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, before the reading of the bill, I want to call attention to the fact there is a proviso left in the bill which was left in inadvertently. It will be found on page 7, lines 23 to 25, inclusive. The bill as reported was intended to be in accordance with one previously passed by the House, but that provision was left in there by inadvertence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I understood the Chair asked whether there was objection to the consideration of the bill. The bill has not been read, or even the title.

Mr. REID. The bill conforms exactly to a bill which passed the House a few days ago, and that proviso is asked to be stricken out to make it conform in that respect to that bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I think we should have the bill read.

Mr. REID. That is the substitute.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2106) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near Van Buren, Ark.

The substitute was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, in order to make the bill conform exactly to the requirements, I would ask unanimous consent to strike out the provision on page 7, lines 23 to 25, inclusive. This proviso was inadvertently put in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. REID. Also, on page 9, in line 13, strike out the word "two" and insert "one." Also, in line 14 strike out "five" and insert "three."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read the third time; was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. REID, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COINAGE, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SOUTHARD] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPRINT OF BILL.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask for a reprint of the bill (H. R. 8988) to fix the standard of weights and measures by the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for reprint of the bill H. R. 7980. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NEW JUDICIAL DISTRICT.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8977) to create a new division of the western judicial district of Texas and to provide for terms of court at Del Rio, Tex., and for a clerk for said court, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the counties of Uvalde, Zavalla, Maverick, Kinney, Edwards, Valverde, Terrell, Pecos, and Brewster shall constitute a division of the western judicial district of Texas.

Sec. 2. That terms of the circuit and district courts of the United States for the said western district of Texas shall be held twice in each year at the city of Del Rio, in Valverde County, and that, until otherwise provided by law, the judges of said courts shall fix the times at which said courts shall be held at Del Rio, of which they shall make publication and give due notice.

Sec. 3. That all civil process issued against persons resident in the said counties of Uvalde, Zavalla, Maverick, Kinney, Edwards, Valverde, Terrell, Pecos, and Brewster, and cognizable before the United States courts, shall be made returnable to the courts, respectively, to be held at the city of Del Rio, and all prosecutions for offenses committed in any of said counties shall be tried in the appropriate United States court at the city of Del Rio: *Provided*, That no process issued or prosecution commenced or suit instituted before the passage of this bill shall be in any way affected by the provisions hereof.

Sec. 4. That the clerks of the circuit and district courts of said division shall maintain an office, in charge of themselves or a deputy, at the said city of Del Rio, which shall be kept open at all times for the transaction of the business of said division.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if there is any public building lurking around in this bill anywhere?

Mr. GARNER. I would say to the gentleman from New York that there is not just at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. But that is the final goal?

Mr. GARNER. No; I can not say that it is.

Mr. PAYNE. Is there any other reason for the bill except that?

Mr. GARNER. Oh, yes; there is no question about that.

Mr. PAYNE. I wish the gentleman would state it.

Mr. GARNER. The people in that section have to travel

from 100 to 420 miles to get to court at the present time in the territory embraced in this bill.

Mr. PAYNE. How much would the distance be shortened by this bill?

Mr. GARNER. From 35 to 250 miles. There are nine counties embraced in the bill, and it will be of great advantage to the Government in the saving of fees of witnesses in attendance at the court.

Mr. PAYNE. Is there any place now where they can hold the court?

Mr. GARNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAYNE. Where is it?

Mr. GARNER. The county court-house.

Mr. PAYNE. Do they get free use of that?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. I hope the House will confine them to that.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "Edwards" and "Brewster" wherever they occur in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GARNER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ST. FRANCIS RIVER.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 13568) to authorize the Campbell Lumber Company to construct a bridge across the St. Francis River, in Clay County, Ark., at or near the point where the section line between sections 23 and 26 in township 20 north, range 9 east, touches said river.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill in full.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

On motion of Mr. MACON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF THE MAILS.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a privileged resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GILLESPIE] desires to offer a privileged resolution. The Clerk will report the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish the House, at his earliest convenience, a comparative statement showing the cost to the Government for the transportation of the mails per ton per mile by the railroads and the cost of transporting express matter per ton per mile by the railroads.

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's motion?

Mr. GILLESPIE. I move that the committee be discharged from the consideration of the resolution and that it be put upon its passage.

Mr. PAYNE. I make the point of order that is is not privileged. It calls for an investigation by the Post-Office Department.

The SPEAKER. The Chair notices that this resolution provides that the Postmaster-General be requested to furnish the House, at his earliest convenience, a comparative statement showing the cost to the Government for the transportation of mails per ton per mile by the railroads, and the cost of transporting express matter per ton per mile by the railroads. The doubt in the mind of the Chair is that this calls for information touching a matter that is not at all under the Postmaster-General, so far as express matter is concerned; and therefore, it would seem that if the resolution were to be adopted, that it would set on foot an investigation in the Post-Office Department. The Chair will hear the gentleman upon the proposition as to whether the latter clause, covering the cost of transporting express matter per ton per mile, does not destroy the privileged character of the resolution.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, it only calls for that information provided it is in possession of the Postmaster-Gen-

eral, and goes to the merit of the resolution rather than its privileged character. If he has not that information he will report that he has not got it and that will end the matter.

The SPEAKER. Ah; but it seems to the Chair, and the Chair suggests to the gentleman that the language goes further—that he furnish the House at his earliest convenience a comparative statement showing the cost for transporting mails and the cost of transporting express matter. Now, it might be assumed that if he does not have the information he will so report; but it will also be assumed that he will be required to enter into an inquiry that might detail much of expense or might not. It is not for the Chair to pass upon that matter. The only thing the Chair has to pass upon is, when the point of order is made, as to whether taking the two together destroys the privilege of the first. Much of inference here has to be indulged in before the point of order could be overruled.

Mr. PAYNE. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the latter part of the resolution being nonprivileged matter, of course it destroys the privilege of the resolution, according to uniform rulings heretofore. The information as to express companies can not be assumed or presumed to be in the knowledge of the Postmaster-General, for that Department has nothing to do with that. On the contrary, the presumption is they know nothing about it and must make an investigation. Now, that calls for something besides information; it calls for an investigation by the Department; and that being nonprivileged destroys the privileged character of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas. The Chair must take notice, as each Member must take notice, somewhat of the various Departments of the Government charged with administration of law. Now, the Chair knows that by a general provision of law certain duties devolve upon the Post-Office Department and certain duties upon the Department of Commerce and Labor and certain other duties on the Treasury Department and certain other duties upon a commission that is not under any Department, as the Interstate Commerce Commission. So that any ruling the Chair might make necessarily involves something of knowledge of the organization of the Government. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, upon the line suggested by the Chair: Is it not proper to state that when the Postmaster-General has to make these contracts with the railroads for carrying the mail he would investigate what kind of a contract he should make? And he certainly has data properly bearing upon this subject in his possession.

The SPEAKER. Just at that point—because the gentleman from Texas and the Chair are at one about this resolution—the Chair must take notice that contracts with the railways are regulated by law, and the service is performed without regard to a contract, when it is performed at all, by the railway, of course, and when the service is performed the compensation, whether under contract or without contract, is absolutely controlled by statute.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, on the proposition raised by the gentleman from New York I understand the rule to be that a resolution upon its face must call for an investigation in order to destroy the privileged character. Now, if you arrive at that by argument or inference, that does not destroy the privileged character of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. On the contrary, the Chair suggests to the gentleman that he must resort to argument to sustain the privileged character of the resolution.

Mr. GILLESPIE. I believe the rule just the other way, Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the Speaker.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GILLESPIE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi such time as he needs to discuss the point.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution requests the Postmaster-General to furnish a comparative statement showing the cost to the Government—that is, the actual cost now—from data necessarily in the possession of the Postmaster-General. It requires nothing, as I understand it, except the collocating of information now in the possession of the Post-Office Department—the cost to the Government for the transportation of the mails per ton per mile, and the cost of transporting express matter per ton per mile, by the railroads. The Postmaster-General has in his possession the information showing the number of tons and the cost both of the express matter and of the transportation of the mails in the ordinary way along the railroads. Undoubtedly if it required an investigation in order to arrive at the facts to be reported to the House the point made by the gentleman from New York would be well taken, but this does not necessarily require that. It not only does not neces-

sarily require it, but it does not properly or incidentally require it. All that is asked of the Postmaster-General is such information as he has. There is no request that he make an investigation to get other information at all, as I understand this resolution. I have read it hastily, because this is the first time I have seen it. My attention was not called to it. Perhaps it might have been made a little bit plainer by saying "a comparative statement from data now in his possession," and if that point is made I have no doubt the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GILLESPIE] would be perfectly willing to put in those words; but it seems to me it is not necessary that they should be put in, because that is what the resolution naturally and without any forced or strained construction must mean.

Mr. GILLESPIE rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, I can only say that if the House should entertain the resolution upon its merits I would agree to the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that the resolution, requesting the Postmaster-General to report the cost to the Government of transporting the mails per ton per mile by the railroads, if it stopped there, would be a privileged resolution under the rule; but when it adds "and the cost of transporting express matter per ton per mile by the railroads," it does not cover a question of privilege under the rule, and it is only the question of privilege that is to be considered. The gentleman arises in his place and makes his motion to discharge the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads from further consideration of this resolution, because, a week having elapsed since it was referred to that committee, it has not reported the same back. In other words, the rule enables the gentleman, if he has the proper case under the rule, to halt the consideration of all other resolutions that are not privileged and the ordinary business of the House, and to halt the House in the consideration of business upon the Calendars from the various committees, and dispose of this resolution by virtue of this rule. Now, if the motion does not prevail and it is not a question of privilege, the resolution remains with the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads for disposition under the rules of the House, the same as other business.

Now, the uniform ruling of the Chair in former Congresses and in this Congress has been by construction not to enlarge the matter of privilege in these cases. It does seem, following the precedents for the orderly transaction of business in the House, that the construction holding the resolution privileged should be strict, and in the opinion of the Chair the latter clause of the resolution is not privileged and vitiates the resolution as a question of privilege. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

UNITED STATES COURT, DUNCAN, IND. T.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 436) establishing a United States court and recording district at Duncan, Ind. T., and conforming other districts therewith.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to the places now provided by law for holding courts in the southern judicial district of Indian Territory courts shall be held in the town of Duncan, and all laws regulating the holding of the courts in the Indian Territory shall be applicable to the said court hereby created in the said town of Duncan.

SEC. 2. That the territory described in this section shall be known as recording district No. 27, beginning at a point where township line between townships 2 and 3 north reaches the east boundary line of Oklahoma Territory; thence east on said township line 24 miles to where it intersects with range line 3 and 4 west; thence south on said range line 12 miles to where it intersects the base line between townships 1 north and 1 south; thence east along said base line 6 miles to the range line between ranges 2 and 3 west; thence south 12 miles along said range line to the township line between townships 2 and 3 south; thence west 30 miles along said township line to where it intersects with the east line of Oklahoma Territory; thence north along said line 24 miles to the place of beginning.

SEC. 3. That the present boundaries of recording district No. 18, in the Indian Territory, is hereby amended so as to read as follows: Beginning at a point at the South Canadian River where the same intersects the range line between ranges 3 and 4 east; thence south on said range line to a section line 3 miles south of the township line between townships 4 and 5 north; thence west on said line to the meridian line between ranges 4 and 5 west; thence north on said meridian line to the South Canadian River; thence down said South Canadian River, following the meanderings thereof, to the place of beginning. The place of record for district No. 18 shall be Purcell.

SEC. 4. That the present boundaries of recording district No. 17, in the Indian Territory, is hereby amended so as to read as follows: Beginning at a point 3 miles south of the township line between townships 4 and 5 north where said line intersects with the range line between ranges 3 and 4 east; thence south along said range line to the base line; thence west on said base line to the meridian line between ranges 4 and 5 west; thence north on said meridian line to a section

line 3 miles south of the township line between townships 4 and 5 north; thence east on said section line to the place of beginning. The place of record for district No. 17 shall be Pauls Valley.

Sec. 5. That it is further provided that all the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 19, 1903, shall apply to districts Nos. 17, 18, and 27 where applicable. That all laws or parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman what committee reports this bill?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is unanimously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. This was the only bill that was left over from yesterday on the call of that committee. The bill would have been the next one to come up.

Mr. PAYNE. The Judiciary Committee can call it up on the call of committees.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Their call has been exhausted. I understand they have had their two days already, and it would be impossible now for them to call this bill up. It is the only one that was left on their calendar.

Mr. PAYNE. Is there any special haste for this legislation?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No; except this bill has passed the House twice and failed, for want of time, to pass the Senate. There is no objection to it whatever.

Mr. PAYNE. It has never been considered at either time, has it?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It was considered when it passed the House. It was considered by the committee both times, and by the House. There was some discussion about it. I will state to the gentleman that this lays off three districts 30 miles square on the Rock Island Railroad on the west side of the Indian Territory. Along the Santa Fe road there are four courts, while on the Rock Island there are only two. There is 100 miles scope of country there with only two courts, one near the Red River and another one near the northern boundary, lying about 80 miles apart. This will divide the distance and give Duncan a court, and leave the intervening space only 40 miles. Three-quarters of the business goes from Duncan to the other courts, and it is unfair to the people. It will be a saving to the United States Government with no expense to the Government. The same clerks will have charge. United States Judge Thompson has recommended the passage of the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the bill create a new county and a new county seat?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Only a recording district. We have no counties in the Indian Territory, and that is the reason why we have the boundaries laid off. In place of counties we have recording districts, and the recording district and the court district is the same.

Mr. PAYNE. That is a local court?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. A local court, and the United States judge requests Congress to pass the bill. There will be a saving to the United States Government in the way of witness fees. This town has three or four thousand people, and is the largest town on the line, except Chickasha, which now has a court.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think bills of this character ought to come up in the regular way, but I will not interpose any objection to the bill this morning.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas a question.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. Is this not the same bill that there was trouble about in the Fifty-seventh Congress, where, after the Speaker's signature was attached to it, it had to be canceled and withdrawn?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think it is.

Mr. LACEY. Ought not this bill to be considered by the Committee on Territories, as it makes practically a new county?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I can not say whether the Committee on Territories ought to have it or not, but the Judiciary Committee has always passed on these bills for new places to hold courts.

Mr. LACEY. Which committee passed upon it in the Fifty-seventh Congress?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think the Judiciary Committee did. When a bill is introduced creating a court or changing the place for holding a court, it is always sent to the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

On motion of Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, a motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14171) 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; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to three hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the other half by myself.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that for the present no agreement as to time be made, and that perhaps we can get through quicker.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Inasmuch as an agreement can not be made unless we make it now, I will ask the gentleman if he will not consent to a slightly longer time. We have no one on this side who wishes to speak except on the bill itself, and it is not our purpose to have general debate on other subjects.

Mr. FITZGERALD. One or two gentlemen have suggested that they might wish to speak on this bill, and perhaps they will not use any time at all.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will not the gentleman consent to three and a half hours?

Mr. FITZGERALD. As far as I am concerned, unless some gentleman on this side wishes to occupy some time, I have no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gentleman will agree to three hours or three and a half I will agree to grant some time from this side to gentlemen on that side if they require it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That will be satisfactory to me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to three and one-half hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the other half by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. SMITH of Iowa was then agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the fortifications appropriation bill, with Mr. CURRIER in the chair.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill.

During the reading of the bill,

Mr. McNARY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws his objection. Without objection, the Clerk will dispense with the further reading of the bill.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, before addressing myself to the details of the bill now pending, I desire to call attention briefly to the methods by which money may be drawn from the Federal Treasury. There are three distinct kinds, or classes, of laws under which money may be paid out of the Treasury.

First. Laws making ordinary annual appropriations. These are only available for contracts made or expenses actually incurred during the fiscal year for which such appropriations are made, and under the so-called "covering-in act" of 1874 are not so available after two years from the end of the fiscal year.

Second. Laws providing for what are called continuing appropriations, which provide that the money appropriated shall be available until expended. Of this character are the appropriations for rivers and harbors, for public buildings under the Treasury and at Soldiers' Homes, for the pay of the Navy and Marine Corps for the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made, for fortifications, and all those laws which specially provide that the money appropriated shall be available until expended; laws with reference to life-saving stations always contain this provision. The provision of the Constitution that Congress shall not appropriate money for the support of an Army for more than two years is not held to be applicable to appropriations for fortifications.

Third. Laws providing for what are called "permanent appropriations." Permanent appropriations are of two classes, definite and indefinite. Definite permanent appropriations may

be illustrated by the standing appropriation of \$5,500,000 a year for the collection of customs duties. The Secretary of the Treasury is annually entitled to take that sum and spend it in the collection of customs without any appropriating act by Congress. There are other definite permanent appropriations, but this is illustrative of the class. There are two types of indefinite permanent appropriations.

There are acts providing that all the receipts from a specific source may be utilized for a given purpose; these are indefinite, because it is uncertain what the receipts will be, as, for example, it is provided that the head tax of \$2 apiece upon immigrants may be used so far as necessary for the payment of the expenses of the Immigration Service. This appropriation is indefinite for two reasons: It is indefinite because it is uncertain what the receipts will be from the head tax and uncertain how much the Department will deem it necessary to expend of those receipts. A second class of indefinite permanent appropriations is to be found in those laws which provide that certain expenses of the Government may be paid out of the Treasury, and it is uncertain as to what those expenses will amount to. This last type may be illustrated in this way: If an American diplomatic or consular officer starts to his station in a foreign land he is entitled to pay from the time he starts, and the man who is returning is entitled to pay until he arrives here. This overlap of pay of diplomatic and consular officers is allowed to be paid out of the Treasury without any act appropriating the money therefor. Among other of these indefinite permanent appropriations may be found the provision for the sinking fund and the payment of the interest upon the public debt. The expenditures from the Treasury under so-called "permanent appropriations" amount now to \$140,000,000 a year and more. The various committees of this House with authority to bring in appropriation bills have nothing to do with past expenditures, save as information upon that subject throws light on future needs. Their primary duty is to ascertain what is needed for the future, not what has been done with past appropriations. Of course, information upon that subject is highly instructive as to what is actually needed for the future, but this Government is now expending about \$800,000,000 a year, or about \$660,000,000 aside from that expended on the permanent appropriations. Of this, about \$640,000,000 are on reports from the four committees—on Military Affairs, on Naval Affairs, on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and the Committee on Appropriations.

It is beyond the power of these committees unaided to fully examine in detail all the past expenditures of the various Departments, and in addition perform their primary duty of ascertaining the amount needed for the future. While the committees make a cursory examination of what has been done with the funds heretofore appropriated for the subjects under consideration by these committees, as we do not have to appropriate the money used in paying the more than \$140,000,000 on what are called "permanent appropriations," no committee makes any investigation whatever of the expenditures under the permanent appropriation laws. We have a cursory examination of expenditures under the annual appropriation bills, a similar investigation of appropriations available until expended, and none at all of the expenditure of \$140,000,000 a year under the permanent appropriation laws of Congress. Rule X of this House provides for the appointment of ten committees of seven members each, one on expenditures in each of the Executive Departments, and one on expenditures on public buildings. Rule XI provides that all proposed legislation—the subjects relating to the examination of the accounts and expenditures of the several Departments of the Government and the manner of keeping the same, the economy, justness, and correctness of such expenditures, their conformity with appropriation laws, the proper application of public moneys, the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands, retrenchment, the enforcement of the payment of moneys due to the United States, the economy and accountability of public officers, the abolishment of useless offices, the reduction or increase of the pay of officers—shall all be subjects within the jurisdiction of the nine standing committees on the public expenditures in the several Departments.

The language of this rule leaves us gravely in doubt about whether it was contemplated that these committees should do more than consider proposed legislation on subjects within their jurisdiction. Whatever may have been the original purpose, these committees have long since ceased to be regarded as charged with the duty of conducting any investigation of the expenditures in the Departments. If under suitable amendment to the rules these committees should be specifically charged to annually investigate all expenditures of the Departments and

report to the House, misappropriation and extravagance would be speedily discovered and done away with. The House was astonished a few days ago to find that the Attorney-General had authorized an expenditure of about \$2,600 out of the contingent fund of his Department for the purchase of an oil painting of his predecessor; but if these committees on expenditures in the Departments were vitalized, as I have suggested, and performed their functions, this House would know that the Attorney-General was simply following a practice of his predecessors for years, and simply following the practice of the head of every Executive Department of this Government for years; that not only have paintings been purchased of Cabinet officers out of the contingent fund, but of important subordinate officers in the Departments, until to-day in the older Departments the oil paintings—alleged works of art, supposed to portray the features of long-forgotten statesmen—have so accumulated that they have to hang them in double and triple tiers upon the walls; and the question is now, not where to get expensive oil paintings to decorate the walls, but where to get walls on which to hang the oil paintings. [Applause.] The time has arrived when this Government, with its \$800,000,000 of annual expenditures, should authorize somebody representing the Congress as the appropriating power to examine, investigate, and report the expenditures of the appropriations that we make. [Applause.]

If these committees on expenditures in Departments can not be vitalized, then some other system must be devised by which the Congress shall be advised as to how well and how faithfully these vast sums are expended by the officers in whose charge we place them. But not only would the vitalizing of these committees and making of each a standing inquisition of one of these Departments confer the benefits I have suggested, but their work, if well done, would be of incalculable benefit to the appropriating committees of this House in determining what amount should be given for future needs.

In the fortifications act of March 3, 1885, passed in the closing hours of the Forty-eighth Congress, it was provided that the President appoint a board consisting of the Secretary of War as president, two engineer officers, two ordnance officers, two naval officers, and two civilians (which subsequently became known as the "Endicott board," after Hon. William C. Endicott, Secretary of War), which board was to report where fortifications or other defenses were most urgently required and the kind and character of defense best adapted for each and the utilization of mines or other defensive appliances. This board reported to the Forty-ninth Congress January 26, 1886, but that Congress made no appropriation to carry out the plans of the board. The general plans of the Endicott board have been followed ever since, and Congress has every year since 1888 made more or less liberal appropriations to carry those plans into effect. In the twenty years since the report of the Endicott board vast changes have taken place in the approved styles of heavy guns and the ammunition used, which has revolutionized the methods of construction of batteries, and those and other changes led the President on January 31, 1905, to appoint a new board, with the Secretary of War at its head, to revise the plans of the Endicott board. This new board, known as the "Taft board," has not yet filed its report, but it is understood it will do so within a very few days.

This report will cover the insular possessions, as well as continental United States, and the estimates will probably for that reason exceed those of the Endicott board. It is estimated that the Endicott scheme, complete, would cost \$99,392,222. Since it was adopted we have appropriated for fortifications \$119,102,483.32, or nearly \$20,000,000 more than the whole estimated cost; but only \$64,094,042.24 has actually been expended under the scheme, and the difference of \$55,008,441.08 has been expended for gun factories, sites for fortifications, torpedoes, ammunition for service, test and practice, field guns, insular fortifications, and sundry other items. Because of the fact the appropriations for fortifications are available until expended, your committee deemed it their duty to ascertain how much was still unexpended under every item carried in the fortifications bill, and the accumulation of appropriations for the past eighteen years.

And it was discovered that the Treasury balances under the various fortification bills heretofore passed amount to \$8,356,245 more than any year's appropriation since the close of the Spanish war. This being, however, a line in which considerable time is required between appropriations and the final completion of the work, a balance is necessary, of some amount, to be always on hand. A gun such as is used on a modern fortification requires approximately two years to construct, and, of course, the work can not be commenced on it until appropriation is made. And so while we have diligently studied to find what

balances remain on hand under every item of this bill, we do not wish to be understood that because we found a balance equal to an annual appropriation that that shows no appropriation is at all necessary this year. The committee finding, however, this large balance of money already appropriated, the expenditure of which in the Government's gun shops will keep them busy for a considerable time, desirous of presenting a bill which should be as moderate as possible upon the one hand and still carry on the work of the fortification of our seaports upon the other, has presented for the consideration of the House a bill which appropriates \$4,838,993, far the smallest fortification bill presented to the House in the ten years since 1896.

Mr. ESCH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. ESCH. Was the gentleman's committee persuaded in making these reductions by the fact that the present coast defenses were undermanned, and that to continue fortifications would simply lead to the increase of the Artillery Corps?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gentleman will ask me that question in a moment, I will be glad to answer it.

Mr. ESCH. Very well.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I say the appropriation recommended is the smallest in ten years, or since 1896—almost two millions below last year's bill, and more than four millions below the estimates of the War Department, and nearly \$600,000 below the average appropriations for the past eighteen years. In this bill \$3,751,993 are appropriated for continental United States and \$1,087,000 for insular United States.

Turning now to the question propounded by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch], I may say that the question of the fortification of the ports of the United States involves this difficulty: I have already stated that the Endicott scheme contemplated the expenditure of about \$100,000,000, not a great sum to be expended in a period of twenty years. But unfortunately it appears that to man this Endicott scheme of fortifications, with each man theoretically serving twenty-four hours with no relief, would require about 38,000 men. Information as to the report of the Taft board is not yet official, but I am justified in saying that under the report of the Taft board the fortification of continental and insular United States would cost about \$106,000,000; that the fortifications when completed would require about 46,000 or 47,000 men to man them, each man serving twenty-four hours. The average expense carried in the army bill per man is about \$1,100, as I now recall it.

An artillery branch of the service sufficient to man continental and insular fortifications, as contemplated by the Taft board, would put an annual charge upon the people of \$50,000,000. So that the mere question of appropriating four or five millions a year for the advancement of the work of construction becomes of comparative insignificance as compared with this incurring of the necessity for the annual expenditure of \$50,000,000 for the skeleton artillery formation to hold the works. Not only that, but I think I am correct—and the gentleman who is upon the Committee on Military Affairs will set me right if I am wrong—the artillery branch now provided for is about 18,000 men, and that it is over 4,000 men short in the actual number of enlistments.

Mr. KAHN. Does the gentleman mean the artillery branch?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I mean the artillery branch.

Mr. KAHN. The entire Army is about 4,000 short.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. And is not that all in the artillery, according to the returns?

Mr. KAHN. That I do not know; I do not think so.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the statement of the Chief of Artillery is exactly as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith] has said.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. For some reason the shortage in enlistments in all the branches of the Army is found to be, substantially all of it, in the artillery branch. We are not able to man the fortifications we have now. But that perhaps is not a sufficient reason for not finishing them and keeping them modernized and up to date.

In many of the places the War Department has practically no men—simply a handful to keep the guns and machinery from deterioration; and this practically means that the existing fortifications would be of no use in time of need unless furnished with men not now in the service. So this committee, anxious that the country shall be reasonably prepared, but unwilling to crowd this work on and impose, not the slight cost of construction, but this enormous cost of maintenance, anxious at this time, when there is little of surplus revenue, if any, to be modest in its demands, has presented this bill.

Mr. GRAFF. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. GRAFF. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa what the conditions of our fortifications are now with reference to efficiency as compared with the fortifications of any of the great European powers?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In some respects they are in a superior condition to those of any other power in the world. We have now completed about two-thirds of the Endicott scheme, and have fortified all the principal points in continental United States. We have equipped those fortifications with the most modern guns. We have made, last year and this, a considerable appropriation to keep them modern. We have equipped them with a modern system of fire control which does not exist in the fortifications of any other power, an improvement which it is claimed by artillery officers increases their efficiency from 100 to 400 per cent.

I have thus briefly outlined the general character of this bill, and I rejoice to state that as to the great body of it the bill meets with the unanimous approval of all the members of the Committee on Appropriations. There is one item of this bill upon which a minority report has been filed, and upon that I desire to speak but briefly at this time.

From the time that we commenced to fortify our coast we have invariably made an appropriation of a gross sum for sites, a gross sum for batteries, a gross sum for guns. We have in no instance specifically mentioned the site or place where the money was to be expended. It is regarded as extremely unwise to notify all the nations of the earth just how extensive and complete are your fortifications at each specific point upon your coast, and for that reason, and because the War Department knows better than Congress as to how extensive the fortifications should be at each given point, we have always appropriated a gross sum and trusted to the War Department to expend it wisely in the proper locality. That policy has been a successful policy. No portion of this country claims that it has been neglected by the War Department in the distribution of these funds. I have never heard of any complaints upon that subject, and the policy has been one in harmony with the policy of every people upon that subject.

When the insular possessions came to be considered, we at first did the same for them. We appropriated a gross sum for sites in the insular possessions, another for batteries in the insular possessions, and a third for guns in the insular possessions. This year the bill has been slightly modified, because the committee did not think it wise to further expend money at present at Guantanamo; and so in place of the bill reading that certain sums are appropriated for the insular possessions for batteries it reads: That \$600,000 is appropriated for batteries for the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Most certainly.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Does the gentleman think it right, and will he state, if he does, how much of that \$600,000 will go to the Philippine Islands? I thought it was the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It is \$600,000 for the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands. I am not able to state, but I think about \$200,000.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Only \$200,000 goes to the Philippine Islands?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. To the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And the other \$400,000 goes to the Philippine Islands?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I think that will be the action of the War Department, but I do not know.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Is there anything in this appropriation which will commit this Government in any way to the selection of a permanent naval station in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Not one thing. The War Department is charged with the responsibility of determining where the greatest emergency for fortifications is in the Philippine Islands, and if this House and the Senate should vote to put up a naval plant at Subig Bay, then the War Department would fortify Subig Bay.

It depends upon the action of Congress with reference to the proposed project at Subig Bay whether a dollar of this money would ever be expended there or not. I think the War Department ought to do in these islands just as it did in the continental United States—that is, determine where the emergency is and spend the money that we give it there. I think I am not more modest than most men, and I think the War and Navy Departments together will be able to determine the places which need fortifications in the Philippines better than the Members of this Congress, and I know they are more capable than myself.

Mr. FINLEY. Is the gentleman able to state about what amount of money will be necessary to fortify the Hawaiian Islands properly?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. About \$2,000,000, I think.

Mr. FINLEY. Does the gentleman think that will secure efficient and permanent fortifications?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It would for the protection of Honolulu and Pearl Harbor, which are the only places that it is contemplated to fortify.

Mr. FINLEY. I hope the gentleman realizes the importance of those islands being fortified, and I am concerned to know whether or not the amount carried in this bill is reasonable to satisfy the demand for the present.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that this bill carries for the Hawaiian Islands for sites every dollar that was asked by the War Department, and that it contains in other items, not specifying those islands, the complete estimates of the War Department for the fortification of the Hawaiian Islands. Every dollar asked for Hawaii was put in, as we understood it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, how much money does this bill carry for the Philippine Islands?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. This bill does not carry any sum for the Philippine Islands. This bill carries \$600,000 for seacoast batteries in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands. It carries \$200,000 for guns in the insular possessions. It carries \$100,000 for ammunition for reserve in the insular possessions, and there is not one dollar appropriated in this bill specifically for the Philippine Islands.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. All told for the two colonies the amount is \$600,000?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. For seacoast batteries for the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippines.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The point I am trying to get at is, the total amount appropriated to be used in the Philippine Islands is \$600,000?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No, sir.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How much is the total?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The total to be used for batteries in the two sets of islands is \$600,000. Two hundred thousand dollars is appropriated for guns in the insular possessions. That may be used there, or may be used at Guam, or may be used at Guantanamo, or may be used in any of the insular possessions of the United States. One hundred thousand dollars is appropriated for ammunition in the same way, and that may be used in any of the insular possessions of the United States.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am obliged to the gentleman for that information. The gentleman stated a moment ago that every cent that the War Department had called for to be used in Hawaii had been appropriated in this bill. Has every cent that the War Department has called for in the Philippine Islands been appropriated in this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would say not, in this sense—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What is the difference between the two?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Oh, very great.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How much did the War Department call for?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Oh, the War Department's call was very great for the Philippines. It had various estimates, from \$3,000,000 down to \$700,000, for the fortifications in the insular possessions. For the batteries they got \$600,000.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What was the \$3,000,000 to cover and what was it asked for?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Three million dollars was not specifically asked for, but in the showing of the distribution they would make of that much money, if they had it, it was stated that it would cover Manila, Subig Bay, Guantanamo—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. For what purpose were they to use the money at these places?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Fortifying.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Then all the way from \$3,000,000 they wanted, if they could get it for this purpose, and you have reduced it to \$600,000 between those two islands?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. For batteries.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The \$3,000,000 was not asked for the Philippine Islands, but for all the insular possessions?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Oh, it was not asked, but the statement was made as to how the \$3,000,000 would be apportioned if they got it.

Mr. KAHN. In all the insular possessions.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I asked the gentleman from Iowa how much the War Department requested for the Philippine Islands. That was my inquiry, and the gentleman said \$3,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Oh, no; not at all. The War Department did not make a request for the Philippine Islands separate and distinct from the other insular possessions, except as to seacoast batteries, you understand. There has been no separation whatever in the estimate or in the appropriation for guns.

There has been no separation in the appropriation for ammunition. The only separation at all is in the appropriation for seacoast batteries. For that purpose this year the request of the Department was for \$1,000,000.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. For what?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. For seacoast batteries.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Was there any more? The gentleman alluded to an item of \$3,000,000 here. Why did they use that term "three million?"

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Because the War Department in these items does not request that we give them all that is necessary to complete their work, but they ask of us such an allowance as they think can be utilized until another appropriation bill is passed.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. In other words, they contemplate that it will take \$3,000,000 to equip the islands?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Oh, it will take more than that. The gentleman from Tennessee constantly confuses seacoast batteries with the completion of fortifications.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am trying to get at how much it will cost to complete the equipment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I will state that the fortifications at Manila Bay will probably cost \$2,000,000. The fortifications at Subig Bay would cost over \$1,000,000. The fortifications at Guantanamo will probably cost \$2,000,000 or \$2,500,000 to complete them.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman; that is what I wanted.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. PALMER. I understood the gentleman to say that the Appropriation Committee did not have time to investigate what money has been spent for in the past, and all they can do is to confine themselves to ascertaining what is to be done with the money to be spent in the future.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Begging the gentleman's pardon, I did not say that.

Mr. PALMER. That was the inference I drew from the remarks that the gentleman made. I think he further stated that if the ten committees on expenditure in the different Departments did their duty they would furnish a great deal of useful information to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gentleman will pardon me, I did not say that either.

Mr. PALMER. I understood him to say that those committees didn't do anything at all, and I wanted to ask him, if they were charged with certain business, why they didn't do it?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I did not say that, Mr. Chairman, and with those few errors the gentleman is correct. [Laughter.]

Mr. PALMER. Didn't the gentleman make some remarks on that subject?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I did.

Mr. PALMER. I would like to understand what the gentleman did say.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I said that the appropriating committees were primarily charged with the investigation of what was needed for the future; that investigation as to what had been done with the money previously received was, of course, an aid in determining what should be appropriated for the future, but that was not the primary duty of the appropriating committees, and that it was impracticable for the four committees of this House to discharge their primary duties as to what ought to be appropriated for the future and to examine in detail every expenditure of the \$640,000,000.

Mr. PALMER. That is exactly what I understood the gentleman to say.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. But that is not what the gentleman said that I said.

Mr. PALMER. And I wanted to know, if these committees did not perform their functions, why they existed, and who it is that has put them out of business.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I said that the rule did not require the committees to make an independent investigation of the expenditures and render a report to the House. It says "proposed legislation" on the subjects within their jurisdiction shall be referred to them. I think the rule ought to say that it shall be the duty of the committees to make an annual investigation of the expenditure of these Departments and report to this House. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I hold in my hand a report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1905, and on page 9 and other pages it shows that there has been an expenditure by the United States Government of seven hundred and twenty millions, giving for each Department of the Government, and including all of the ten Departments to which the gentleman has referred, a statement of the expenditures made during the past year for various purposes.

I think the remarks which the gentleman has made about these ten committees seem to cast some aspersion upon them if it should go to the country that these Departments had made the expenditures and that there was no examination of the way in which they had been made. If that impression is to go abroad I think he has made an unjust criticism upon the faithful service of seventy Members of this House, upon these ten committees, of having neglected their duty.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman is mistaken. I stated that the rule did not require these committees to make independent investigations. Can that cast any aspersion upon them?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Will not the gentleman supplement that statement with this, that every one of these expenditures have been properly audited in the various Departments, that each Department has reported to Congress in a separate document in detail showing the object for which every penny has been expended, and that it has all passed through a complete system of auditing, showing whether the expenditures have been in accordance with the law and in line with the appropriations made the preceding year by his own committee?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the gentleman claim that from the statement as made up he knew it was the invariable practice to buy portraits of all Cabinet officers and superior bureau officers?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I knew it was the practice without the statement at all.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Did the gentleman know it from the statements?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I did not.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Do the statements show it?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. It has not been my duty to look into it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Do the statements show it?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I don't know whether they do or not. I know this, Mr. Chairman, that that expenditure could not have been made without having been audited by the Auditor of the Treasury Department for the Attorney-General's Office.

Mr. McNARY and Mr. ALEXANDER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. But, Mr. Chairman, I have not yet concluded. I am utterly unable to understand how any penny of the funds of this Government which will be appropriated by this committee—the chairman of the subcommittee of which is now addressing the House—can be expended by any Department of the Government and that Congress should not know by official reports that those expenditures have been properly made and approved by the Auditor of the respective Departments in the Treasury Department.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Before yielding to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I did not mean to be understood as claiming that these accounts were not properly audited within the respective Departments. I did not mean to assert they were not reported to Congress. I did not say so, but I am not one of those who believe in allowing this to drift into a bureaucratic government. [Applause.] I want some examination of the expenditures of public money made by somebody besides the Auditor of that particular Department. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Why does not the gentleman come in with a recommendation instead of simply a criticism?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I have made a recommendation that these great committees of this House be vitalized by amendment to the rules of this House which will make them, in place of subordinate committees, among the very great committees of the House of Representatives of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. McNARY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. To clear up this matter to my mind, I understood the gentleman to say—and if I am wrong I hope he will correct me—that his Committee on Appropriations did not make

an examination into the expenditures of the Government, and I understood him further to say that the other committees on expenditures in the different Departments did not make an examination into the expenditures of those Departments.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I did not so state, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McNARY. But, therefore, if I understood him correctly, as far as the gentleman has stated there is no committee of this House which makes an examination into the expenditures of the Departments, and the only information we have as to whether those expenditures are actually so or not is the report of some auditor in some one of the Departments; that, as a matter of fact, this House takes the statement of the auditor of the Department and does not make an independent investigation itself, and there is no knowledge on the part of the gentleman's committee or any other committees as to whether or not those expenditures were made. If that is the case, I would like to know it. If it is not, I would like to have it cleared up.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I have stated that I did not say so. I said it was impossible for these great appropriating committees, charged with the primary duty of ascertaining what was needed for the future, to adequately and sufficiently investigate past expenditures, and I said that no committee investigated the expenditures under so-called "permanent appropriations." That is what I said.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, allow me to ask one question. Is there any such investigation made outside of the permanent appropriations?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is to the extent of the ability of these great appropriating committees.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Did the gentleman ever know of a report since his service in Congress from any one of these ten committees on expenditures?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I never did.

Mr. McNARY. And there is no report made, no investigation made, by a committee of this House. There can not be any other deduction.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some misunderstanding in regard to auditing the accounts of the Government. After a Department passes upon the accounts of its officials they go to the proper auditor of the Treasury Department, an independent quasi-judge, who is entirely independent of the Department first passing upon them, as independent, in fact, as if they were before the Supreme Court of the United States or the Court of Claims.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. That is, they have two audits.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Do you say the Congress of the United States ought to appropriate some six, seven, or eight hundred million dollars a year and make no effort by itself to find out whether the money is properly expended, but trust it wholly to department officials?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; decidedly no.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is all I am contending for.

Mr. ALEXANDER. There seemed to be a misunderstanding on the part of some gentlemen that there was not an independent audit.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The Treasury Department must audit all Departments before paying them, in a sense.

Mr. ALEXANDER. But here is the trouble: The Department of Justice, if you please, is given half a million to expend for United States marshals—

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining of the hour.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It passes upon their accounts primarily to its satisfaction. If it thinks a charge is wrong, it sends it back to the marshal to be corrected. When it has thus put the accounts in such shape as it can approve, it sends them to an auditor of the Treasury Department for an independent audit. I do not know how such accounts can be audited more thoroughly than is done by the different auditing officers of the Treasury Department. It is the old Hamilton system, which is in life to-day as much as it was in 1789. The Treasury Department has grown as a tree grows. Hamilton gave it origin and life, and it has grown up and kept pace with the country. It is not a mosaic; it is one great whole; and I do not believe any government under the sun has a better system.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to suggest, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield, notwithstanding this perfect system of audit-

ing he speaks of, we do ascertain upon investigation that many appropriations are diverted from the purpose for which Congress intended.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Is that the fault of the auditors?

Mr. TAWNEY. Not necessarily—

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Let me answer the chairman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I can not accept the chairman's statement that the auditors of the Treasury Department allow money to be diverted from channels along which the law intended it should go. I have never heard of an instance of it.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will read the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations taken yesterday I think he will be convinced that my statement is correct.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I want to add, however, that I see no reason why the Congress should not make its own investigation. I favor the fullest investigation.

Mr. TAWNEY. We are now making the fullest investigation possible with the time at our command.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish to ask two questions, solely for information. Have they ever fixed Pearl Harbor so they can get a battle ship into it?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am not advised as to the condition of Pearl Harbor, but I will say to the gentleman that the fortifications of Honolulu and Pearl Harbor will be identical, the same fortifications protecting both, and the city of Honolulu ought to be fortified anyhow.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If they have not done it, why have they not done it?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Simply because the Navy Department has not reached that stage of progress in the construction of its navy-yards.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was stated over and over again here in debate at the time of annexation of the Sandwich Islands, that if we did not get Pearl Harbor and have it fixed the whole Republic would likely be bombarded. I want to know if they are going to do it?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The fortifications are necessary, because the same fortifications cover Honolulu and Pearl Harbor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am interested in the harbor being fixed so that we can get a battle ship in it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman tell us how far he thinks his committee has the power to investigate these matters, and how far it has gone?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Our committee would be authorized, if it saw fit, to investigate everything that has been done under the last year's appropriation. We went into the most exhaustive hearings on this bill, the most exhaustive in many years, but we could not take time enough to ascertain what is needed for the future and investigate every item of expenditure under all the headings in the past.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I would like to know from the gentleman if he does not think that these committees on expenditures in the various Departments should meet and investigate the expenditures in these various Departments?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I have been endeavoring, in my humble way, to present that proposition to this committee—that they ought to be required to investigate the respective Departments and annually report to this House as to all abuses in them.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I will be very glad if the gentleman will introduce a resolution of that kind. We will support him on this side of the Chamber, I know.

Mr. CASSEL. Coming back to the bill. Under "Fortifications in insular possessions" you say, "For construction of seacoast batteries in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, \$600,000." Would the whole of this \$600,000 be spent in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It could be; yes, sir.

Mr. CASSEL. The law that was passed in 1895 said, "Hereafter all estimates for fortifications for insular possessions of the United States shall be made and submitted to Congress showing amounts proposed to be expended at each harbor and in each insular possession."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That has been done.

Mr. CASSEL. Now, what is the amount in that suggested appropriation?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The estimate for this work is not given separately on the copy I have before me.

Mr. CASSEL. May I tell the gentleman, then? The War Department asks for \$740,000 for the Philippine Islands and \$200,000 for the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. CASSEL. Now, then, why has not a specific appropriation been made for each of these different works, according to the request of the War Department, instead of putting it in bulk?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The War Department did not so request. The War Department complied with the act of Congress which required them in the insular possessions to furnish detailed estimates.

Mr. CASSEL. Was it not the intention in that act that the appropriation should be made specifically, as well as the request for appropriations?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I think not. I helped to draw that provision, and I did not so understand it.

Mr. CASSEL. Would it not have been a better thing?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I think not.

Mr. CASSEL. And clear up this matter so Congress could make a direct appropriation for the different islands?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I think it would be a great mistake to advise all the people of the world just how much we are spending in Honolulu, just how much we are spending in Manila, and at Subig Bay. It is contrary to the practice of all the nations of the earth.

Mr. CASSEL. Then a general appropriation had better be made for the whole proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That has been the practice from the beginning of our fortification system.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has consumed one hour.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to use any portion of the time in my control now, and I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. This bill carries appropriations amounting to \$4,838,993. At the last session of Congress there was appropriated for fortifications \$6,747,893, or \$1,908,900 more than the present bill carries. The scheme of seacoast fortifications, for which appropriations are made, is that adopted by the so-called "Endicott board." Since 1888 Congress has been providing the means to perfect the plans of defense then adopted. It has been estimated that the complete cost of fortifications planned by the Endicott board will be \$99,392,222. The total appropriation for fortifications since 1888 has been \$119,102,483.32, of which \$62,094,042.24 have been expended upon the Endicott scheme.

The balance of the appropriations, about half of the entire amount appropriated during the past eighteen years, has been used in the erection and equipment of the gun factory at Watervliet, the gun-carriage factory at Watertown, for work of the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications, in the purchase of land for fortification sites, in acquiring torpedoes for harbor defense, for ammunition for service and test, in the manufacture of field guns, and to a limited extent in providing fortifications for the insular possessions.

The war with Spain accounts for the fact that during the Fifty-fifth Congress the total appropriations made for purposes of fortifications aggregated the sum of \$35,828,134.60. With the exception of that Congress, when war made imperative lavish expenditures for the national defense, the policy has always been to proceed gradually with the work of completing the seacoast fortifications.

For the fiscal year 1905 the total estimates submitted to Congress for fortifications amounted to \$21,573,197, while the appropriations were \$7,518,192. For the fiscal year 1906 the estimates were \$10,458,570.40; the appropriations, \$6,747,893. For the coming fiscal year of 1907 the total estimates are \$10,388,066.65, while the amount proposed to be allowed in the pending bill is \$4,838,993. That it has been wise to proceed slowly with this work has been demonstrated beyond question. Improvements extremely important in character are continuously being made in guns, ammunition, projectiles, gun carriages, methods of firing and supplying guns, in the methods of directing and controlling gun fire, and in innumerable other matters that have resulted in some respects in a complete revolution in the methods in use when the Endicott board made its report.

So marked have been some of the changes brought about by the remarkable inventive genius of our people and the skill and scientific attainments of officers assigned to the work pertain-

ing to the development of what may be termed the "matériel" of our fortifications that it became imperative within the recent past to appoint a board to revise the plans of the Endicott board. So it happened that the present Secretary of War, Mr. Taft, appointed a board known as the "Taft board," consisting of Army and Navy officials, constituted along identical lines with that of the Endicott board, to revise the plans originally adopted for the country's defense. The result undoubtedly will be greater efficiency in the protection of the ports of the country, and the cost will be correspondingly increased.

So far as the provision is made in the pending bill for fortifications, ammunition, and other necessary works and apparatus for this country, there was practically unanimity among the members of the committee. There were, of course, differences of opinion, but those differences were easily reconcilable. While some of the members of the committee might have changed the amounts allotted in different items, if their own views could have been adopted, upon the whole the bill as finally agreed upon was satisfactory to the entire committee.

The same unanimity, however, Mr. Chairman, does not exist as to the provision for the fortifications of the insular possessions; and it is to this point particularly that I wish to direct what I have to say. From 1888 to 1906, eighteen fiscal years, with the exception of the extraordinary amount allotted during the Fifty-fifth Congress, the total appropriations for fortifications were \$97,561,744.72, an average of \$5,420,096.93 a year. The pending bill is about 10 per cent lower than the average of appropriation bills during the past eighteen years, and of the \$4,838,993 carried in this bill \$1,087,000, or about 25 per cent of the total, is allotted for fortifications in the insular possessions.

The items allowed for these possessions in the bill are as follows:

For seacoast batteries, \$600,000; for procurement of sites in Hawaiian Islands, \$150,000; for seacoast guns, carriages, etc., \$200,000; ammunition for seacoast guns, etc., \$100,000; alteration and maintenance of seacoast artillery in insular possessions, \$5,000; inspecting instruments, range finders, etc., \$32,000.

In addition to the amounts appropriated, an item in the bill permits the mounting of seven 12-inch guns in the insular possessions, out of the guns now on hand in the Department of War as a reserve for this country. So that, in addition to the amounts actually appropriated, the cost of these guns should be included in the total amount allotted for the insular possessions.

A different spirit seems to animate men whenever it is proposed to appropriate for the Philippine Islands. There has never been any doubt of the advisability of proceeding slowly and gradually in the work of completing the defenses for the United States; but there seems to be an extraordinary haste upon the part of everybody who has anything to do with the matter to obtain appropriations, asked or suggested, for the Philippine Islands. If there be any possibility within the near future of a war with a foreign country, then the total amount carried in this bill is ridiculously small and absurd. If there be no danger of a foreign war, then, in my judgment, the amount allotted in this bill for the insular possessions, about 25 per cent of the entire appropriation, is outrageously extravagant.

In the last Congress great dissatisfaction was manifested with the manner in which money was being appropriated and expended for defenses in the insular possessions. It must be remembered that while it has never been specifically stated in the fortification appropriation bills, during the past eighteen years, where the money appropriated should be expended, nevertheless a well-defined and positive scheme of fortifications had been adopted for the different harbors and ports of this country. While Congress appropriated money in gross sums, it was known that the War Department would utilize the money at the places where it was most imperatively needed, but under the well-defined plan that had been approved by Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the gentleman permit me an inquiry? Is it not known to the gentleman, at least unofficially, that the Taft board has prepared the same kind of a plan of fortification covering the Philippines and Hawaii as the Endicott board prepared covering the continental United States?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not that information. I applied to the Office of Naval Intelligence in the Navy Department, which I assumed might have some information about the proposed scheme for the defense of the Philippine Islands, and I was informed Saturday that they had no information on the subject there. It was further stated that my request for information had been referred to the office of the Secretary of the Navy, and so far the only information sent has been a copy of the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, to which I shall refer later. From other sources I obtained information which led me to conclude that the report of the Taft

board was not ready to transmit to Congress, but would be shortly. I am not aware that the board has done anything other than revise the original Endicott board's plans. However that may be, no Member of Congress has ever critically examined the Taft board's plan for the fortifications of the Philippine Islands.

Congress did approve tacitly, if not specifically, the plan of defense for this country originally adopted by the Endicott board, so that while appropriations were made of lump sums for fortification purposes, it was with the knowledge on the part of Congress that the money would be expended to carry out a well-considered and approved plan.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. In regard to the suggestion made by the chairman of the committee, does not the gentleman know that there has been and is now considerable conflict between different branches of the service as to whether Cavite or Subig Bay shall be made the specially fortified harbor of the Philippine Islands? And is it not true that there is not only not a definite plan, but that there is a very great divergence of opinion as to what plan shall be followed?

Mr. FITZGERALD. From several unofficial sources I have obtained information that inclines me to the belief that there is considerable divergence of opinion, but unfortunately I have been confronted with the fact that the General Board states in such positive terms that it has decided upon at least two projects for fortifications in the Philippine Islands, that until I know what is in the report of the Taft board I should be inclined to hesitate to say whether there is an official difference of opinion, whatever private difference of opinion there may be among the officers.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will pardon me a second interruption, is it not a fact that the War Department has two purposes in fortifications: One to fortify harbors and protect cities and avoid landings, and the other to protect naval stations; and that, so far as Manila is concerned, the War Department would act, largely, independently on its own judgment for the protection of the city and the harbor, and whereas at Subig Bay it would absolutely follow the Navy as to whether the Navy put a navy-yard there?

Mr. FITZGERALD. At this time I will make a statement that I intended to make later. This army and navy board has decided that one of the most effective defenses for the city of Manila would be a strongly fortified place at Subig Bay, with a powerful fleet inside of it.

The joint army and naval board has made this statement in a recommendation that with Subig Bay strongly fortified—and Subig Bay is only from 40 to 70 miles from Manila—and with a strong fleet within Subig Bay a hostile fleet would hesitate very much to enter Manila under those circumstances. But why it would not be more effective to put the fleet in Manila and have fortifications at the entrance of Manila Bay to prevent the hostile fleet entering is something I am unable to understand. I am only a layman; I have not the scientific knowledge necessary to pass upon such question; but why a fleet and fortifications 40 miles away would be more effective than if they were right at hand is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. DRISCOLL. May not this be the reason that, since we are not permanently located in the Philippines and may withdraw some time and set up a republic there, if we spent fifty millions in Subig Bay, we might retain it as a permanent naval station? Now, I want to ask the gentleman a question. This bill provides \$600,000 for seacoast protection in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands. I want to ask if there is anything in this appropriation bill or in the disposition of it by the War Department or the Navy Department or any other Department by which a site may be purchased, or in any way commit the Government to one place in preference to another as a permanent station?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The difficulty about this appropriation is that if it be made in the way proposed in this bill some official in a bureau, or one of the Cabinet officials, by directing that the money be expended at a certain place, could to that extent commit the country to a policy without any decision of the question by Congress.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEIFER. Wasn't that the custom at all times, to leave to the Department the distribution of the fund and the selection of the place where the money would be expended?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have explained that that was done in

this country, but it was because Congress had approved of the Endicott plan. Lump sums were appropriated, and it was left to the discretion of the Department to say where the money was most imperatively required. But Congress knew that it would be expended in accordance with the plan which it had approved. There has been, however, no plan adopted so far as the insular possessions are concerned. Last year the dissatisfaction became so great that this provision was enacted in the fortifications act:

Hereafter all estimates for fortifications of insular possessions of the United States shall be made and submitted to Congress, showing the amount proposed to be expended at each harbor in each insular possession.

The Department complied with that law, and in the original draft of the bill submitted to the committee for consideration there was contained the items for each particular harbor for which appropriations are desired at this time.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman tell the committee what reason the Committee on Appropriations had for appropriating a lump sum instead of specifying where the money was to be expended?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am about to discuss that. As I said, in the draft of the bill submitted to the Committee on Appropriations the harbors were specifically named and the amount for each place definitely stated. There seems to be a very prevalent belief that some particular advantage will be gained by some foreign power if, instead of saying \$600,000 shall be appropriated for the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands, a definite amount should be fixed for the Hawaiian Islands and for each place in the Philippine Islands sought to be fortified. It is well known that there is only one fortification for the Hawaiian Islands—that is, one project that will effectively cover both Honolulu and Pearl Harbor.

It is immaterial how much is expended at those places; the thing that is of value to a foreign power is to know the exact location of the different guns that are mounted for defense. It is immaterial whether one million or ten millions of dollars are expended. That information is contained in the estimates submitted to Congress, and there is no doubt that the information is transmitted to every foreign capital in the world, perhaps more quickly than it reaches the Members of the House in their investigations. That information is not of much value. The thing to be kept secret, and which is important, is just at what particular place the particular guns are to be mounted. The whole system of modern defense is based upon concealed fire, so as to prevent hostile fleets concentrating their fire upon the places where the guns are mounted and so dismantling them.

Unable to apprehend any disadvantage from such a policy, I am in favor at this time of specifically restricting the appropriations for fortifications in the insular possessions to particular harbors. There has never been, to my knowledge, and I have endeavored to get the information, what might be said to be a definite plan for the complete defense, protection, and fortifications of the Philippine Islands. It is true that the general board has stated that it is necessary to defend Manila and also Subig Bay.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would ask the gentleman what he would defend at Subig Bay?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, they say there is nothing there at present but vacant land, but the Navy Department intends to put there a very elaborate naval station, and when that is there the defenses will be needed.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What is there now?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The information conveyed to the committee is practically that the land is vacant.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is there any land there at all? Is it not a fact that to-day there is not a place big enough that is available to put an ordinary warehouse on, and that the full plan—if there is a plan—is to hereafter redeem or capture from the sea by piling or some system of that kind a place large enough to put some buildings upon it, and digging the hill away in the rear?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is a considerable plan, to which I am going to refer in a moment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And when the gentleman gets to that, I wish him to state another thing. Where is the fortification that is to protect the naval station to be put? The gentleman speaks about getting the navy in behind the fortifications. Where are the fortifications to be?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, we always leave the exact loca-

tion of fortifications to the men who have been educated to determine questions similar to that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. As a matter of fact, if the gentleman will allow me, there is an open harbor narrower at the mouth than in the rear, in the basin part of it, but whatever fortifications are made have to be put somewhere outside of Subig Bay, and if this House could only go, as some Members of it did, and look into Subig Bay, and much more fully than any naval officer ever did, the Members would understand how utterly absurd this whole proposition is.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think it is necessary for any man of ordinary intelligence to go to Subig Bay to form an opinion on the subject.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Although I know that to go there and see what anybody can infer from the information at hand is to make a man's convictions very positive.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is right.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But my statement will be based entirely on what I have been able to obtain from official reports.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, allow me to ask the gentleman a question right there in view of what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] says. If it is as unreasonable to fix this harbor for defense at Subig Bay as the gentleman from Ohio thinks it is, is it not unwise still to leave it in the discretion of the Navy Department and the War Department to do that very thing?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Undoubtedly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why not fix it so that they can not do it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope enough gentlemen in this committee will agree with me to put an amendment on the bill to make it absolutely impossible to expend a dollar of this money at Subig Bay.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I hope so, too, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me. And for this very simple reason: If we ever get anything of value out of the Philippine acquisitions, and I believe we will of immense value, the center of it will be at Manila, and if we ever have a war grow out of our possessions over there—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Which we will have.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The center of that war will be at Manila. Now, then, I am not strategist enough to combat the opinion of the Admiral of the Navy, but left to my common sense I would say that with a narrow harbor and a narrow entrance 14 or 16 miles from Manila, capable of protection and defense and fortification that can make it strong as Gibraltar, that is where we should expend our money. I speak now of Corregidor, the island situated in the mouth of the harbor, with narrow channels on each side of it, with bluff shores on each side of it, in a position that could defy all the navies of the world at one time. That is the place to fortify against the entrance of a hostile navy into Manila Bay, and if you do not do that, while you are signaling your fleet to come down 55 or 60 miles from Subig Bay the enemy will have gone inside and destroyed the naval station at Cavite and destroyed the city if they saw fit to do so.

Mr. FITZGERALD. While the naval authorities say if Subig Bay was fortified and a fleet was in there it would make it unlikely a hostile fleet would go to Manila, yet I agree with the gentleman from Ohio that if the fortifications were at Manila and our fleet was behind them it would be much more unlikely that a hostile fleet could enter.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it not a fact that what it is contemplated to make in the way of improvement or fortification at Subig Bay has in view the abandonment at some time in the future of the Philippine Islands, and that if we should expend money for fortifications of Cavite or Manila Bay that when we abandon the Philippine Islands the money expended there would be of no service whatever to the people of this country; but, on the other hand, if we did fortify Subig Bay it would be with the intention of retaining it, when we abandon the Philippine Islands, as a permanent feature of this Government, such as a coaling station or whatever we may want to have there?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I do not know that I can answer that. All that I know is that on December, 1903, the joint board in a communication marked "Confidential" and printed as a House document—so that there is no great secrecy about this information—makes this statement, which I will put in the RECORD and then it can be examined by all Members for themselves. I will read it all so as to make it complete:

CONFIDENTIAL.]

JOINT BOARD,
Washington, December 19, 1903.

SIR: The joint board having been requested by the Secretary of the Navy to consider how far the available resources of the two serv-

ices, in advance of Congressional action, will suffice to protect certain naval advanced bases in our insular possessions, and having made its report on that subject, regards it a duty to submit more particularly to the Departments of War and of the Navy its opinion on the need of an immediate appropriation by Congress for the fortification of Subig Bay and Manila Bay.

The policy of Congress may be assumed to be to hold the Philippines in American possession as against any foreign enemy, but although the islands have been in our possession now more than five years, not a gun has been mounted nor an earthwork raised to protect any of their harbors. The defense of the Philippines in war depends upon the cooperation of the Army and the Navy. Both are united in demanding the fortification of Subig Bay as essential to any plan of defense. This joint board, representing the professional opinion of both services, has the honor to submit to the Government its judgment that the national policy as expressed in Congress can not be maintained in war unless provision is made for defense.

The Secretary of the Navy, in his annual report, has given the reasons in favor of establishing the principal naval station of the Philippines in Subig Bay. In his words, "It would seem as if this body of opinion ought to be deemed conclusive. I know of no other military question upon which such unanimity exists." The decision of the Government, then, needing only the appropriation by Congress to give it effect to establish a naval base in Subig Bay, may be regarded as fixed.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield one moment at that point to a question as to the unanimity of opinion?

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will allow me to complete this statement, and then I shall yield to him.

The Navy Department has already in view the deposit of a large store of coal at Olongapo, the site chosen for the naval station in Subig Bay, and the floating dry dock authorized by Congress, at a cost, including transportation, of about a million and a quarter dollars, is destined for the same place. Obviously such resources, unprotected by fortifications, would be at the mercy of the enemy or—only less disastrous consequence—would enforce the presence of the fleet to defend them, thereby hindering instead of promoting its activity.

The joint board is unanimously of the opinion—

(1) That without a fortified naval base in the Philippines the Asiatic fleet can not keep open the lines of communication for supplies from the United States, or between the Army posts within the Philippines, without which supplies the military forces of the United States could not hold command of the islands.

(2) That Manila is not, but that Subig Bay is, suited for a naval base and station, and of all harbors in the archipelago it is the best for the purpose.

(3) That the fortification of Subig Bay is essential to the security of a naval station located there.

(4) That a fortified naval base at Subig Bay will contribute materially to the defense of Manila Bay.

These four are the opinions the board are unanimous upon. I will read the rest of this extract, because it is interesting:

The Secretary of War, in his annual report, calls attention to "the necessity of constructing defenses for our insular possessions," and names Subig Bay and Manila Bay among other places for which "projects for defense . . . have been made and approved, and estimates for the necessary construction have been transmitted to Congress," and adds:

"There ought to be no delay in putting all of these points in such a condition that at least they will not be defenseless against any sudden foray by a single lightly armed cruiser."

The purpose of the Joint Board is to point out that Subig, the American naval base in the Far East, and Manila, the capital and military headquarters of the Philippines, stand preeminent, and to urge that appropriation for the fortification of the two bays should be made by Congress without delay, in order that the development of the naval station and its defense may proceed together and that the commercial and military resources of the city may be guarded. The consequences of neglect or delay may be nothing less than national disaster.

That is signed by George Dewey, Admiral of the Navy, senior member. Now I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I understood the gentleman in reading that report to state that there was an absolute unanimity of sentiment between the military and naval authorities on the Subig Bay question. Is it not a fact General Wood is wholly and absolutely opposed to the creation of a naval station at Subig Bay?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have heard from different Members of the House that there is a serious doubt in the minds of many very eminent Army and Navy officials as to the advisability of fortifying Subig Bay; and yet the official information communicated to Congress is to the effect that there is no military question affecting this country upon which there is so universal unanimity among officials as upon this question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will permit another interruption; I believe it is a fact that General Corbin has also changed his mind absolutely as to the availability of Subig Bay, and he is now opposed to it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, if those two officials have all of the influence with this Administration that it is intimated they have, this plan to fortify Subig Bay may be relegated to oblivion.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman allow a single further observation? Does the gentleman know anything of the country in the rear or back of Subig Bay?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am going to read something—

Mr. GROSVENOR. And of the character of productions and supplies, or anything of that kind, or the travel necessary to get to Manila or anywhere else from the region where Subig Bay is located?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will read from a statement made by

the Secretary of the Navy in 1904 (Mr. Moody) as to the advisability and necessity of establishing a naval station at Subig Bay.

On the 25th of January, 1904, he said to the Naval Committee:

In regard to Guantanamo and Olongapo, I want to say in the beginning that no words of mine can overestimate the national importance of these two stations. I think I would rather see every appropriation for public works in the bill cut out than fail on these two stations. Let me take up Olongapo—

which is in Subig Bay—

first.

We have been five years in the Philippines. We have not any naval station there of any consequence. We have no dock, we have no repair shops or storehouses under the protection of fortifications, and if there should be a foreign war, as I am advised, and I do not see why the advice is not sound, we should be perfectly helpless in the East. If we continue to stay in the Philippines it is of vital importance we should establish a naval station there. Now, where? Every single bit of information is in favor of establishing it within Subig Bay, at the harbor of Olongapo. Nobody disagrees. The Army and Navy alike say it is the place to do it. There is plenty of water. The protection of the entrance may be made perfect.

At the same time the Secretary of the Navy submitted to the Naval Committee a detailed estimate of the cost of providing a naval station at Olongapo. He submitted the figures given by what was known as the "Olongapo board," and he gave the figures as revised by the Department.

The figures given by the Olongapo board stated that the cost of a complete naval station at Olongapo would be \$12,907,500. The revised figures in the Department made it \$9,784,500, and that excludes \$1,125,000 previously estimated for the floating steel dry dock.

Mr. McNARY. How much would it be at Manila?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will come to the naval station at Cavite when I finish this.

Mr. LONGWORTH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH]?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman pardon me?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Has it not also been stated that it will take not less than seven years before this station could be built under any circumstances, even supposing that labor could be gotten there?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think that is true. This station has an acreage of 32 square miles of territory. I do not know whether it is under water or up in the mountain. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] states that there is no room there now for a single warehouse.

Mr. McNARY. Is not one of the real reasons for preferring Subig Bay to Manila Bay or Cavite the fact that Subig Bay can be defended at the entrance, and that Manila Bay is about 30 miles wide, and there is not any possibility of defending that, as Dewey well showed when he went in there? And the question of labor can be settled, as it is in these matters, by bringing the labor to the point?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; the defense of Manila is much simpler than that of Subig Bay. The entrance to Manila Bay is narrow, with an island in the center. The trouble with the Spaniards when Dewey went in was that they were asleep, or at least not keenly alert. They did not awaken in time. Our fleet was passing the fortifications before a shot was fired, and quickly slipped by them before the fire was effectively directed.

Mr. RIXEY. I understand that one of the serious objections to Cavite is that the dredging would be very expensive.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will pardon me, I want to take up the dredging at Olongapo first.

Mr. RIXEY. I want to call the gentleman's attention to another objection, and that is that there is not sufficient land at Cavite, and they can not get it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In this estimate of the Olongapo board, afterwards revised by the Navy Department—I hope the gentleman will pay attention to this, because the Secretary of the Navy and everybody else has said there was ample water at Olongapo—there is an estimate for dredging of 6,260,000 cubic yards in the inner basin, to cost \$1,900,000; the revised estimate cuts it to 3,000,000 cubic yards to be dredged, at a cost of \$600,000. Then 1,934,000 cubic yards is to be dredged at Marian Point—that was reduced in the revision to 1,100,000 cubic yards, and the difference in price was from \$800,000 to \$220,000; cutting down the Lalake Hill—and this is what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] refers to—765,000 cubic yards of material, at a cost of \$498,000.

Closing the branches of the Santa Rita and Binictigan rivers, \$45,000. The station is said to contain 32,000 square miles and has 16 miles of water front. It is necessary to remove a mountain, to do about \$3,300,000 worth of dredging, to

close, or turn off, at least two rivers in order to make the place available as a naval station. And yet a naval and army board have submitted a unanimous report to Congress that this is the most ideal place in the Philippine Islands for a naval station. So far as I am concerned, I shall refuse to accept as conclusive as to the desirability of this place as a naval station the opinion of a board that admits a mountain must be leveled, that 4,100,000 cubic yards of dredging must be done, and two rivers turned from their courses in order to make the reservation available. That can not possibly be, in my judgment, the most desirable place for a naval station in the Philippine Islands.

They tell us that the naval station at Cavite, in Manila Harbor, will be abandoned. Secretary Moody stated in the hearing in 1904 that it was not the intention of the Department to establish a great naval establishment in the Philippine Islands like that at New York or League Island; but a place was wanted where ordinary repair work could be done. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that such a station now exists. Considerable money has been expended to obtain it. It appears from the latest report of the Chief of Bureau of Construction and Repair that in his department alone during the last fiscal year at the Cavite Navy-Yard the maximum number of workmen employed was 1,217, the minimum 781, the average 1,076. Besides the Bureau of Construction and Repair, there is Steam Engineering, Equipment, and Yards and Docks.

The amount of work done at this particular station is somewhat surprising, in view of the repeated statements that it is unsuited for naval repairs. In a communication sent by the Navy Department, in January, 1906, to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, there is contained detailed information as to the amount of money expended for the repair of ships at every navy-yard of the United States, and the naval station at Cavite ranks fifth among the number. For instance, at the greatest naval establishment of the country, in Brooklyn, there was expended \$1,545,718; at Norfolk, Va., \$791,923; at Boston, \$786,639.21; at Mare Island, Cal., \$664,803.81; at Cavite, \$556,861.15. Not by one Bureau alone was this money expended. Equipment spent \$22,807.67; Ordnance, \$12,704.17; Construction and Repair, \$303,328.41; Steam Engineering, \$218,020.90. With the exception of the amount of work done in the navy-yard at Brooklyn, the work done at Cavite is practically as great as that done at any other great naval station of the United States. So that I say there is to-day, with a very little additional expenditure, ample facilities for the ordinary repair work of the Navy in the Philippine Islands. And yet it is planned to abandon and dismantle this station and create another, entailing expenditures of from \$12,000,000 to, perhaps, \$25,000,000.

The estimates submitted for this year for a naval station at Olongapo, aggregate \$1,000,000; and I shall read what the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks says about these estimates:

Naval station, Olongapo, Philippine Islands, estimates aggregating \$1,000,000. Estimate submitted for improvement of this station are those recommended by the board of officers appointed to specifically consider the immediate requirements of this station on a working basis. The Bureau has had no opportunity to learn anything more about these items than is disclosed by the details of amounts estimated; but as the board has made the matter a special study, the Bureau has no doubt the improvements are those most calculated to meet the immediate efficiency of the station and to prepare it for navy operations. The estimates are accordingly formally submitted and commended to favorable consideration.

It is not stated whether it is the so-called Olongapo board's work, which was revised and considerably reduced by the Department, or whether another board has prepared these estimates. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and other gentlemen who were there know what is at Olongapo at present. Let me read what is estimated will be necessary to put this station in a position for immediate operations:

Temporary installation of tools from Cavite, \$80,000; special wharf for floating dry dock, \$65,000; toward dredging, filling, grading, including cost of dredges, necessary tools and equipment to cost \$1,200,000, \$250,000; toward machines, tools, machinery, etc., other than from Cavite, to cost \$500,000, \$50,000.

Toward quay walls for permanent water front, to cost \$840,000, \$80,000; extension of drainage canal, \$25,000; closing Santa Rita and other rivers, \$60,000; toward roads, including bridges, to cost \$156,000, \$20,000; toward station, railroad, and equipment, to cost \$92,000, \$20,000; toward ship fitter's shop, to cost \$100,000, \$75,000; toward bending shop, to cost \$110,000, \$60,000; sawmills, \$65,000; toward smithery, to cost \$80,000, \$65,000; toward waterworks, to cost \$300,000, \$60,000; steam floating derrick, \$17,000; telephone system, \$3,000.

That is the estimate of what is required to put this station where it can commence to do work. The Secretary of the Navy said it is not intended to have anything like the stations that they have in this country. If such a station is established as

is evidently contemplated, I know that more work will be done and a more perfect and effective plant will be established in the Philippine Islands than in any place in the United States.

Mr. RIXEY. As the gentleman has stated, the general board of the Army and Navy were unanimous in recommending Olongapo over Manila. Now, in view of that fact, and in view of the further fact that almost without exception, so far as the Naval Committee knows, the naval officers who have visited that coast recommend Subig Bay over Manila Bay, I should like to ask the gentleman what we are to do if we are not to follow these recommendations? Now, I will let the gentleman answer my question first, and then ask him another.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I should like to have the gentleman finish, because his question will require more than a categorical answer.

Mr. RIXEY. There are two objections to Cavite. One of them, they say, is practically insurmountable, and that is that the dredging would be exceedingly costly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will state to the gentleman that they show they will have to do \$3,000,000 worth of dredging at Olongapo. There is no estimate that it will cost more than that at Cavite.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania rose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I see the gentleman from Pennsylvania shakes his head; but I have the statement submitted by the—

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. The gentleman may have a statement, but it does not follow because he has the statement that Congress proposes to appropriate for \$3,000,000 worth of dredging there. If we have a station there, we will maintain it without costing this Government anything for dredging.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may be able to do that, but considering that after a very careful examination by two boards they submit that it will require about 3,000,000 cubic yards of dredging, the gentleman may be able to explain satisfactorily how he will get rid of that material. For instance, it is absolutely essential that there should be some dredging done at Olongapo in order to make possible the use of the floating dry dock on its way to the Philippines. If no dredging is necessary, how is it that there is pending before the Naval Committee the estimate which I have already mentioned: "Toward dredging, filling, and grading, including cost of dredges and necessary tools and equipment (to cost \$1,200,000), \$250,000?"

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman give me the time to make an explanation?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has already yielded to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. RIXEY].

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] can yield time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. RIXEY. The difference between the dredging at Olongapo and Cavite, as claimed by the naval officers, is that when you once dredge Subig Bay it will require very little expenditure to keep it in condition. Whereas at Cavite, Manila Bay, there will be continual dredging of the most costly kind, and it is further stated that it is almost impossible to get sufficient water at Manila Bay.

Another objection to the naval station at Manila Bay is that the Government only has 47 acres of land, both for the Army and the Navy, and the statement of naval officers is that that is not sufficient, and that no additional land can be gotten there.

Those are the objections. So far as I am concerned I feel friendly to the proposition to remain at Cavite, if we can remain there, but if it is an impossibility, then we may as well recognize that condition now as to go on with our expenditures there and recognize it later.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not assume that Cavite is the ideal place for a naval station. I believe that with very little additional expenditure all the imperative repair work required by the Navy in the Far East can be done there. That would obviate the necessity of establishing this costly naval station at Subig Bay, and then the necessity for the fortification of Subig Bay would be obviated.

What has been developed so far regarding the fortifications of Subig Bay? The War Department estimated at first that it would cost \$700,000. This year it is stated to the committee that, in view of the plans of the Navy Department, it would cost either a million or a million and a half to fortify the place. There should be some definite plan before Congress is asked to make appropriations. We should not go ahead blindly nor in the dark. Until some policy is adopted by this country as to the future of the Philippine Islands, it does not seem wise to make any expenditure for fortifications at all. As I stated at the outset, Mr. Chairman, if there be danger now or in the near future of a foreign conflict, the \$4,800,000 carried in this

bill is ridiculously small and absurd; if there be no danger of a conflict between this country and some foreign nation, then the 25 per cent of the amount of this bill to be allotted for insular possessions—\$1,087,000—is, in my judgment, outrageously extravagant. Here is what Major Abbot said about the cost of fortifying Subig Bay:

Mr. SMITH. What is to be the total cost of Subig Bay?
Major ABBOT. Subig Bay would have cost about \$750,000 under the original project.

Mr. BRUNDIDGE. You say it has cost that?
Major ABBOT. No; it would. That is what it was originally estimated to cost. But in view of the statement by naval authorities as to the importance of the place, it became apparent that the greater number of heavy guns would have to go in, so that the estimates would be probably a million dollars more than we figured on—say, a total of perhaps a million and a half.

As matter of fact there is no man living in this country to-day who is a position to state what the complete cost of fortifying Subig Bay will be. It depends upon too many uncertain and indefinite projects. I am unalterably opposed to spending \$30,000,000 for fortifications and a naval station at Subig Bay, regardless of our policy toward the Philippine Islands. There may be some difference of opinion as to the propriety at this time of fortifying Manila. Members on this side of the House are practically unanimous that until a definite declaration of policy is made regarding the Philippine Islands by this Government nothing should be expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed one hour.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will finish in five minutes. So far as Subig Bay is concerned, I hope the House will effectively put a stop to the contemplated expenditures there. So far nothing has been expended at Subig Bay for fortifications.

Mr. McNARY. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. I would like to ask the gentleman to explain how much less it would cost to fortify Manila and complete the work of a naval station there than it will to do the work at Subig Bay.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not all the figures the gentleman requests. I understand it will cost about \$3,000,000 to fortify Manila. At Cavite there is a naval station which is practically doing as much work as any naval station in the United States except the navy-yard at Brooklyn. With very little expenditure, in my judgment, that station would suffice for all ordinary repairs. It is different, of course, if it is desired to establish a great plant there, at which could be done anything from ordinary repair to constructing a battle ship.

Even if there be money already expended at Subig Bay, it would be a wise policy, in my judgment, for the country to discontinue expenditures at that place. Whatever expenditures are made let them be at Manila.

When the provision for fortifications in the insular possessions is reached there will be two amendments offered; one will be to strike out the language in the bill which provides for fortifications in the Philippine Islands. If that amendment be not adopted, there will be another amendment to prevent the use of any part of the money appropriated under that item for fortifications at Subig Bay. If that be adopted, the result will be to make \$600,000 appropriated for Hawaii and the Philippine Islands available for Honolulu and Pearl Harbor and Manila. I should be pleased to have the House fix specifically the points at which the money shall be expended. Unless this be done, unless some definite policy is determined upon, there can be no estimate of what our expenditures in the Philippines will be. Let something, however trivial, be done at any place, and it will be used as a lever to pry out enough to complete the project irrespective of the total cost.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Can the gentleman give us an estimate of how much money we have already spent in the Philippine Islands for building up the harbors or maintaining the Army or the Navy, or any one of the several expenditures?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not able to tell how much we have expended in connection with the Navy, but in this bill, in the bill passed at the last session of Congress, and in the bill for fortifications in the session that preceded the last, there has been appropriated in all \$3,061,920 for objects connected with the fortifications of our insular possessions. Two hundred thousand dollars in addition has been appropriated for sites in Hawaii.

In addition to the money expended we have taken and are authorizing, roughly speaking, about twenty guns to be mounted in the insular possessions. There are transferred from the reserve guns for this country guns for the defense of the insular possessions, and it is impossible, without including the

cost of the guns so transferred, accurately to state what it has cost so far to fortify these possessions.

I have purposely avoided saying anything that might be considered as giving a partisan cast to this discussion. That a considerable difference of opinion exists as to the best place to locate a naval base in the Philippine Islands is known to many Members of this House. It is imperative that a sharp watch be kept upon the expenditures by this Government for objects in the Philippines. If the requests that come from the Departments be not carefully scrutinized the appropriations will grow with such surprising rapidity that the country will protest most vehemently. Haste should be made slowly in these matters.

While there are irreconcilable differences between this side of the House and that side upon some questions of policy as affecting the Philippine Islands, there is no difference—indeed, there can be no difference—of opinion as to the necessity and propriety of keeping the appropriations for military purposes in the insular possessions to the lowest possible amount consistent with safety. Two years have passed since the officials of the military departments pronounced so emphatically for the establishment of a naval base at Subig Bay, and yet to-day the dissatisfaction in official circles with this project is growing and becoming more manifest. It is not unpatriotic to call attention to this discontent; it would be highly improper to attempt to conceal it. Let the fullest light be shed upon the entire plan, insist upon the most complete information, consider carefully the opinions of all competent to give judgment, and then our action will be wise and more likely beneficial. Meanwhile enthusiasm should not be used to smother facts, nor should false pride prevent the doing of the wisest thing, regardless of what has been heretofore. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. OLMSTED having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 10.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to return to the House of Representatives House bill 297, to authorize the construction of dams and power stations on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution which has just come over from the Senate and is on the Speaker's table be concurred in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OLMSTED). The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is requested to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 297) to authorize the construction of dams and power stations on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, for the purpose of amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, while we are providing for the fortification of our country against a foreign foe I am in favor, also, of fortifying it against an influx of undesirable immigration. Among the most important questions for the consideration of Congress and the people of the United States is the subject of immigration and naturalization of aliens.

For some time past I have been making a study and examination of this important question, with a view, if possible, of arriving at a correct solution of it. In connection with this subject I have carefully examined the last report of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, Hon. Victor H. Metcalf; the last annual report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, Hon. Frank P. Sargent; the report of the Commission on Naturalization appointed by order of the President March 1, 1905, composed of the following commissioners: Milton D. Purdy, of the Department of Justice; Gaillard Hunt, of the Department of State; Richard K. Campbell, of the Department of Commerce and Labor; also the reports of Immigrant Inspector Marcus Braun, transmitted to the House of Representatives in compliance with a resolution.

All of these reports of these distinguished gentlemen, who have given this subject most full and careful consideration, agree that there should be and must be further restrictions upon the immigration of aliens into the United States and a thorough revision of the laws upon naturalization. In this conclusion,

both as to further restriction of immigration and revision of the naturalization laws, I agree.

The subject of immigration of aliens into the United States divides itself naturally under three heads:

First. The admission of aliens into the United States.

Second. The proper distribution of these aliens after they have been admitted in accordance with the law.

Third. The naturalization—making American citizens of such aliens after they have been admitted and distributed.

Upon the subject of admission of aliens into the United States numerous acts of Congress have been passed, and under these acts numerous regulations framed by the Commissioner-General of Immigration. The immigration laws have been, I believe, with possibly a few exceptions, revised and codified in the act of March 3, 1903. In a personal interview with the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor, Mr. Metcalf, and with Mr. Campbell, of the law department of the Bureau of Immigration, I have been informed that practically all the laws upon this subject are contained in the said act of March 3, 1903, and such amendments and additions thereto as in the judgment of the Department of Commerce and Labor are wise and necessary are to be incorporated in a bill to be presented to Congress.

It appears from the report of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor that during the past year the number of aliens who applied for admission into the United States was 1,026,499. This is in excess by 237,507 of the number reported for 1882, and the arrivals for that year, 1882, were in excess of those during any year prior to 1903 and more than 200,000 in excess of the arrivals in 1904, so that the year 1905 marked the high tide of immigration into the United States. The following article shows immigration in 1905:

IMMIGRATION IN 1905—NUMBER OF FOREIGNERS ARRIVING ALMOST DOUBLE THE POPULATION OF BOSTON.
[From the New York Sun.]

For purposes of comparison calendar years are as good as fiscal years. The year 1905 breaks the record. The figures for recent years are as follows:

| | |
|-----------|-----------|
| 1902..... | 739,280 |
| 1903..... | 937,371 |
| 1904..... | 808,257 |
| 1905..... | 1,065,834 |

The immigration for this single year equals that of the entire fifty years following the inauguration of President Washington. In numbers it doubles the population of Baltimore and nearly doubles the population of such cities as Boston and St. Louis. It would replace the entire population of Connecticut, with 100,000 surplus to spare. It would repopulate Vermont and New Hampshire combined, with 250,000 to spare.

These people came, as usual, from all the corners of the earth, but particularly from the southeastern corner of Europe. The arrivals from Greece, Turkey, Roumania, Servia, and Bulgaria constitute an interesting total of between 25,000 and 30,000. The horde came from Russia, Italy, and Austria-Hungary. The following shows the flood from those countries during the last three years:

| Country. | 1903. | 1904. | 1905. |
|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Russia..... | 147,623 | 161,610 | 175,831 |
| Austria-Hungary..... | 234,636 | 165,703 | 284,967 |
| Italy..... | 233,417 | 156,764 | 268,441 |
| Total..... | 615,676 | 484,167 | 729,239 |

Thus it appears that seven-tenths of the arrivals of last year were from these three countries. It also appears that within three years more than 1,800,000 of these people have come to the United States.

The Secretary of Commerce and Labor in his report says:

The important feature is that more than 1,000,000 aliens have been added to our population in the course of twelve months, a fact that suggests the necessity of considering whether some adequate measure should not be adopted so to limit the number of arrivals as to lessen the obvious dangers from our alien population increasing more rapidly than it can be assimilated.

The Commissioner-General of Immigration in his most excellent report of July 1, 1905, containing full information on this important subject, says that—

The welfare of our own people is involved in the continuous influx of such a vast tide of peoples of the most widely varying aims and capacities.

The experience of another year—

He says—

while it has brought a gratifying confirmation of the confidence heretofore expressed in the efficiency of existing measures and agencies, has also served to establish a strong conviction of the magnitude and gravity of the problem presented by the growth of our alien population. These problems loom so largely in the prospect of our country that it may be said, without giving just cause for the charge of exaggeration, that all other questions of political economy relating to things rather than to human beings shrink into comparative insignificance.

This is an important question, a great problem worthy of the most careful thought and consideration of every patriotic American citizen. It involves, or may involve, not only the welfare

of our people, but our free institutions. An immigration of more than 1,000,000 people in one year is an addition to the population of the United States of about one-eighth of our present population.

The problem involves questions also from a labor standpoint. We want a desirable class of immigrants in the South and whole country for our farm labor, and we want these immigrants properly distributed; but we do not want the worst and undesirable class of immigrants who enter the country. They compete with American labor and can not be assimilated with our population.

Governor Swanson, of Virginia, in his inaugural address, on the subject of immigration says:

The department of agriculture has been instrumental in bringing to this State several thousand of immigrants from the Northwest, who have purchased homes and now constitute a part of our best citizens and most prosperous farmers. There is a great scarcity of farm labor in this State, which must be supplied. Not much more than half of our land is under cultivation. Progress and prosperity demand that this uncultivated half should be converted into fertile and yielding farms. The cheapness and fertility of our lands, the superabundance of our climate, the nearness and accessibility of our markets, the great demand for labor, must necessarily soon bring a large immigration to Virginia. Wisdom requires that we should as early as possible endeavor to control and guide the character of this immigration, so that it may bring us an elevation, not a deterioration, of citizenship. Better have no immigration, better let much of our land remain waste and unoccupied, than have injected in our populations persons whose principles are a menace to civilization and presence a curse to society.

The correspondent adds:

These are sentiments which the South generally should heed. She has great quantities of rich lands standing idle for want of people to cultivate them; and if cultivated they would yield handsomely to the cultivators and contribute to the upbuilding of that whole section. But it is not a question of rushing numbers in and filling up with Tom, Dick, and Harry. Something more—a very great deal, indeed—is necessary than the mere tilling of the soil. The people who till it should be worthy of American citizenship and bent on acquiring and exercising it. They should not be, as Governor Swanson declares, "a menace to civilization and a curse to society."

While addressed to the people of Virginia, this deliverance of the new governor of the Old Dominion is in its larger features worthy of national attention and application, and marks its author as worthy of the confidence his people have reposed in him.

The problem is, under our immigration laws, how to get the best class of immigration and at the same time exclude the undesirable classes, which imperil our development and endanger our free institutions and lower the standard of American labor. Of the more than 1,000,000 immigrants who came into the country during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, an increase of 213,629 over the fiscal year 1904, it is safe to say that three-fourths, certainly the great majority, came from Austria-Hungary, Russia, Italy, the races of southern Europe, and from Syria.

The Commissioner-General of Immigration says in this connection:

The countries which may be regarded as the chief sources of future increase in immigration are those two in Europe which have the greatest resources in population to dispense with—Russia and Austria-Hungary.

He says that nearly 700,000 of these immigrants brought amounts of money with them less than \$50. He declares that—

One of the most significant features of immigration is the large increase in the number of idiots, insane persons, and paupers during the past year, which, coupled with an increase of 25 per cent in the number of diseased aliens, justifies the Immigration Bureau in directing attention to the flagrant and willful disregard by ocean steamers of the laws for the regulation of their business in securing alien passengers destined for the United States.

He declares—

Of the various features of the immigration law, none has proved so difficult of enforcement as that which was passed for the protection of labor in this country over unfair competition by aliens.

Referring to the large number of aliens imported into the country in the interest of great corporations, already highly protected under the high protective tariff of the Republican party, he insists that—

Congress was influenced by the right principle when it forbade those classes which are the primary beneficiaries of our protective duty to import alien labor and thus absorb all of the benefits of that duty, deprive labor of its proper proportion of such benefit, and condemn to idleness or to comparatively inadequate compensation that large body of American citizens whose brawn, intelligence, and industry are such essential features of our national prosperity.

Concluding his most excellent report, the Commissioner-General of Immigration further declares:

It is no longer sufficient to close the door upon certain classes, manifestly undesirable additions to any community. The aliens who are forbidden admission to the United States by section 2 of the act of March 3, 1903, are as objectionable to the communities in which they are born, and of which they have always formed a part, as they are to us. It can not be denied that of such that are not expressly excluded by law there are many aliens entering the United States who, if not individually open to objection on the score of physical, mental, or moral defects, admitted by all men, are yet of such total alien, if not repugnant

character and genius, as to raise a doubt whether they will in the course of succeeding years become assimilated.

This view has found expression as yet in legislation affecting aliens of but one race, but that solitary instance, however, is a recognition of the principle that the welfare of the people at this stage of the world's development calls for the Government to prevent an unrestricted irruption of elements hostile to our free institutions, if not incapable of comprehending them.

He then recommends further restriction of immigration and certain amendments of the immigration laws. Adopting his recommendations in part, I have introduced into the House a bill of my own upon this subject. This bill adds to the excluded classes, so that, with the amendment to the immigration laws proposed by my bill, the ignorant, vicious, lawless, aged, imbecile, weak-minded, those of poor physique, and the paupers of the Old World, all of whom are a menace to our institutions, are refused admission into the country. The bill offered by myself also increases the head tax. It increases the penalties imposed upon transportation companies for violation of immigration laws, and it provides for thorough physical examination and more rigid inspection at the port of embarkation.

Now, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that, looking at this matter in the fairest and most impartial light, and with due regard to all sections of the country and our people, in accordance with the views of the eminent officials whom I have mentioned and my own views and a thorough investigation of the subject, some such legislation is necessary, not only in the interest of American labor but also for the best interests of our free institutions. It has been said that it is the theory of our Government that America is the "land of the free and the home of the brave," and that we must have immigration to keep pace with the growth and prosperity of the country. But it can not be denied by anyone that the class of immigration that has been coming into the country in recent years from the races of southern Europe, and from Turkey, in Asia, some of it the very scum and riff-raff of European and Asiatic countries, is not desirable, and that it is against the interest of American labor, and that it will, if allowed to continue, eventually affect and influence our American institutions.

The kind of immigrants we want are the thrifty, industrious citizens of northern Europe, who can be assimilated with our population and add real strength to the United States—those described in the following article from a North Carolina newspaper in my district:

TO EUROPE FOR IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. M. F. H. Gouverneur, vice-president of the Carolina Trucking and Development Company, of Wilmington, is soon to leave for Europe in the interest of his company. He will spend his time in northern Germany and Holland in an effort to induce immigration to eastern North Carolina, and place them on lands owned by the company. The company owns more than 300,000 acres in the counties of New Hanover, Pender, Duplin, Brunswick, Bladen, Columbus, and Robeson.

Farmers of the German and Holland class are usually successful, and of the order called "hustlers." For intense farming they are unequalled, and are just the people required in a country that needs development. That some of them may be placed in Pender County, we hope.

In the First Congress, when a bill was offered to encourage immigration and provide for naturalization, James Madison, the leader of the House, said:

It is no doubt very desirable that we should hold out as many inducements as possible to the worthy part of mankind to come and settle among us and throw their fortunes into a common lot with ours; but it is not our desire to swell the catalogue of the people in numbers; but it is to increase the wealth and strength of the community, and those who acquire the rights of citizenship without adding to the wealth and strength of the community are not the people whom we are in need of. I would be extremely sorry if our rule of naturalization excluded a single person of good family who really meant to incorporate himself into our society. On the other hand, I do not wish that any man should acquire the privilege but such as would be a real addition to the wealth and strength of the United States.

Now, it can not be contended for one moment that the class of aliens who have been coming into the country in recent years either add to the wealth or strength of the country. On the contrary, they are a source of danger and menace and lower the standard of American labor. We can get enough of desirable immigration, whatever may be needed, without admitting undesirable classes. Many of the aliens in recent years who have been coming to this country have no intention of making a permanent residence here. Thomas Jefferson, in his first annual message as President, in 1801, declared that—

The general character and capabilities of a citizen should be communicated only to those manifesting a bona fide purpose to embark their life and fortune permanently with us.

Now, as shown very thoroughly and clearly by Inspector Marcus Braun in his report to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, it is an undeniable truth that both Italy and Hungary regard emigration of their people simply as a temporary absence abroad for the purpose of earning money and bringing it back. He says that he is convinced beyond a doubt that some European countries, agencies, and private individuals are not only continuing to regard this country as the dumping ground

of citizens of an undesirable class, but this is coupled with the arrogant and widespread assumption that this country is but an asset of a large number of European powers, subject only to their desires and orders. He says that these facts, if universally known in this country, would drive the blood of humiliation into the face of every true American and a description of it would defy the pen of a Macaulay. He declares that immigrants, inadmissible for reasons other than disease, are constantly brought into the country in large numbers by the concerted action of European governments, steamship agencies, bankers, and schemers of all sorts. The immigration agencies and steamship agencies reap large profits from this indiscriminate immigration, and the large sums of money sent annually to Europe from the United States (according to last year's reports \$50,000,000 was thus sent to Austria-Hungary alone) have had a magnetic effect on some governments of Europe and has awakened in them the desire to multiply these shipments of immigrants to the greatest extent possible.

He shows that the Cunard Line, through the activity of its subagents and a contract with the Hungarian Government, cleared last year an income of over \$2,000,000 from Hungarian emigration. He shows that many Armenian emigrants to the United States have obtained naturalization papers and as soon as they have earned sufficient money for their needs and comfort have returned supplied with American citizenship papers, which they obtained legally or illegally, as the case may be. He declares that our consul at Beirut said that the governor of Mount Lebanon told him recently, if this constant travel from Syria to and from the United States should not cease soon, the United States had better annex the province of Lebanon; that there were at present more American citizens there than Turkish subjects. The United States immigration laws are treated with contempt in Syria. Anybody and everybody is being shipped from there, and the only word known to these immigrants as to their destination is the word "America;" they know nothing else. Every steamer arriving in Syria brings heavy mail from the United States. Large sums of money are received annually from this country, and a constant desire and greediness for more is universally manifested. Ninety-nine per cent of alleged American citizens in Jerusalem do not speak a word of English. Most of them whom he interviewed did not know the name of the street in which they claimed to have resided while in the United States.

Italian emigration, he shows, is encouraged by that Government, which charges a fee for every Government passport issued to an emigrant. The Italians are justified in every respect in fearing a restriction on the part of the United States, as it is evident from the information received in interviews with Italian bankers and ship agents that the amount annually received in Italy from the United States averages \$1 a day for every Italian who comes to this country for temporary labor.

Now, this kind of immigration from Austria-Hungary, Russia, Italy, Armenia, and Syria, constituting an undesirable class, most of whom come only for temporary purposes to accumulate money which they send home, eventually returning there themselves, is not the kind of immigration contemplated either by the fathers of the Republic or which is a benefit to the American people. And, as said by Mr. Braun, this stream of undesirable immigration continues and is on the increase. It consists of two classes; first, those who are objectionable by reason of physical, mental, or moral defects, or who are undesirable because they come to this country merely for a temporary stay which they use for the accumulation of money and then return to their native country; and, second, the large number who come here in violation of our alien contract labor laws. The emigration from the Turkish dominions, both European and Asiatic, Braun declares, "is nothing short of a menace to the country. From there we positively get the worst kind of people in the world." He concludes by declaring that—

While there are people of all lands who go to other countries for purposes of business and earning money in various capacities, which is legitimate and to which no exception can be taken, it is an entirely different matter with the great horde of immigrants who have flooded this country during the last decade. They come here, not because of our free institutions, or because they have a desire to advance themselves either materially or intellectually, but because the American dollar is of a much greater purchasing value in their native countries, to which they always remain loyal. They make no effort to learn our language, customs, and views; they do not think of ever becoming citizens or contributing in the least to the development of the country, and if they take the oath of citizenship it is only because it facilitates their purposes here and protects them abroad.

Geographically speaking, the immigrants coming from the north of Europe, if not affected by disease, are the best we get. Those from western and southern Europe are very rarely desirable, even if they can not be excluded by disease or moral defect.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is very clear to my mind, in view of this report and of the information which I can obtain from the various reports and documents upon this subject, that there is

no question that the races of northern Europe are the most desirable for us. Those coming from southern Europe, as a general rule, are not a desirable class. It is said the South needs immigration to develop its agricultural and manufacturing resources, but the South does not need the class of undesirable immigration which has been pouring into the country in a constant stream in late years. A late article in the Washington Post, which I have before me and from which I will read, expresses very clearly what, it seems to me, should be our true position on that subject:

LET THE SOUTH SIT STRAIGHT.

Those of our southern friends who have imbibed the European immigrant idea with characteristic enthusiasm and are now mightily alarmed over the prospect of losing some of the projected influx through the cunning machinations of their northern rivals will do well to examine the current reports of Italian activity in certain parts of New York and Pennsylvania.

We note from time to time, in various esteemed contemporaries published beyond the Potomac, editorial injunctions of great solemnity and news accounts of meetings, addresses, and resolutions, all tending to educate the southern public in this connection. White immigration from Europe is necessary [sic] to the upbuilding of the section. With large floods of white laborers from the southern and southwestern districts of that continent, our prosperity will advance by leaps and bounds. Agriculture, commerce, mining, and manufacturing will increase upon a scale of geometrical progression. Everybody will be rich and happy next week, if not sooner. And there you are!

Meanwhile, however, the Post's suggestion stands knocking at the door of recognition. Why not take a good look at the fruits of Italian and Slav immigration in other parts of the country before trying it by wholesale for ourselves? We have had very little experience of this kind at the South, and that, in most instances, has been discouraging.

But why should the South open its doors to a new invasion of this kind? It is sufficiently notorious that Italy, Hungary, and the Danubian provinces are anything but anxious, or even willing, to send us their virtuous, wholesome, and desirable peasantry. They are all blessed with these industrious, worthy, and valuable elements of population, but our agents in that part of the world know that we receive very little infusion from those sources. European governments are only too anxious to deport their criminals and degenerates, and it is of record that we have been only too incautious in the matter of receiving them. It does not follow, however, that southern communities need give asylum and opportunity to these outlaws. The South is growing richer every day with the material already at its disposal. Why imperil the certainty of a splendid and a sound development by adventure in strange fields with sinister and abhorrent instruments?

It is no doubt true that the South will be benefited by an increase of population and of industrial material, but the South can well afford to move carefully in this regard. As things now stand, its prosperity is assured. Our southern friends need only hold aloof from perilous experiment in order to reap the promise now beckoning from sure ground.

Such immigration as comes into the South and into the country should be the best possible and the most desirable.

Now, Mr. Chairman, after the alien, if desirable, is admitted into the country under our laws there is another important question connected with this subject, namely, the proper distribution of immigrants. It is proposed in order to properly distribute desirable immigrants for farm labor in the South as well as in the West that an agent of the State, or two or more States, shall be stationed in New York for the purpose of furnishing information to immigrants and to aid them in determining where they should locate; information as to resources, products, climate, soil, etc., of the various States and Territories.

A constant stream of immigration has been going to the West in view of the inducements offered by that section of the country and representations made by its agents.

The third important division of this subject of immigration is the naturalization of aliens. From an examination of the report of the Commission of Naturalization and study of the subject, I am inclined to think that the naturalization laws should be so revised as to require uniformity of certificates, confining the jurisdiction of naturalization of aliens to United States courts or State courts of record, and that no alien should be naturalized or entitled to the privileges of an elector until he shall have resided in the United States for five years at least and is able to read intelligently and write.

I trust that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will at least so revise the immigration and naturalization laws as to put a stop to this ceaseless flow of undesirable immigration of aliens, competing with and lowering the standard of American labor in the shop and in the factory and upon the farm; people incapable of comprehending our form of government, incapable of assimilation, a menace to our free institutions, and dangerous to our American ideas and civilization.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if there is one subject that has been well disputed in the last five years, it is the proposition for the establishment of a naval station at Olongapo, in the Philippine Islands. Inasmuch as I have listened during five years to at least a hundred days of argument for and against that proposition, I feel myself quite well informed upon it. I suffer the disadvantage of not having been

in the Philippine Islands. I enjoy the opportunity, however, of saying that I never will be in the Philippine Islands unless I am put into a condition of body and mind wherein I have no power to resist. Nevertheless, if I had my way about it, I would fortify Manila because the city belongs to the Philippine Islands and I would fortify Subig Bay because it belongs to the people of the United States. I am sorry I have not had the advantage of gentlemen who made the excursion last year. I was not expected and therefore I did not go, but I have listened to and have heard from men who have not been there one day, two days, or five days, but who have spent one year, two years, and three years in the islands, upon the proposition of establishing a naval station in the Philippine Islands. Furthermore than that I am benefited by the advice of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, a gentleman who has spent perhaps one day or two days on the spot, not 4 miles from the place where this station is to be located and being thus 4 miles away gives a bird's-eye view and then makes a guess at it, but who went upon the ground for the purpose of informing himself and his colleagues on the Committee on Naval Affairs—and I refer to the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss]. We are well satisfied not only with his observations, but with the report that he has already made to us. If the committee will bear with me for two or three minutes, I desire to say that there is no place in the United States, there is no place in any of the possessions of the United States, so well adapted for a naval station as at that found in Subig Bay. There is no place in the United States where a naval station is either projected or established that we do not have to dig mud in order to get a ship to it with perhaps the exception of Bremerton. Up to the spot where the steel dry dock that this Government has built within the last year there are found 60 feet of water, which a civilian who spent a year there told us the other day Providence itself had provided and which Providence had maintained. There has been no change whatever in that channel—not a tortuous, dangerous channel, but one that is a mile wide, one that flows between high mountains, not in a straight line where bullets may fly and projecting shells may go to strike our ships, but one that is protected in any point of its course by high mountains through which ships' guns can not send their missiles of death and destruction. This channel winds around for 7 miles, a mile in width, and for one-half that width there are 60 feet of water and there has been this depth for years and years. Sixty feet of water are found from the ocean up to the very place where we propose to establish a dry dock. Let me go back to the origin of this programme. If there was one subject the Administration had an interest in three years ago, it was the proposition to establish a station at Olongapo, in the Philippine Islands.

If there was any estimate that was suggested by Secretary Moody with all of the earnestness that that gentleman possessed, it was that we should establish this station, and his reasons were sensible to us and we adopted them and established the station there. Following upon that we made an appropriation of \$1,250,000 for a dry dock, which is now on the road to the Philippines, where there is no other place to put it except in Subig Bay. Men who testified within the last week agreed all around that there is no water at Manila in which you can use this dry dock. It will either go to Subig Bay or you will tie it up in the ocean somewhere or bring it home. It was built especially for that point and it was not built for any other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. Mr. Chairman, to repeat what I have already said, this has been a disturbing question with one branch of the Government. My friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] knows that to be so. The commission that was sent to the islands searched everywhere to find deep water, and I would like to assure the gentlemen who are listening to me—and if the others will listen for one minute I will assure them also—that never again, as I live upon this earth, will I vote one dollar for a naval station where you have not sufficient depth of water upon which to float ships to the stations of repair. The great depth of water at this point impressed us all favorably. The further assurance of the Government authorities that no dredging would be needed at this point for years to come impressed us also favorably, and was a strong inducement to favorable action.

If this dry dock continues on its course and does not upset before it reaches Manila it will go to Subig Bay, where we have tentatively provided for its reception. The Committee on Naval Affairs has agreed tentatively on appropriations for Olongapo. They will not reach \$200,000. The committee has made an appropriation for a channel to drain the swamp near where this

dry dock will be located, costing perhaps fifteen or twenty thousand dollars. They have further tentatively agreed upon one item in the bill of perhaps sixty or eighty thousand dollars to build, not to dig, but to build from the shops that the Spaniards located there a pier to connect them with this dry dock, which of itself contains a machine shop.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman—

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Not for a minute, please. Mr. Chairman, another proposition that satisfied us very well was that even the Spaniards had concluded to abandon Manila and had built some sort of shops at Subig Bay. The Spaniards concluded to leave Manila for the reason they could not keep sufficient depth of water there in which to float their ships. A naval officer and a civil engineer testified the other day that there is no place in the Philippine Islands in which a battle ship can be docked except at Subig Bay. They further testified that the water about Cavite was subject to obstruction from moving sand that continually fills in the dredging. They say that is their experience, and were positive in their advice to us that we should abandon Cavite not entirely, but to look forward toward establishing a station at Subig Bay. Acting largely, I suppose, upon their advice as well as upon the advice given us heretofore, we concluded that for the time being we will ask this House to permit us to stay in Subig Bay. Not that we will adopt, Mr. Chairman, the estimates handed us by the Navy Department for millions of dollars at Subig Bay, but we will recommend to this House, at the proper season, a modest item carrying a modest amount for improvements at this place. It is true that the Government has a programme which, if carried out, will involve the expenditure of twelve or fifteen million dollars. It is true that the Government has even recommended more than twelve or fifteen million dollars. I may say to my friend from New York it is true that heads of Departments and other officials have recommended \$43,000,000 for navy-yards and for construction and maintenance, but it does not follow because gentlemen make such estimates that Congress will immediately and without inquiry approve them, but the provisions that have already been, as I have said, tentatively agreed upon will be all that the Government will need for the time being in the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I would like to say just one thing more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield to the gentleman three minutes because I want to ask him a question.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I am very much obliged, and I will divide my time with the gentleman when he asks the question. Another strong inducement to this is this, and I speak knowingly upon this subject, because I am advised by people living at Subig Bay, and we have lived there for months, that the health of the place is almost perfect. Right on this landlocked harbor they have cool nights; nights in which they can enjoy their sleep. There are in that place from six to eight hundred, maybe a thousand, marines collected for some purpose in the East I know not of, but about which I have read, and the health of these men is good, very good. There is no sick; there is no real discomfort in these cool mountains, in this landlocked harbor, surrounded by high hills that nature itself has provided, which some day should stand as a protection to us against an enemy.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to inquire of the gentleman if he was not aware in the navy appropriation act signed on the 27th of April, 1904, there was an item for dredging the basin in front of the quay walls for the floating dry dock of \$48,000?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. At Subig Bay?

Mr. FITZGERALD. At Subig Bay.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have it here.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. My friend is asking a question, and I have no doubt it is true, but the money has not been all used; but the purpose of establishing that dry dock at that point—

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not a dry dock that it is proposed to build, but it is in order to enable the Navy Department to use the floating dry dock that is now on the way there, and it took \$48,000 so far to do this. How much more is required, in spite of the statement that they have unlimited water, nobody in this Government knows.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am not able to do so. I am very sorry to confess my ignorance, but I am unable to answer. I can not remember all of these different propositions. It is possible for one to sit down, of course, and pick out an item here and there and ask a question concerning it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] use up some of his time now if possible.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has thirty-seven minutes and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has thirty-five minutes remaining.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

[Mr. JONES of Virginia addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS].

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word at this time upon the question of the location of our naval station in the Philippines. I presume it is a matter which will come also in the regular order upon our naval bill, and it was my intention at that time to go into the question quite extensively and not speak upon the fortification bill at this time; but inasmuch as the question has come up I would like to say a few words upon it now.

The question of the location of a naval station in the Philippines was, in my judgment, settled by Congress two years ago. At that time we had before us the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Moody, and also the report of the board which had investigated this question as to the proper location of our naval base in the Philippines, and upon that testimony and the testimony of other officers the committee reported upon the wisdom of establishing a naval base at Olongapo. That matter was properly before this House. The importance of it was stated in the report which I had the honor to submit at that time. A naval reservation was set apart for the Navy at Olongapo. The reservation is 4 or 5 miles square. I might go into the reading of the testimony which was before the committee and some of which was read on the floor of this House as to the advantages of this particular site. Secretary Moody said that he had been—all over the subject and every single bit of information is in favor of establishing it within Subig Bay at Olongapo. Nobody disagrees. The Army and the Navy alike say that it is the place to put it. There is plenty of water, and protection at the entrance may be made perfect.

Admiral Dewey was before the committee, and he said, having given the subject a great deal of study:

I am convinced that Subig Bay is the one place in the Philippines for a naval base.

Later on he says:

There is no necessity of spending much money on it at first. I suppose that in the course of time it will grow, but it is of the first importance that we should have a dry dock somewhere in the Philippines, and this dock should be protected by guns.

Now, I could go into the whole discussion of this subject and bring you the testimony of naval officers who have looked into this question. There has never been a commander in chief of our fleet in the East who has not come back here after a thorough investigation and study of this question and said to us, this is the proper place for the naval base in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Was Admiral Dewey ever in Subig Bay in his life?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; he went in there to find the Spanish fleet before he went into Manila Bay.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. My information is the other way.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois permit me to ask the gentleman from Virginia a question? Was Admiral Dewey in as far as the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. FOSS. I think he was in a great deal farther.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I will say to my friend that my information is that he was not.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Well, the gentleman from Virginia knows how far he was in.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. And there is a Member of this House who was with him, from whom I have got my information—a gentleman on the Republican side of the Chamber.

Mr. FOSS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that not only our naval authorities are firmly convinced of this, but upon their advice we made an appropriation in this House of over \$800,000 toward its establishment, of which \$500,000 was toward the establishment of a coaling station and \$300,000 toward the establishment of a navy-yard. That was two years ago. Contracts have already been let for that coaling station, so we are expending this appropriation to-day.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman state when he got that appropriation?

Mr. FOSS. Two years ago. And since that time we have added \$100,000 more to it. Now, the naval officers were convinced at that time and are convinced now—and I have talked with Admiral Dewey and members of the naval board who have had this whole matter under consideration—and they are more convinced to-day than they were then that that is the place for our naval station. Well, what else? Why, the joint board of Army and Navy officers have also had this thing under consideration and this is from their report. The Lieutenant-General, if I remember, of the Army was a member of that board, as was also the Admiral of the Navy. What is it?

First. That without a fortified naval base in the Philippines the Asiatic Fleet can not keep open the lines of communication for supplies from the United States or between the Army posts within the Philippines, without which supplies the military forces of the United States could not hold command of the islands.

Second. That Manila is not but that Subig Bay is suited for a naval base and station, and of all harbors in the archipelago—and the harbor which has been spoken of by the gentleman from Virginia included—it is the best for the purpose.

Third. That the fortification of Subig Bay is essential to the security of a naval station located there.

That is the opinion of the joint board of the Army and Navy. It seems to me that it almost ought to be considered res adjudicata. And upon that report we have appropriated money for this naval station. Now, gentlemen come in here who perhaps have journeyed over to the Philippines as I went and have expressed their opinions as to whether this is a fitting place or not for a naval station. Now, I want to ask you seriously whether you think they are competent to judge. I tried to induce a large number of that company one day to go with me up to Olongapo from Manila, and there was only one gentleman whom I could induce and he was a member of the committee—Mr. Loun. We went up and investigated and looked over this place and came back, but other gentlemen who have seen fit here to say something against this location of this station have never been there and did not go with us at that time. Now, gentlemen have also said Generals So-and-so do not believe that this place is the best place.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. But I did not; I said General Wood and General Corbin.

Mr. FOSS. Well, General Wood and General Corbin are able Army generals, but I do not know that they have ever acquired any great reputation in this country as naval experts, and I will follow them when it comes to Army matters. I will follow them when they tell me where we ought to put the barracks of our Army or where we ought to put the fortifications for the Army here or there; gladly will I follow them. Why? Because they are educated along that line. But when it comes to the Navy, I will follow the opinion of naval officers—the men whom we have sent to the Naval Academy and educated in naval affairs, who are familiar with that particular line of Government service. Their testimony and their opinion I will follow, but I will not follow the opinion of any Army officer on the question of a location of a naval station.

Now, Mr. Chairman, another thing. We have got a naval station down at Cavite. We have been using it for a number of years, or ever since we have been in the Philippines. It is a small Spanish station, and the committee has recommended appropriations to no large extent for it. We have gone along with this with its costing the Government but very little money in the shape of repairs now and then, and we have been doing very good work there, but looking to the future of the establishment of a permanent naval place, the Navy Department has come to the conclusion that it would not do to stay at Cavite. Why?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. I will ask a few minutes more. I have been down at Cavite, and I know the condition there.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I will yield five minutes more time to the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. FOSS. They have got 47 acres of land at Cavite. I went over it—drove around it. It is all covered with buildings, and you can not get any more buildings there. It is an old Spanish naval station. You can not get a battle ship, according to the testimony of Admiral Dewey—and it has been confirmed during the last few weeks by testimony of naval officers before our committee—within 2 miles of Cavite, within 2 miles of the naval station. It is going to cost millions of dollars to dredge around this naval station in order to get your ships up there. Then what next? Why, you have got to have more land for your naval station, and the naval officers say that they have got to make land out into the water, and that

means the large proposition of dredging and filling in, and then after you have done that, what have you got? A naval station of a hundred acres, perhaps, with an expenditure of \$10,000,000 or so.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Will the gentleman permit one question right there?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Will the gentleman tell me how much level ground there is at Olongapo now available?

Mr. FOSS. Well, I did not go all over it.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I thought you went and examined it.

Mr. FOSS. But I went over some of it. We have got over 500 marines there. We have got marine barracks; we have got the old Spanish buildings which were a part of the naval station which they had there years ago, and we propose to use those. Then, there is a town or village off a little ways, and this level tract of land, which is larger, I may say, than my friend's front yard—

Mr. JONES of Virginia. It might be that and not be very large.

Mr. FOSS. There is quite an expanse of level land there, and I will say to my friend, I would not want to walk over it all in a day, but there is a village there of 600 Filipinos. There is plenty of land there to build a naval station—plenty of land.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Plenty of level land without digging down the mountain side?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; plenty of level land without digging down the mountain side.

Some gentleman has stated there are some rivers that run down through there and that some of the land is wet and marshy, but that can be drained off.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. It is only 2 feet above the level of the bay.

Mr. FOSS. I do not know how many feet, but it is down very near to the water's edge.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. With a river running through it.

Mr. FOSS. Very near to the water's edge, and it has been in that condition for hundreds of years, they tell me. And it has never been overflowed, so they tell me. The water in this perfectly landlocked harbor is very smooth, and it is considered the best place for our naval station by men who know—not only by men who know, but by men whose business it is to know.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Let me ask my friend if he remembers how long that civil engineer lived there?

Mr. FOSS. It seems to me he said a year or two years.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. A Government engineer?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. FOSS. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, the gentleman has said something about the advice of men whose business it is to know. Upon whose advice did we establish this naval station at Cavite?

Mr. FOSS. That was the old Spanish station, established by the Spaniards.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, upon whose advice did we spend money there, and make appropriations, and continue a naval station there?

Mr. FOSS. We did it upon the Navy Department's advice.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Are they not people whose business it is to know? Now, the gentleman tells us Cavite is thoroughly unfitted for that purpose.

Mr. FOSS. Yes; we took the old Spanish station. We had a fleet there, and we had to repair our ships. That is the station the Spaniards had used for years, so we took that station temporarily for the purpose of repairing our ships.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has seventeen minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just one minute, in order for the gentleman to answer this question. That is all.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I grant the time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand, we took a place 2 miles from where a ship could possibly land, continued it as a naval station upon the advice of people whose business it was to know, and spent how many millions of dollars? How much have we spent there?

Mr. FOSS. I should say not over two or three hundred thousand dollars in repairs to this old Spanish naval station; but I do not want to let that statement go which the gentleman has made, that no ship could get within 2 miles of there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I so understood the gentleman a few moments ago.

Mr. FOSS. No battle ship.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, that is the kind of ship I am talking about. A naval station is used for battle ships.

Mr. FOSS. Surely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will grant the gentleman three minutes longer.

Mr. FOSS. Now, this is our present situation, Mr. Chairman. We have made these appropriations. Congress has established this naval station. We have built a dry dock, and that dry dock is on its way over there, and there is not any place where you can put it except in Subig Bay. Oh, you can put it in Manila Bay, but Manila Bay is a place where there are frequent storms. You can not put that dock over there and moor it safely unless you put it in still water somewhere; and our naval authorities have said that there is only one place there, in their judgment, in which to put it, and that is in Subig Bay—first, because the water is quiet and still, where they can put our ships into dock and work on them, and then, in the second place, where there is a sufficient depth of water, 60 feet, which we must have for that dock. Will these honorable experts, who know so much about the situation over there and talk against Olongapo, tell us of some spot in Manila Bay, anywhere, where you can safely moor this dock and where there is sufficient water near the shore in which to do so?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman say there is sufficient water at Olongapo?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then why, in 1904, did you appropriate in your appropriation bill \$48,000 with which to dredge for that dock?

Mr. FOSS. Why, my dear friend, there is not a harbor in all the world anywhere that you can use for commercial purposes, to say nothing about naval purposes, but what you have got to expend a little money for dredging.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, \$50,000 is a pretty good sum where I live for dredging; it may not be at Manila or Olongapo.

Mr. FOSS. Why, you have had hundreds of thousands of dollars expended for that purpose in New York Harbor.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Four per cent of all the appropriations for rivers and harbors have been expended at New York, and it carries 65 per cent of all the exports of this country.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. FOSS. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I would just like one minute more simply to state the situation. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. FOSS. We have got that dock on the way, going over to the Philippine Islands. We have got to put it somewhere, and it is bound for Subig Bay, I want Congress to know. It is because that is the only place where we have sufficient depth of water, and it is regarded as the only suitable site for a naval station. Now, after that dock is over there, we have got to connect it with the land, and we are going to build out a little pier that will cost \$65,000, and that appropriation will be carried in the naval appropriation bill. We are going to give them a few tools, that will amount to about \$100,000, to repair our ships—not to make expensive repairs, but for them to do just small repairs. Whenever any expensive repairs are needed the ships will come home to our own people at our own yards under the appropriations that we are allowing in the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the gentleman from New York use some of his time now?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here listening to the debate since the House resumed its work this morning, and I have heard nothing but dollars, thousands, millions; expenditures, expenditures, expenditures! Philippine burdens galore. When is it going to end?

I find, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman who has just taken his seat states that less than two years ago we appropriated for the Philippine improvements—did you say \$8,000,000 or \$800,000.

Mr. FOSS. Over \$800,000 at Olongapo.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. And \$500,000 somewhere else?

Mr. FOSS. I do not know that I said anything about that.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. You said \$500,000 for something—

Mr. FOSS. I say of this \$800,000, \$500,000 of it went toward the building of a coal plant.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. And then \$300,000 for something else; and then, in addition to that, \$100,000 more, you said.

Mr. Chairman, here we come to-day with a bill that appropriates \$600,000 for guns for the Philippine Islands and Hawaii. Four hundred thousand of that for the Philippine Islands, I believe, and \$200,000 for Hawaii. I will not read the details, but give the "totals" of the appropriations carried in this bill, as shown by this report we all have.

Total, fortifications and other works of defense, 1906, \$2,414,400. Estimates for 1907, \$2,860,900.

Now, then, "Total armament and fortifications, 1906, \$2,988,550;" nearly \$3,000,000. "Estimates for 1907, \$2,913,009.90; recommended for 1907, \$1,882,000." Then we go over a page or two, and under the head of "Insular possessions" we find the money appropriated for that amounted in 1906—I would like to get the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] to the table on page 4 of the report, and have him explain these figures to me. Look where you say "total," at the bottom of the page, "appropriations for 1906, \$6,747,893." "Estimates for 1907, \$8,953,112.90; recommended, \$4,838,993." Now, that is the "total" of what?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The total for this purpose.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How much for Hawaii and all the islands?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. One million eighty-seven thousand dollars.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we learn from the words of this report that we seem to be engaged in doing nothing but spending the American people's money in fortifying for war and making a great military port out of the Philippine Islands. We have to make, in order to hold these islands, a navy on a parity with "any navy in the world," a navy to successfully cope with all the world. We must keep a "standing army" as long as it can stand, outside of coffins, in the Philippine Islands; we must keep up an endless chain of sending our able-bodied sons to the Philippine Islands and retain them out there as long as we can keep them out of a coffin and able to shoulder a musket.

As the result of this colonialism, we must keep a standing army in peace three times larger than we had when the Spanish war began, and Uncle Sam foots the bill. All this, and more I won't recite, by way of parenthesis, gentlemen. Notice we have no deficiencies in our colonial appropriations. Plenty of money for those purposes.

Do you know that on Saturday last the Treasury Department stopped forty elevators in various custom-houses in the United States, because of a lack of money to run the elevators?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That was not because there was not money enough in the Treasury, but because it had not been appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. But you cut down our home appropriations low enough to allow these colonial appropriations. I got notice of this from the postmaster at Nashville Monday, about the Nashville elevator. Protests from the officers in the magnificent Government building at Nashville were sent me. There are some ten or twelve different departments located in this half-million-dollar custom-house.

I got protests from Postmaster A. W. Wills, from the United States district attorney, the marshal, the collector of internal revenue and of customs, from the court clerk, Mr. Doak, from the Weather Bureau, from the superintendent of the southern free rural delivery, Mr. Conger, and a number of other officers. There are many heads of departments on second, third, and fourth floors of this building, who must walk up and down the stairways, as well as all the witnesses who go to attend sessions of the Federal courts there, held by Circuit Judge Lurton and District Judge Clark.

The business of this great country is embarrassed in this way simply because the last Congress did not appropriate enough money to run the Government along those lines. Yet we find no deficiencies in the Philippine appropriations, but we find them in appropriations for our home people.

I went to the Treasury Department yesterday morning, and I was pretty red hot about this, I want to say. Nashville has about 130,000 people, and has always been a great city. She has produced two Speakers of this House—John Bell and James K. Polk. Nashville was the home of Andrew Jackson and James K. Polk, Presidents of the United States. We have produced two judges of the United States Supreme Court—Judge Howell E. Jackson and Judge John Catron. Circuit Judge H. H. Lurton lives and holds court there. Judge Clark holds the district court there. In one suit, involving over a million and a half dollars, about 1,500 witnesses, I am told, have been examined in this building, and it is not concluded.

And yet, Mr. Chairman, we did not appropriate enough money in the last Congress to run the elevators in that great building in that magnificent city, and there are thirty-nine other Government

buildings in this country which are in the same sad plight to-day. You gentlemen will get letters about it if you have not already received them.

Why didn't you appropriate this money, gentlemen? Simply because you were, as now, taking the tax money paid by the people in this country and building up the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico and various other outside places, instead of looking after your own people at home. [Applause.] Our river and harbor works are suffering for the same reason.

Mr. SIMS. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Perhaps we have not very many great men in our district, but we claim Howell E. Jackson as a citizen of my district. He was born there and lived there until he was 50 years old.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. You are not so hard up for great men in your district that you need to take any of ours away from us.

Mr. SIMS. We can not spare any of them.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Judge Jackson formerly lived in Jackson and Memphis; but after his election to the Senate of the United States and while on the Supreme Bench—until his death—he lived near Nashville, at West Meade, where he died.

Mr. SIMS. You said your district produced him.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I meant the State produced him. He lived at Nashville. We have other men as good as he was, and he was good enough. He killed himself in his efforts to uphold our income-tax law of 1894, and he knew it would.

Mr. SIMS. He lived at Jackson, Tenn., when he was made judge, and that is in my district.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I think you are mistaken, but that is immaterial.

Mr. SIMS. He was living at Jackson, Tenn., when he was appointed.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. No; he was living at Nashville, West Meade, and I sent him a letter there about his trying for this supreme judgeship.

Mr. SIMS. We would like to have the gentleman himself in our district.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I thank my colleague for the compliment of the suggestion.

Now, gentlemen, I ask you seriously, whither are you going? I am not taking politics now, I am talking about an outrage in common we have imposed on our people.

I went into the room of the Committee on Appropriations a few minutes ago to get the names of the cities where these custom-house elevators were stopped, and the clerk of the committee informed me that he had sent down to get the list.

The chief clerk of the Treasury Department told me yesterday there were forty elevators that had been recently stopped, and these judges at Nashville, some of them old men, have to climb up two or three flights of stairs, and so do all the other people who have any business with the Government, except with the post-office on the ground floor. Gentlemen, I think you are carrying your expenditures in the Philippines a little too far. I think you had better stay at home a little bit with your money. I think you had better look after your town people. I think we had better look after our own people instead of going across the ocean, twenty-eight days' travel from our own country, trying to find a hole in or under the water where we can spend millions and millions of money that ought to be spent here at home; at least our home people should first be fully cared for.

Mr. CANDLER. They stopped the elevators at Memphis and at Birmingham.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes; I guess that is true. Now, gentlemen, I am not going to say, "I told you so."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee one minute more.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, gentlemen, I am going to read from Thomas Jefferson's third annual message. He often warned us to stay on this side of the world. He said:

Separated by a wide ocean from the nations of Europe and from the political interests which entangle them together, with productions and wants which render our commerce and friendship useful to them and theirs to us, it can not be the interest of any to assail us, nor ours to disturb them.

We should be most unwise, indeed, were we to cast away the singular blessings of the position in which nature has placed us, the opportunity she has endowed us with of pursuing, at a distance from foreign contentions, the paths of industry, peace, and happiness, of cultivating general friendship, and of bringing collisions of interest to the umbrage of reason rather than of force.

These burdens all come from not following the old Democratic doctrine of staying at home, where "nature" put us. [Applause.]

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I now yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GILLESPIE].

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, and as a part of my remarks to print a petition or statement of grievances from the bituminous coal league of Pennsylvania—the operators and shippers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record, and to print the petition to which he has referred.

Mr. PAYNE. On what subject?

Mr. GILLESPIE. The grievance of the bituminous coal operators and shippers of Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. To have it appear in the Record as a part of his remarks, and to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. PAYNE. I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope the gentleman from New York will not object, because we agreed to a shortening of the time for general debate.

Mr. PAYNE. The House ought to hear it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the gentleman from New York wouldn't stay here and listen to it.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to hear it now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be granted time to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be granted time to read the memorial. I understand the gentleman from New York will agree to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the time for general debate was fixed by the House, and can not be changed in the committee. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], but the time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask unanimous consent that the committee may rise in order that the proposal may be submitted to the House.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has twelve minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, in order that the elevator men of the Nashville public building and my very distinguished friend from Tennessee may feel relieved, I send to the Clerk's desk an extract from the Cincinnati Inquirer of February 1, which I ask to have read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFICIT—ALMOST ALL WIPED OUT—AND UNCLE SAM EXPECTS TO BE RID OF IT ENTIRELY WITHIN THIRTY DAYS.

WASHINGTON, February 1, 1906.

The monthly statement of the Government receipts and expenditures, issued to-day, shows a condition of the Treasury which is eminently satisfactory to the officials. One year ago to-day there was a deficit of over \$28,500,000, which has now been reduced to less than \$3,400,000, with the prospect that this amount will be entirely wiped out within the next thirty days. It is pointed out that to-day there is an available cash balance on hand, including deposits in national banks, of nearly \$144,000,000, with the daily receipts more than equaling the expenditures. This improved condition is due almost entirely to large increases in customs and internal-revenue receipts. During January the customs receipts alone amounted to \$26,889,912, which is an excess over January, 1905, of over \$4,500,000, and since July 1 last the customs receipts have exceeded those for the corresponding period last year by over \$22,500,000. During the same period internal-revenue receipts have increased over \$9,000,000. The expenditures last month were about \$2,250,000 less than for January, 1905, principally on account of reduced interest payments.

The monthly statement of the public debt department issued to-day shows that the debt, less cash in the Treasury, amounts to \$991,524,646, which is a decrease for the month of \$3,345,072. The debt is recapitulated as follows: Interest-bearing debt, \$895,159,180; debt on which interest has ceased since maturity, \$1,170,825; debt bearing no interest, \$389,079,673; total, \$1,285,409,678. This amount, however, does not include \$1,615,264,869 in certificates and Treasury notes outstanding, which are offset by an equal amount of cash on hand held for their redemption.

The cash in the Treasury is classified as follows: Gold reserve, \$150,000,000; trust funds, \$1,615,264,869; general fund, \$169,953,761; in national bank depositories, \$61,343,643; in Philippine treasury, \$5,148,603; total, \$1,404,710,877, against which there are demand liabilities outstanding amounting to \$1,110,825,795, leaving a balance on hand of \$293,885,082. Deducting the \$150,000,000 gold reserve leaves an available cash balance on hand of \$143,885,082.

The monthly circulation statement issued by the Comptroller of the Currency shows that at the close of business January 31 the total circulation of national-bank notes was \$543,230,080, which is an increase for the year of \$76,807,227 and an increase for the month of \$2,315,733. The total circulation based on United States bonds was \$506,365,749, an increase for the year of \$70,557,848 and an increase for the month of \$1,523,436. The amount of circulation secured by lawful money was \$36,864,331, an increase for the year of \$5,249,379 and an increase for the month of \$792,297. The amount of bonds on deposit to secure circulating notes was \$509,901,690 and to secure public deposits, \$64,822,800.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, criticism has been made on the floor as to the percentage which this bill appropriates or allots to the insular possessions. That percentage has been overstated. It has been stated that it was practically 25 per cent, when, in fact, it is a little over 20 per cent, and it must be borne in mind that while we have been engaged for eighteen years in appropriating money for the fortification of continental United States we have only been engaged for a brief period in the fortification of the insular possessions. Fortifications for continental United States are in a more advanced state than fortifications of the insular possessions. Not only this, but the insular possessions are chiefly exposed to a hostile attack. With the modern system of wireless telegraphy some one would indeed be at fault if any foreign fleet could reach any United States continental port without finding an American fleet to contend with.

It is impracticable for us to maintain any great fleet perpetually at the Philippine Islands, at the Hawaiian Islands, at the island of Guam, at the island of Porto Rico, and at the island of Cuba. These island possessions are the most exposed of all our possessions, and they have had the least done for their fortification. Not a gun is yet mounted in the insular possessions, but several will be by the end of next June. We are far in advance at home of what we have done for these people, and I should be loath to see one dollar cut off the appropriations proposed for the insular possessions, signifying to those people that they are not the subjects of our constant and watchful solicitude and care.

Now, it is contended here that we must violate all the practice of the past by designating, upon the judgment of Congress, where the War Department shall and where it shall not expend this money. It is suggested there was a general scheme under the Endicott board. It was never approved by Congress and never investigated by Congress. There is a general scheme known as the "Taft board plan" for the fortification of continental and insular United States, which is similar to the Endicott scheme.

We propose to appropriate this money as it has always been appropriated, not setting up the judgment of civilians against the judgment of trained men upon this subject. It has been my pleasure to listen to these experts here in the House, and after listening to their conflicting testimony I am compelled to say that I am better satisfied than ever to refer the whole subject to the War Department as to where the fortifications shall be in the Philippines and other insular possessions.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Well, I desire to yield for a moment or two to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has but two minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Very well; what is the question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman believe it is imperative to at once fortify Guantanamo on account of its exposed position; and if he does, why hasn't he made provision for that in this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Because we simply have a right to establish a navy-yard there. Cuba is not ours, and then \$180,000 has been set apart for the fortification of Guantanamo and not yet expended, and the Government has nothing there as yet to defend, while at Subig Bay we have more than \$2,000,000 already voted for this dry dock, for a coaling station, a naval station, and for other purposes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And we have already allotted \$455,000 there for fortifications and have not expended a dollar.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is true, and we have more than \$2,000,000 appropriated there exposed to attack and loss at Subig Bay and nothing at Guantanamo, and that is why I would give the War Department a wider discretion at Subig Bay than at Guantanamo.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GROSVENOR) having resumed the chair, Mr. CURRIER, 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. 14171) making appropriations for fortifications and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa rose.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 1098. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Grau;

S. 851. An act granting an increase of pension to Fredrick Houser;

S. 837. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Dunton;

S. 850. An act granting an increase of pension to Arthur F. Devereux;

S. 845. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Page;

S. 3307. An act granting an increase of pension to Philip W. Cornman;

S. 787. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen Ernst;

S. 785. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin C. Pierce;

S. 3244. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna F. Keith;

S. 727. An act granting an increase of pension to Jasper H. Keys;

S. 3243. An act granting an increase of pension to Akey C. Johnson;

S. 715. An act granting a pension to George A. Rollins;

S. 3180. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Geiger;

S. 3286. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary J. McGehee;

S. 714. An act granting an increase of pension to Susie Place;

S. 2879. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hoge;

S. 707. An act granting a pension to Alice E. Gilley;

S. 706. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Saltar;

S. 2825. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Scott;

S. 2779. An act granting an increase of pension to James J. Egan;

S. 670. An act granting an increase of pension to Anthony Barrett;

S. 2730. An act granting an increase of pension to James P. Ford;

S. 669. An act granting an increase of pension to Laurence Mericle;

S. 2583. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Robey;

S. 666. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Patrick;

S. 2564. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Matheny;

S. 647. An act granting an increase of pension to Leonard Harmony;

S. 2555. An act granting a pension to Sarah A. Barger;

S. 644. An act granting an increase of pension to Willard R. Hubbell;

S. 2415. An act granting an increase of pension to Fannie I. Edgerton;

S. 2481. An act granting an increase of pension to Elijah R. Wilkins;

S. 637. An act granting an increase of pension to John D. O'Brien;

S. 1525. An act granting an increase of pension to Zachariah Bradford;

S. 2293. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Hitchcock;

S. 2256. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander F. McConnell;

S. 1524. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Bukey;

S. 1517. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Kennedy;

S. 1509. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Hodges;

S. 2255. An act granting an increase of pension to James Thompson;

S. 1474. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Davis;

S. 2229. An act granting an increase of pension to William I. Hilkey;

S. 1467. An act granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Blodgett;

S. 2144. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. M. Brown;

S. 1466. An act granting an increase of pension to Phyllena Davis;

S. 2113. An act granting an increase of pension to Agnes Zentz;

S. 1456. An act granting a pension to Joann Morris;

S. 2112. An act granting an increase of pension to John Heck;

S. 1432. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Foreaker;

- S. 142. An act granting an increase of pension to William Furlong;
- S. 572. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Salisbury;
- S. 2071. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Anshutz;
- S. 2023. An act granting a pension to Amanda M. Richey;
- S. 565. An act granting an increase of pension to Lombard B. Alrich;
- S. 1987. An act granting a pension to Ella T. Hapeman;
- S. 564. An act granting an increase of pension to Wilson Hyatt;
- S. 534. An act granting an increase of pension to Dennis A. Davis;
- S. 1842. An act granting an increase of pension to Ransom O. Thayer;
- S. 1841. An act granting a pension to Robert Catlin;
- S. 531. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Satterthwait;
- S. 515. An act granting an increase of pension to Dennis Buckley McCready, alias Thomas Buckley;
- S. 1828. An act granting an increase of pension to Alvin Abbott;
- S. 1852. An act granting an increase of pension to Milton Marsh;
- S. 1827. An act granting an increase of pension to George C. Chase;
- S. 509. An act granting a pension to Annie L. Tredick;
- S. 1735. An act granting an increase of pension to Washington Hogans;
- S. 508. An act granting an increase of pension to William Kress;
- S. 1709. An act granting a pension to Florence Greeley De Veaux;
- S. 493. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Whittig;
- S. 1559. An act granting an increase of pension to Laura Clark;
- S. 472. An act granting an increase of pension to David F. Magee;
- S. 1529. An act granting an increase of pension to James L. Small;
- S. 407. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Purvis;
- S. 625. An act granting an increase of pension to Phebe J. Bennett;
- S. 393. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Stamper;
- S. 622. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram Swain;
- S. 385. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Gearey;
- S. 606. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Crowell;
- S. 330. An act granting an increase of pension to Kemenskia A. N. L. Collins, alias Lewis Collins;
- S. 603. An act granting an increase of pension to Lide S. Leonard;
- S. 329. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Blewett;
- S. 596. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Harding;
- S. 576. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick J. Shelley;
- S. 315. An act granting an increase of pension to George Pike;
- S. 1368. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Hicks;
- S. 328. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Warner;
- S. 322. An act granting an increase of pension to Isabella Workman;
- S. 575. An act granting an increase of pension to John Flynn;
- S. 314. An act granting a pension to Aletha E. Reynolds;
- S. 279. An act granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Barker;
- S. 1367. An act granting an increase of pension to Almon Foster;
- S. 1303. An act granting a pension to Harrison Brott;
- S. 949. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Epler;
- S. 244. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bramel, alias Thomas Bramble;
- S. 1271. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin Irwin;
- S. 238. An act granting an increase of pension to John Savage;
- S. 212. An act granting an increase of pension to John T. Liddle;
- S. 211. An act granting an increase of pension to Wilson J. Pool;
- S. 1258. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Paige, alias Jackson Morse;
- S. 210. An act granting an increase of pension to Silas P. Hall;
- S. 1212. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Wilcox;
- S. 209. An act granting an increase of pension to George F. Ross;
- S. 1163. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha G. Cushing;
- S. 206. An act granting an increase of pension to Gordon H. Sheppard;
- S. 1042. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis Piccard;
- S. 193. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Eberly;
- S. 1041. An act granting an increase of pension to Myron E. Billings;
- S. 185. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Cate;
- S. 1038. An act granting an increase of pension to James Frazier;
- S. 183. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Hunt;
- S. 1035. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew McClory;
- S. 179. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Mayhew;
- S. 178. An act granting an increase of pension to Irene A. Cochrane;
- S. 1015. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph McSwain;
- S. 164. An act granting a pension to Helen A. Fredrick;
- S. 994. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Weston;
- S. 145. An act granting an increase of pension to Wellington Marlett;
- S. 126. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Street;
- S. 140. An act granting an increase of pension to Maitland J. Freeman;
- S. 138. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Linehan;
- S. 122. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Stump;
- S. 120. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Buckley;
- S. 96. An act granting an increase of pension to George A. Francis;
- S. 991. An act granting an increase of pension to Jane McMahon;
- S. 81. An act granting an increase of pension to David E. Everett;
- S. 950. An act granting a pension to Emma M. Rea;
- S. 80. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Stangan;
- S. 986. An act granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Doan;
- S. 74. An act granting an increase of pension to Aaron T. Currier;
- S. 16. An act granting a pension to Susan H. Cutler;
- S. 923. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel L. Badger;
- S. 11. An act granting an increase of pension to Ruth B. Gurney;
- S. 9. An act granting an increase of pension to David P. Bolster;
- S. 1270. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Barr; and
- S. 943. An act granting an increase of pension to Oscar R. Arnold.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 14581) to appropriate \$25,000 to inclose and beautify the grounds and repair the monument on Moores Creek battlefield, North Carolina, and the same was referred to the Committee on the Library.

REPRINT OF BILL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following request of Mr. LORIMER for a reprint of the bill H. R. 12070—

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to have printed in the RECORD a communication to me in the form of a petition—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend for a moment. The Chair lays before the House the request of Mr. LORIMER for a reprint of the bill (H. R. 12070) making an appropriation for the completion of a 14-foot waterway from Chicago to St. Louis. Without objection, it will be so ordered. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is the gentleman from Texas, who makes a personal request.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GILLESPIE] has the floor, and the Chair requested that he suspend for a moment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. But the gentleman will recognize that a motion to adjourn is in order.

Mr. JAMES. But a motion to adjourn does not take the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GILLESPIE] off the floor. He had the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. But, Mr. Speaker, I rose to address the Chair, and was recognized before the gentleman from Texas rose at all.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GILLESPIE] had the floor, had been recognized by the Chair, and the Chair asked him to suspend a moment until the request made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER] for a reprint of a certain bill could be put. When that was done, then the recognition came back to the gentleman from Texas, and in the meantime the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] made the motion to adjourn. I insist that the point of order is well taken and that the gentleman from Texas has the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion to adjourn for the present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement addressed to me in the form of a petition from the Bituminous Coal Trade League of Pennsylvania, operators and shippers, setting forth their grievances against certain combinations they complain of.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Speaker, for the third time I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not had the opportunity yet.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now we know you object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a memorial the title of which he has read. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Please let the Chair make a statement. The temporary occupant of the chair desires to say he would not wish to be considered as doing anything unfair. The Chair did not recognize the gentleman from Texas, but asked the gentleman from Texas to suspend his request until the gentleman from Iowa should yield the floor, so the gentleman from Texas did not have the floor. The gentleman from Iowa now moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, division!

The House divided; and there were—ayes 82, noes 49.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, upon this I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Iowa will take their places as tellers.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 92, noes 53.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, upon this question I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 106, nays 64, answered "present" 5, not voting 209, as follows:

YEAS—106.

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Acheson | Davidson | Hedge | Otjen |
| Adams, Wis. | Dawes | Hill, Conn. | Palmer |
| Alexander | Denby | Howell, N. J. | Patterson, Pa. |
| Allen, N. J. | Dickson, Ill. | Howell, Utah | Payne |
| Bennet, N. Y. | Dovener | Hubbard | Reynolds |
| Birdsall | Draper | Hughes | Rives |
| Boutell | Edwards | Hull | Samuel |
| Brick | Ellis | Jenkins | Smith, Ill. |
| Brown | Esch | Jones, Wash. | Smith, Iowa |
| Brownlow | Flack | Kahn | Smith, Pa. |
| Burke, S. Dak. | Foss | Keifer | Smyser |
| Burleigh | Foster, Ind. | Kennedy, Nebr. | Snapp |
| Burton, Del. | French | Knapp | Southard |
| Burton, Ohio | Fulkerson | Knopf | Southwick |
| Butler, Pa. | Fuller | Lacey | Steenerson |
| Calderhead | Gaines, W. Va. | Lafean | Stevens, Minn. |
| Campbell, Ohio | Gardner, Mass. | Littauer | Tawney |
| Capron | Gardner, N. J. | Lorimer | Taylor, Ohio |
| Cassel | Gillett, Cal. | Loudenslager | Tirrell |
| Chaney | Goebel | McCarthy | Tyndall |
| Cole | Graff | Madden | Van Winkle |
| Cooper, Wis. | Graham | Mahon | Volstead |
| Crumppacker | Gronna | Marshall | Waldo |
| Curtis | Grosvenor | Morrell | Welborn |
| Cushman | Hamilton | Mouser | Woodyard |
| Dale | Haugen | Needham | |
| Dalzell | Hayes | Olcott | |

NAYS—64.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Aiken | Fitzgerald | Kitchin, Wm. W. | Rodenberg |
| Bartlett | Floyd | Kline | Shackelford |
| Beall, Tex. | Gaines, Tenn. | Lamar | Sheppard |
| Bell, Ga. | Garner | Lee | Sims |
| Brooks, Tex. | Garrett | Livingston | Small |
| Burgess | Gillespie | Lloyd | Smith, Ky. |
| Burleson | Hardwick | McNary | Smith, Md. |
| Byrd | Heflin | Macon | Spight |
| Candler | Hill, Miss. | Moon, Tenn. | Stanley |
| Chapman | Houston | Page | Stephens, Tex. |
| Clark, Fla. | Howard | Patterson, N. C. | Sullivan, Mass. |
| Clark, Mo. | Humphreys, Miss. | Pou | Thomas, N. C. |
| Clayton | Hunt | Randell, Tex. | Wharton |
| Davis, W. Va. | James | Randsell, La. | Wiley, Ala. |
| Dixon, Ind. | Jones, Va. | Richardson, Ala. | Williams |
| Ellerbe | Kelher | Rixey | Wilson |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

| | | | |
|---------|-------|---------|--------|
| Currier | Lever | Sherman | Wanger |
| Johnson | | | |

NOT VOTING—209.

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Adams, Pa. | Fletcher | Lindsay | Robinson, Ark. |
| Adamson | Flood | Little | Rucker |
| Allen, Me. | Fordney | Littlefield | Ruppert |
| Ames | Foster, Vt. | Longworth | Russell |
| Andrus | Fowler | Loud | Ryan |
| Babcock | Garber | Lovering | Schneebell |
| Bankhead | Gardner, Mich. | McCall | Scott |
| Bannon | Gilbert, Ind. | McCleary, Minn. | Scroggy |
| Barchfeld | Gilbert, Ky. | McCreary, Pa. | Shartel |
| Bartholdt | Gill | McDermott | Sherley |
| Bates | Gillett, Mass. | McGavin | Sibley |
| Bede | Glass | McKinlay, Cal. | Slyden |
| Beidler | Goldfogle | McKinley, Ill. | Slomp |
| Bennett, Ky. | Goulden | McKinney | Smith, Cal. |
| Bingham | Granger | McLachlan | Smith, Samuel W. |
| Bishop | Greene | McLain | Smith, Wm. Alden |
| Blackburn | Gregg | McMorran | Smith, Tex. |
| Bonyng | Griggs | Mann | Southall |
| Bowers | Gudger | Martin | Sparkman |
| Bowersock | Hale | Maynard | Sperry |
| Bowie | Haskins | Meyer | Stafford |
| Bradley | Hay | Michalek | Sterling |
| Brantley | Hearst | Miller | Sullivan, N. Y. |
| Brooks, Colo. | Henry, Conn. | Minor | Sulloway |
| Broussard | Henry, Tex. | Mondell | Sulzer |
| Brundidge | Hepburn | Moon, Pa. | Talbott |
| Buckman | Hermann | Moore | Taylor, Ala. |
| Burke, Pa. | Higgins | Mudd | Thomas, Ohio |
| Burnett | Hinshaw | Murdock | Towne |
| Butler, Tenn. | Hitt | Murphy | Townsend |
| Calder | Hoar | Nevin | Trimble |
| Campbell, Kans. | Hogg | Norris | Underwood |
| Castor | Holliday | Olmsted | Van Duzer |
| Cocks | Hopkins | Overstreet | Vreeland |
| Conner | Huff | Padgett | Wachter |
| Cooper, Pa. | Humphrey, Wash. | Parker | Wadsworth |
| Cousins | Kennedy, Ohio | Parsons | Wallace |
| Cramer | Ketcham | Patterson, S. C. | Watkins |
| Darragh | Kinkaid | Patterson, Tenn. | Watson |
| Davey, La. | Kitchin, Claude | Pearre | Webb |
| Davis, Minn. | Klepper | Perkins | Webber |
| Dawson | Knowland | Pollard | Weeks |
| De Armond | Lamb | Powers | Weems |
| Deemer | Landis, Chas. B. | Prince | Weisse |
| Dixon, Mont. | Landis, Frederick | Pujo | Wiley, N. J. |
| Dresser | Law | Rainey | Williamson |
| Driscoll | Lawrence | Reeder | Wood, Mo. |
| Dunwell | Le Fevre | Reld | Wood, N. J. |
| Dwight | Legare | Rhinock | Young |
| Fassett | Lester | Rhodes | Zenor |
| Field | Lewis | Richardson, Ky. | |
| Finley | Lilley, Conn. | Roberts | |
| | Lilley, Pa. | Robertson, La. | |

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania with Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky.

Mr. DAWSON with Mr. PADGETT.
 Mr. DWIGHT with Mr. SOUTHALL.
 Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.
 Mr. BARCHFELD with Mr. LITTLE.
 Mr. WATSON with Mr. SHERLEY.
 Mr. CALDER with Mr. VAN DUZER.
 Mr. MCKINNEY with Mr. PUJO.
 Mr. CROMER with Mr. ZENOR.
 Mr. RHODES with Mr. GRANGER.
 Mr. MCCALL with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.
 Mr. HASKINS with Mr. LEVER.
 Mr. MCKINLEY of Illinois with Mr. McDERMOTT.
 Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas with Mr. RHINOCK.
 Mr. DARRAGH with Mr. GARBER.
 Mr. THOMAS of Ohio with Mr. SULLIVAN of New York.
 For the day:
 Mr. LOVERING with Mr. RAINY.
 Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina.
 Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS with Mr. SLAYDEN.
 Mr. KNOWLAND with Mr. MAYNARD.
 Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. LAMB.
 Mr. HUFF with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.
 Mr. HOAR with Mr. HOPKINS.
 Mr. HEPBURN with Mr. HAY.
 Mr. HENRY of Connecticut with Mr. GUDGER.
 Mr. GREENE with Mr. GREGG.
 Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts with Mr. MEYER.
 Mr. MUDD with Mr. TALBOTT.
 Mr. GILBERT of Indiana with Mr. GLASS.
 Mr. DRESSER with Mr. GILL.
 Mr. DIXON of Montana with Mr. FLOOD.
 Mr. COUSINS with Mr. FIELD.
 Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. SULZER.
 Mr. BONYNGE with Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee.
 Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.
 Mr. BEDE with Mr. BURNETT.
 Mr. BANNON with Mr. BOWERS.
 Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.
 Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. BANKHEAD.
 Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. SPARKMAN.
 Mr. BOWERSOCK with Mr. McLAIN.
 Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. UNDERWOOD.
 Mr. HITT with Mr. DE ARMOND.
 Mr. PARKER with Mr. LESTER.
 Mr. LAW with Mr. LINDSAY.
 Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. BROUSSARD.
 Mr. BISHOP with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. FASSETT with Mr. HEARST.
 Mr. MCCREARY of Pennsylvania with Mr. COCKRAN.
 Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. HENRY of Texas.
 Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota with Mr. TOWNE.
 Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania with Mr. LEGARE.
 Mr. MARTIN with Mr. GRIGGS.
 Mr. WACHTER with Mr. TRIMBLE.
 Mr. MANN with Mr. BOWIE.
 Mr. DUNWELL with Mr. LEWIS.
 Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. BRANTLEY.
 Mr. LE FEVRE with Mr. WATKINS.
 Mr. HALE with Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 Mr. WOOD of New Jersey with Mr. RUCKER.
 Mr. WILEY of New Jersey with Mr. WALLACE.
 Mr. VREELAND with Mr. WOOD of Missouri.
 Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH with Mr. WEBB.
 Mr. SCOTT with Mr. RYAN.
 Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas.
 Mr. PRINCE with Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky.
 Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. RUSSELL.
 Mr. NORRIS with Mr. REID.
 Mr. MCGAVIN with Mr. MOORE.
 On fortification bill:
 Mr. BROOKS of Colorado with Mr. JOHNSON.
 For the session:
 Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RUPPERT.
 Mr. KNOPF with Mr. WEISSE.
 Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.
 Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.
 Mr. CURRIER with Mr. FINLEY.
 The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.
 Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 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 Navy, transmitting, in response to the inquiry of the House, reports as to delay of materials for the ships *Connecticut* and *Louisiana*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for the relief of George W. Evans—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, recommending legislation for the admission of the insane of civilian employees of the Medical Department of the Army to the Government Hospital for the Insane—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Manistee Harbor, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with accompanying illustrations.

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. SOUTHARD, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13783) to provide souvenir medallions for The Zebulon Montgomery Pike Monument Association, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1183); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14611) to create and establish a Bureau of Geology and Mining as a part of the Department of Commerce and Labor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1184); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BARTHOLDT, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the House resolution (H. Res. 266) requesting information from the Secretary of the Treasury relative to custom-house property in New York City, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1185); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BIRDSALL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 443) to authorize the President of the United States, in conjunction with the State of Texas, to run and mark the boundary lines between the Territories of Oklahoma and New Mexico and the State of Texas, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1186); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SOUTHARD, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8444) providing for the recoinage of abraded and uncurrent silver dollars into subsidiary coin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1187); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 229) providing for the purchase of metal and the coinage of minor coins, and the distribution and redemption of said coins, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1188); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7144) for the relief of Aaron Everly, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1189); 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. 13735) for the relief of John Purkale, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1190); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 14803) to provide for the correction of mistakes made in locating the mineral leases in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 14804) making an appropriation for the construction and completion of Locks and Dams Nos. 12 and 13 in the Kentucky River, and authorizing the Secretary of War to have a review or renewal of the survey made of the North Fork, Middle Fork, and South Fork of the Kentucky River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLACK: A bill (H. R. 14805) to provide for the purchase of Ticonderoga, in the State of New York, and to establish a national park thereat, and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 14806) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to interest and usury—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 14807) to encourage and to temporarily assist the construction, equipment, operation, and maintenance of railroads in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 14808) authorizing the Choctawhatchee Power Company to erect a dam in Dale County, Ala.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 14809) to remove the criminal insane from the Government Hospital for the Insane, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYNARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 14810) to erect a public building at Hampton, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 14811) to authorize George T. Houston and Frank B. Houston to construct and operate an electric railway over the national cemetery road at Vicksburg, Miss.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 14812) to authorize the purchase or construction of a steam or naphtha launch for use in the customs collection district of Norfolk, Va.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 14813) to amend an act approved March 1, 1905, entitled "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"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 14814) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Highways, and to provide for national aid in the improvement of the public roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 14815) for the extension of Harvard street, Columbia Heights, District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GRONNA: A bill (H. R. 14891) providing for the segregation of \$1,000,000 from the reclamation fund created by the act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. LAMAR: A bill (H. R. 14892) making an appropriation for completing the construction of the road to the Barancas military post by way of the national cemetery and the navy-yard on the naval reservation near Pensacola, Fla.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 14893) to change the name of Cristobal to Aspinwall—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A resolution (H. Res. 270) instructing the Committee on Ways and Means to report favorably on the Bowie bill—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 14816) for the relief of Pinkney Persons—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 14817) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Weaver—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14818) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Laura L. Otis, late of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14819) to refund legacy taxes illegally col-

lected from the estate of John C. Wiedeman, late of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COCKS: A bill (H. R. 14820) granting an increase of pension to Anna G. Valk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIER (by request): A bill (H. R. 14821) to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of holders of Kaw or Kansas Indian scrip to be paid interest according to the face of said scrip—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 14822) granting an increase of pension to Amos McManus—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14823) granting an increase of pension to William Woods—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14824) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Newman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULKERSON: A bill (H. R. 14825) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14826) granting a pension to J. W. Mesick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 14827) granting an increase of pension to William K. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 14828) for the relief of the heirs of and legal representatives of George S. Simon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14829) granting an increase of pension to Erasmus B. Manahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 14830) for the relief of Van Foreman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14831) for the relief of A. Portwood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14832) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. M. F. Sims, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14833) for the relief of the estate of Alexander Williams, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14834) granting an increase of pension to Ruth J. McCann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14835) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Wiler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14836) granting an increase of pension to George Akers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 14837) granting an increase of pension to Arthur G. McNeil—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 14838) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Noggle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 14839) granting an increase of pension to James McManus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 14840) granting a pension to Nathaniel H. Rone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 14841) for the relief of J. C. Shelby—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 14842) for the relief of John Brodie, Frank Klein, and Charles Anderson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14843) for the relief of Alexander D. McDonald, of San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 14844) to refund taxes illegally collected from the estate of Sarah Jane Bain, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14845) granting a pension to Anna Magdalena Jacoby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 14846) for the relief of Louis H. Legler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER (by request): A bill (H. R. 14847) for the relief of George F. Ormsby—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 14848) granting an increase of pension to Samantha E. Herald—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 14849) for the relief of the heirs of Alfred Mullins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 14850) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Allen C. Newland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 14851) granting an increase of pension to James E. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14852) to correct the military record of Showers E. Nelson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 14853) granting an increase of pension to Helen C. Sanderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14854) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 14855) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 14856) granting a pension to Burdine Blake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 14857) for the relief of J. W. Allen, administrator de bonis non of B. N. C. Allen, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14858) for the relief of H. Z. Taylor, administrator of the estate of H. R. M. Taylor, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 14859) for the relief of the heirs of William M. West—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SAMUEL: A bill (H. R. 14860) granting an increase of pension to William D. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 14861) granting an increase of pension to Dennis W. Ray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14862) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. White—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 14863) for the relief of the estate of R. W. Hawkins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14864) for the relief of the estate of John H. Seebold, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 14865) for the relief of Maj. J. Y. Dashiell, late a paymaster in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 14866) to grant an honorable discharge to George W. Elliott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 14867) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14868) to remove the restrictions off of the allotments of William N. Talliaferro and Mary Estella Talliaferro and permitting them to sell their real estate—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 14869) granting an increase of pension to E. H. Waters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: A bill (H. R. 14870) for the relief of Mildred Douthitt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14871) for the relief of William McCracken—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14872) for the relief of the estate of R. M. McClelland, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14873) granting a pension to George H. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14874) granting an increase of pension to William C. Hearne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14875) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Witt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14876) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George Vandergriff—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYNDALL: A bill (H. R. 14877) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay George R. Martin \$100 additional bounty—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 14878) granting an increase of pension to Charles Rattray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 14879) granting a pension to Louisa J. Nelson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 14880) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Virmilya—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 14881) for the relief of heirs of William Douthitt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14882) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Haws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14883) granting an increase of pension to Fannie E. Pennypacker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14884) granting an increase of pension to Henry Stauffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14885) granting an increase of pension to Patrick McGhee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14886) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Todd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMAR: A bill (H. R. 14887) granting an increase of pension to Mathew D. Raker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 14888) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Bunker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 14889) for the relief of David B. Dowdell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14890) granting an increase of pension to James H. Posey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

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. 9287) granting a pension to Eliza Byron—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1911) granting a pension to Harriet E. Grogan—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred 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 W. D. Hubler, of Oakdale, Nebr., relative to the "fraud order"—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the legislative assembly of Porto Rico, for legislation for citizenship for the people of Porto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of citizens of Wampum, Lawrence County, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Sons of Veterans, Pennsylvania Division, Anna M. Ross Camp, No. 1, against bill H. R. 8131—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of New Jersey: Petition of the Passaic City Teachers' Association, approving and urging passage of bills S. 2327 and H. R. 5065—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREWS: Petition of Otero County Advertiser, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of the University of Missouri, for removal of the tariff from books, maps, and lithographic prints—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of St. Louis Electrotpe Foundry Company, favoring bill (H. R. 9022) granting postal privileges to certain charitable publications—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Religious Liberty Bureau, against bill (H. R. 10510) relative to Sabbath observance in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of Sons of Veterans, Camp No. 37, of Wattsburg, Pa., for passage of bill H. R. 8131—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: Petition of G. E. Boynton Lodge, No. 138, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Eagle Grove, Iowa, favoring the Bates-Penrose bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petition of the Graduate Magazine, of Lawrence, and the Kansas Prohibitionist, of Kansas City, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: Petitions of the Citizen and the Teller County Banner, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN: Petition of the Ward County Reporter, of Grand Rapids, Wis., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Good Will Grange, Amherst, Me., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Kennebec Lodge, No. 343, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, for the Bates-Penrose bill and in support of the Gilbert bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Amos Vaughan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Petitions of Newland Watkins, G. D. Harris, Rev. W. L. Matheny, A. C. Bush, J. D. Greer, Mitchell P. Fox, the Graf Printing Company, R. M. White, T. W.

Hunter, and John Beal, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAYTON: Petition of many citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COCKS: Petition of the New York State Agricultural Society, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Lynbrook Council, No. 12; Puritan Council; Freeport Council, No. 57; Shelter Council, No. 32; Our Council; Atlantic Council; Empire Council; Woodmen Council, No. 83; A. A. Haines Council, No. 66, and Linbrook Council, No. 121, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of many citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Port Jefferson, N. Y., against repeal of the canteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association, against the Grosvenor bill, reducing the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association, endorsing the President's position on the railway-rate question—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association, for elevation of the dairy division to a distinct bureau of the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association, for bill H. R. 345—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin State Board of Agriculture, for revision of the tariff schedules along certain lines, favoring a reciprocity treaty, and for railway rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of the Republican, of Grundy Center, Iowa, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. S. & G. H. Lewis, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRIER: Petition of Charlestown (N. H.) Grange, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petitions of the Tribune and Monitor, Fort Scott, Kans., and Arthur Capper, of Topeka, Kans., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Atchison Council, No. 99, United Commercial Travelers of the United States, for an amendment to bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOVENER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Eliza Peel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the Central Federated Union, favoring the bill H. R. 12472—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of the California Fruit Growers' Exchange, relative to Federal control of railway rates and private cars—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Woods—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Amos McManus, of Lancaster, S. C.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel P. Newman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of the Humane Society, relative to extending the time for transit of live stock—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOOD: Petition of the Bath County Enterprise, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thompson Garland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

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

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

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Herman G. Weller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of G. W. Glenn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of J. M. C. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William K. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: Petition of citizens of Texas, favoring investigation of affairs in the Kongo Free State—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 10056, for placing Capt. Charles I. Gibbs on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of the Adams Budget, of Adams, N. Dak., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hans Anderson, relative to drainage of Red River lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of the Frankford (Ohio) Farmers' Institute, for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Rehoboth Central Grange, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of a mass meeting of citizens of Detroit, Mich., held in the Detroit Opera House on Sunday, December 10, 1905, relative to outrages upon the Russian Jews and for appropriate action by Congress—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of the Colmon Courier, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of S. A. Duhling—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, against passage of bill S. 529, relative to creating a force of naval volunteers—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Board of Trade, against repeal of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petition of the Waco Echo, of Waco, Tex., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of Quinnetisset Grange, of Thompson, Conn., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petition of the Bristol Press, of Bristol, Conn., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of the Nebraska Signal, of Geneva, Nebr., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of Mayflower Council, No. 159, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the Kingdom, of San Francisco, Cal., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of San Francisco, Cal., against repeal of the present bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Oakland Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, relative to carrying live stock—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLINE: Petition of the Reading Telegram, of Reading, Pa., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Coopersburg Sentinel, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMB: Petition of the Dames of 1846, for increase of pensions to soldiers of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of Camden Grange, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McLAIN: Petitions of the Fayette Chronicle and the Leader, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of Colonel T. B. Kennedy Subdivision, No. 685, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring bill H. R. 239 (the employers' liability bill)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the National Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., for improvement of the merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Humane Society, against extending the

twenty-eight-hour law relative to transit of live stock—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Philip H. Sheridan Garrison, No. 31, relative to desecration of the flag of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the California Fruit Growers' Exchange, relative to Government control of railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of prominent citizens and business firms of North Dakota, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hans Anderson, relative to land drainage in the Red River Valley—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of the Glenburn Advance, of Glenburn; the Goose River Farmer, of Mayville, and the Press, of Dickinson, N. Dak., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINOR: Petition of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association, for a distinct bureau for the dairymen's department in the Department of Agriculture, against reduction of the tax on oleomargarine, and in approval of bill H. R. 345—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Joshua Holcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: Petition of the National Board of Trade of Philadelphia, for Federal control of interstate insurance—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Intelligencer, of Philadelphia, Pa., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOUSER: Petition of Local Union No. 1081, of Marion, Ohio, and R. J. Aigler, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of the Nebraska State Swine Breeders' Association, favoring bill H. R. 345 (the experiment stations bill)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, Overland Lodge, No. 123, of Omaha, Nebr., favoring the Bates-Penrose bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of D. Lewis, of Carlisle, Ark., relative to the "fraud order"—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Nathan B. Williams, relative to the "fraud order"—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PAYNE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Aaron P. Seeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John L. Clifton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: Petition of Grange No. 1128, of Pennsylvania, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Harriet Kyler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petitions of the Journal, of Johnstown, Pa.; the Mirror, of Altoona, Pa., and the Cambria Tribune, of Ebensburg, Pa., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVES: Petition of the News, of Owaneco, Ill., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCROGGY: Petition of E. H. Colvin et al., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Stebbins & Burney, of Little Falls, N. Y., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERLEY: Petition of the Pentecostal Herald, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of Local Union No. 305, of Duquoin, Ill., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Caroline Neilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of citizens of Washington, D. C., against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: Petition of Clarksville Grange, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of the professors of the Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., favoring the metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of the Business Men's

Club of San Antonio, Tex., for extending the benefit of irrigation to Texas—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John F. Aslup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of the New Hampshire Audubon Society, for bill S. 2966, relating to forest reservations and the protection of game—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts: Petition of the Massachusetts Medical Journal, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: Petition of W. S. Gilmer, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of the Ledger, of Olean, N. Y., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Maddox & Co., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of the Granite, Marble, and Bronze, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: Petition of the Advocate, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 14, 1906.

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

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ADMISSION TO GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, requesting that the second clause of section 4843 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be further amended so as to authorize the admission to the Government Hospital for the Insane of civilian employees in the Medical Department of the Army who may be or become insane while in that employment; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to the act of January 12, 1895, providing for the public printing and distribution of public documents, a letter from the Commissioner of Patents and a copy of the decisions of the Commissioner of Patents and of the United States courts in patent cases for the year 1905; which was referred to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2106) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near Van Buren, Ark., with an amendment; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 436. An act establishing a United States court and recording district at Duncan, Ind. T., and conforming other districts therewith;

H. R. 8977. An act to create a new division of the western judicial district of Texas and to provide for terms of court at Del Rio, Tex., and for a clerk for said court, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13548. An act to authorize the commissioners' court of Baldwin County, Ala., to construct a bridge across Perdido River at Waters Ferry;

H. R. 13567. An act to authorize the Campbell Lumber Company to construct a bridge across the St. Francis River, in Clay County, Ark., at or near the point where the section line between sections 21 and 28, township 19 north, range 9 east, touches said river; and

H. R. 13568. An act to authorize the Campbell Lumber Company to construct a bridge across the St. Francis River, in Clay County, Ark., at or near the point where the section line between sections 23 and 26 in township 20 north, range 9 east, touches said river.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President: